

Colorado Statewide Intercity and Regional Bus Network Study

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study is to form a foundation for strengthening the intercity and regional bus services available in Colorado by identifying policies to guide the State's role and investment in intercity and regional bus services. The study includes an overview of relevant federal and state regulatory and funding policies, along with the recent history of the intercity bus industry and its positions with regard to funding and regulations. This information is included to provide a context for considering alternatives that respond to the changes in the industry and the services it provides. It also includes an inventory of the existing intercity services, including longer-distance regional services operated by public transit providers, documenting the routes and frequencies, and connectivity of these services. To identify unmet needs, a demographic analysis was performed to locate places in Colorado with a density of populations having transit need characteristics, including young adult populations, senior populations, low income populations, and autoless households. The existing intercity networks were mapped to determine if areas of need are served by the existing network.

As part of the study process, this information was provided to a study Advisory Committee representing intercity bus providers, transit operators, and regional planning agencies. In addition, an extensive telephone/e-mail survey of stakeholders was conducted across the state. As a result of this input it became clear that addressing Colorado's needs would require not one intercity bus network, but two. Many of the needs identified are for long-distance commuters making work trips, however, the Federal Transit Administration's (FTA) Section 5311(f) program is designed primarily to replace unprofitable rural intercity bus service, and use of it for commuter service is not permitted. Therefore, the study focused on developing a rural intercity network eligible for funding under Section 5311(f), designed to provide coverage of the state; and a second network of regional services to meet commuter needs.

Estimates of the annual operating costs of the services included in both networks were developed, based on assumptions regarding the appropriate level of service (frequency) and the costs of the type of operator likely to provide the service. The identified routes and service levels were compared to the regional public transportation elements developed for the statewide 2035 Transportation Plan, and some slight revisions were made to bring these plans into

congruence. Finally, this study addressed the need for state-level policy consideration of the need for funding sources to address the identified regional needs, as there is currently no state operating assistance and available federal funds are not adequate to address these needs.

ISSUES IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PREFERRED NETWORKS

As indicated above, the Stakeholder and Committee input suggested that there are needs across the state for several kinds of service. These include long-distance daily commuter service aimed at work trips, basic mobility for essential trips to distant medical and human services, and intercity services providing connectivity from rural places to the major urban areas and to the national intercity networks (bus, rail, and air) for trips to more distant places.

The programs available to address these needs are very limited. Colorado receives a limited amount of annual funding under the FTA Section 5311(f) program of assistance for rural intercity bus transportation (\$1,182,286 in FY 2008), based on the 15 percent set-aside element of the state's overall Section 5311 allocation (based on its percentage of the national rural population). These funds cannot be used for commuter services, and must have an intercity network connection. The existing intercity bus services are funded with fare revenues (except for two existing S.5311(f) projects), but there are additional routes needed to provide a minimal level of connectivity from many rural communities to the major urban areas and the intercity networks. These services will require subsidies because they will not generate sufficient revenues to pay the full cost of the service.

The study also identified significant needs for long-distance commuter services. These services would require a higher level of service (greater frequency) than the intercity connections, and are needed in many more corridors. They are needed to support employment trips, and to reduce the role of the single occupant vehicle in peak periods (to address congestion and energy issues). In some corridors, high-frequency commuter bus service could be implemented as a precursor to Bus Rapid Transit or rail services. The identified regional services require other (beyond S.5311(f)) sources of funding, both because of the restrictions on the S.5311(f) services, and because the funding requirements are greater. Existing regional services are funded by the local jurisdictions, and the ability to implement any additional services is dependent on the willingness of local jurisdictions to provide operating funds.

RESULT: TWO PREFERRED NETWORK PLANS—INTERCITY AND REGIONAL

Consequently, the study evolved two preferred networks, each related to the funding programs and the distinct characteristics of the need: an Intercity Bus (ICB) Network, and a Regional Network.

The Intercity Bus Network

The ICB Network (Figure ES-1), was developed as an option that can be funded under S.5311(f). The ICB Network provides for a minimal level of coverage statewide. It includes existing services provided by private carriers without any public funding assistance, plus additional corridors that would require S.5311(f) funding. These corridors could be operated at a minimal level of service—one round trip per day (defined as Level of Service D for this study), for approximately \$800,000 per year if localities were willing to cover 50 percent of the net operating deficit. Using a new match option provided by FTA under a “Pilot Project” that allows use of the value of existing unsubsidized connecting service as in-kind match, the total federal cost would be \$1,600,000 per year for the entire network. However, there would be no local cash match required. Table ES-1 presents a list of the routes, the projected net operating deficit, and the estimated S.5311(f) funding requirements under the two match scenarios.

Table ES-1: INTERCITY PROGRAM OPERATING COSTS

Cities	Net Operating Deficit	Project S.5311(f) Operating Share	Federal Share with In-kind Match
Denver-Craig-toward SLC (ends at state line)	\$567,000	\$284,000	\$567,000
Greeley-Yuma	\$224,100	\$112,000	\$224,100
Colorado Springs-Salida	\$199,800	\$100,000	\$199,800
Gunnison-Montrose	\$126,900	\$63,000	\$126,900
Montrose-Delta-Grand Junction	\$121,500	\$61,000	\$121,500
Gunnison-Salida-Denver-DIA	\$307,800	\$154,000	\$307,800
Lamar-toward Wichita (ends at state line)	\$62,100	\$31,000	\$62,100
TOTAL ICB Service		\$805,000	\$1,609,200

The Regional Network

A network of regional services (Figure ES-2) was developed to address the needs for commuter services. It was based on stakeholder and Advisory Committee input, local and state plans. It includes existing commuter services provided by public transit systems across the state, plus additional proposed services. The proposed services were initially developed for each corridor at three different levels of service (A, B, or C) to reflect different frequency requirements. In the final preferred network, each corridor has a single recommended Level of Service (LOS) which is associated with the estimated cost. Both a recommended (high LOS) and Interim (improved LOS) plans were developed. The Denver Regional Transportation District (RTD) services in the Denver region were costed separately, as these are already at a higher level of service. Table ES-2 presents a summary of the Regional Network Operating Costs, and complete details are provided as an Attachment to this Executive Summary.

Table ES-2: REGIONAL NETWORK OPERATING COST SUMMARY

Level	Rural Regional	RTD Regional	Total Regional	Additional Local \$ Needed
Recommended	\$34.8 million	\$16.4 million	\$51.2 million	\$13.9 million
Interim	\$28.4 million	\$16.4 million	\$44.8 million	\$7.6 million

RELATIONSHIP TO THE 2035 TRANSPORTATION PLAN

To ensure consistency with other intermodal statewide plans, the Corridor Vision Statements developed for each region as part of the Statewide 2035 Transportation Plan were reviewed and compared to the Intercity and Regional Preferred Networks developed as part of this study. Most of the proposed regional or intercity service in the Preferred Networks has been identified as needing some form of public transportation service in 2035. Four corridors identified in this study with either regional or intercity service did not show this need in their Corridor Vision, and this study recommended that these regions amend their Corridor Visions to show a need for transit on the following corridors as shown in Table ES-3:

Table ES-3: CORRIDOR VISIONS

Region	Corridor	Required Change
Intermountain	CO 131	Add “transit” as a future mode
Northwest	CO 12	Add “transit” as a future mode
Eastern and Upper Front Range	US 34	Add “transit” as a future mode
Southeast	US 50	Add “transit” as a future mode

RECOMMENDATIONS

Intercity Bus Network

The study recommends that Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) consider the intercity bus services identified as the ICB Preferred Network as the first priority for S.5311(f) funding, including continuation of successful existing projects, adding new projects as operators are identified. To the extent possible, CDOT should regard the full S.5311(f) 15% set-aside of the S.5311 program as available for the intercity program. The timing of expansion projects, the three-year limitation on holding funds in reserve, and the performance of existing projects will require active management that may mean the use of S.5311(f) for other projects or capital projects in any given year, or even use of some portion of the set aside for other S.5311 projects (partial certification) rather than have funds lapse.

In addition to the operation of the recommended S.5311(f) routes, CDOT should take a proactive role in utilizing this and other funding sources for other projects to support the development of a statewide network of connecting intercity and public transit services. Ultimately a network would need to provide users with the ability to obtain information about the different modes, operators, and services and how they connect; the ability for users to make the physical transfer between modes and carriers in shared intermodal terminals; and for users to be able to obtain interline ticketing to facilitate connections.

The study identified two key intermodal terminals that are critical to the development of a connecting network of intercity, statewide, and regional services. Denver Union Station offers the possibility of providing a single location where passengers could transfer between intercity bus, Amtrak intercity passenger rail, RTD, and FREX regional bus services, RTD light rail service, RTD commuter rail, and local transit buses. CDOT, RTD, and the City should work toward the realization of this potential to create a model intermodal hub. The other key facility is Denver International Airport, where intercity bus services no longer operate because of security issues (though RTD Skyride bus service links the airport with the Greyhound station). Again, the link from the national/international commercial air network to the intercity and regional bus service networks in a single terminal is needed to create an intermodal system allowing convenient usage of the existing and planned services.

For these reasons it is recommended that CDOT and other regional stakeholders utilize S.5311(f) and other funding sources to support the development of an intermodal network by supporting other types of projects including:

- Facility costs for portions of intermodal terminal facilities that are proportionate to their use by rural intercity services,
- Incremental costs that may arise to enable intercity/regional bus access to Denver International Airport (such as security checks, etc.),
- Provision of internet/telephone information about the entire network (perhaps using a third-party platform such as Google Transit),
- Trailblazer signs to let users know where stations and stops are located.

Potentially other state funds available for capital could also be used for such purposes, particularly if combined with similar efforts including private firms, local, and regional transit (for example, including all transit statewide in an internet information system).

Regional Bus Network

In the absence of an identified funding source for expanded regional (commuter) services, the recommended Rural Regional Preferred Network, both the interim service level and the full service level, be viewed as a framework for further consideration and planning at the regional and state level. Both CDOT and regional efforts at the development of future transit

programs may consider these networks as potential future services, and policy-makers may consider these networks and the cost estimates in terms of program and funding needs. CDOT should take a proactive lead role in planning and promoting both the regional bus services and intercity bus services, recognizing that they each address a different market, both of which need additional services.

CONCLUSIONS

This study should be regarded as a solid first step in identifying statewide intercity bus and regional transit needs, and in linking these needs to the ongoing statewide transportation planning process. The issues identified are complex, including funding and the lack of effective institutional framework to address many of the issues, as both the intercity and regional services are multi-jurisdictional in nature. Statewide policies regarding regional and intercity bus services are not well developed, particularly those regarding organizational responsibilities and potential funding sources.

This study provides recommendations regarding the intercity bus services, for which the organizational and funding issues are more easily defined because there is a federal funding source. However, additional planning and policy work is needed, particularly for the regional services (which may even include other modes such as Bus Rapid Transit or rail passenger service). Remaining questions for consideration include:

- What is the role of the state in regional and/or ICB services—planning, prioritizing, funding, grantee, contracting authority?
- What are the state’s specific policy objectives and goals for regional and ICB services?
 - Policy objectives might address connectivity, coverage and productivity—and consider the operating and capital costs associated with these objectives.
 - Policies will provide a basis for setting priorities for the state funding (including use of federal funds) of regional and ICB services.
- What process would be appropriate to determine the role of the state and the development of policies regarding regional and ICB services?

This study provides an initial step forward in the development of both the process and the policies, providing a framework for the additional work that will be required to develop and implement services addressing the identified needs.

ATTACHMENT TO EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

**DESCRIPTION OF RURAL AND URBAN
REGIONAL SERVICES**

RECOMMENDED RURAL REGIONAL SERVICES

Corridor	Existing		Proposed		Existing Annual			Additional Annual			Total Annual		
	LOS	Daily Trips ⁽¹⁾	LOS	Added Trips ⁽¹⁾	Miles	Riders	Op Costs ⁽³⁾ (thousands)	Miles	Riders	Op Costs ⁽³⁾ (thousands)	Miles	Riders	Op Costs ⁽³⁾ (thousands)
South Front Range													
I-25 South Pueblo-Colorado Spgs	F	-	B	16	-	-	-	50,000	25,000	\$168	50,000	25,000	\$168
I-25 South Colorado Spgs-Denver	A+	42	A+	None	795,000	140,000	\$1,600	-	-	-	795,000	140,000	\$1,600
North Front Range													
I-25 North Fort Collins-Denver	F	-	A	32	-	-	-	593,000	297,000	\$1,483	593,000	297,000	\$1,483
US 85 Greeley-Denver	F	-	C	8	-	-	-	134,000	67,000	\$335	134,000	67,000	\$335
US 287 Berthoud-Longmont	F	-	B	16	-	-	-	60,000	30,000	\$150	60,000	30,000	\$150
US 34 Loveland-Greeley ⁽⁴⁾	B	24 in 2008	A	8	180,000	90,000	\$450	60,000	30,000	\$150	240,000	120,000	\$600
I-70 Corridor													
I-70 Grand Jct-Parachute	F	-	B	16	-	-	-	298,000	149,000	\$1,416	298,000	149,000	\$1,416
I-70 Parachute-Rifle	F	-	C	8	-	-	-	55,000	28,000	\$261	55,000	28,000	\$261
I-70 Rifle-Glenwood Spgs	B	18	B	None	188,000	76,000	\$724	-	-	-	188,000	76,000	\$724
I-70 Glenwood Spgs-Dotsero	F	-	C	8	-	-	-	61,000	31,000	\$290	61,000	31,000	\$290
I-70 Dotsero-Gypsum	C	12/9	C	None	1,400,000	849,000	\$5,675	-	-	-	1,400,000	849,000	\$5,675
I-70 Gypsum-Vail	A+	183/102	A+	None	-	-	-	64,000	32,000	\$304	64,000	32,000	\$304
I-70 Vail-Copper Mountain	F	-	C	8	-	-	-	138,000	69,000	\$518	138,000	69,000	\$518
I-70 / 119 Frisco-ID Spgs-Bik Hawk	F	-	C	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Routes Feeding I-70 Corridor													
Hwy 82 Aspen-Glenwood Spgs	A+	83/73	A+	None	1,888,000	1,985,000	\$10,597	-	-	-	1,888,000	1,985,000	\$10,597
CO 24 Leadville-Vail	D	6	B	10	103,000	50,000	\$402	172,000	86,000	\$1,000	275,000	136,000	\$1,402
CO 91 Leadville-Frisco	F	-	C	8	-	-	-	96,000	48,000	\$456	96,000	48,000	\$456
CO 9 Fairplay-Frisco	F	-	C	8	-	-	-	99,000	50,000	\$470	99,000	50,000	\$470
Winter Park and Grand Lake													
US 34 Grand Lake - Granby	F	-	C	8-S only	-	-	-	22,000	11,000	\$83	22,000	11,000	\$83
US 40 Granby - Winter Park	D	4	C	4-W; 8-S	12,000	30,000	\$45	36,000	23,000	\$173	48,000	53,000	\$218
Steamboat Springs													
US 40 Craig - Steamboat Spgs	D	6-W; 4-S	B/C	10-W; 4-S	103,000	35,000	\$276	137,000	17,000	\$377	240,000	52,000	\$653
Hwy 131 Yampa - Steamboat Spgs	F	0	C/D	8-W; 4-S	-	-	-	41,000	14,000	\$113	41,000	14,000	\$113

RECOMMENDED RURAL REGIONAL SERVICES

Corridor		Existing		Proposed		Existing Annual		Additional Annual		Total Annual				
		LOS	Daily Trips	LOS	Added Trips	Miles	Riders	Costs	Miles	Riders	Costs	Miles	Riders	Costs
Montrose, Telluride, and Gunnison Areas														
62 / 550	Montrose - Placerville	F	-	C	8	-	-	-	161,000	81,000	\$765	161,000	81,000	\$765
CO 145	Placerville - Norwood	C	6	C	2	33,000	17,000	\$157	11,000	6,000	\$52	44,000	23,000	\$209
CO 145	Norwood - Nucla	F	-	C	8	-	-	-	76,000	38,000	\$361	76,000	38,000	\$361
CO 145	Placerville - Telluride	C	9	B	7	56,000	28,000	\$266	43,000	22,000	\$204	99,000	50,000	\$470
CO 145	Telluride - Cortez	F	-	C	8	-	-	-	239,000	120,000	\$1,135	239,000	120,000	\$1,135
CO 135	Gunnison - Crested Butte	C/F	10-W; 0-S	B/C	6-W; 8-S	110,000	55,000	\$413	66,000	33,000	\$248	176,000	88,000	\$661
Durango														
US 160	Cortez - Durango	F	-	C	8	-	-	-	100,000	50,000	\$375	100,000	50,000	\$375
US 550	Farmington/Aztec-Durango	F	-	C	8	-	-	-	81,000	41,000	\$304	81,000	41,000	\$304
CO 172	Ignacio - Durango	C	8	B	8	54,000	10,000	\$108	54,000	10,000	\$108	108,000	20,000	\$216
US 160	Bayfield - Durango	C	8	B	8	67,000	10,000	\$112	67,000	10,000	\$112	134,000	20,000	\$224
US 160	Pagosa Spgs - Bayfield	F	-	C	8	-	-	-	188,000	20,000	\$240	188,000	20,000	\$240
San Luis Valley														
US 160	South Fork - Alamosa	F	-	C	8	-	-	-	128,000	64,000	\$320	128,000	64,000	\$320
285 / 160	Saguache - Alamosa	F	-	C	8	-	-	-	143,000	72,000	\$358	143,000	72,000	\$358
US 285	Antonito - Alamosa ⁽⁵⁾	F	-	C	8	-	-	-	78,000	39,000	\$195	78,000	39,000	\$195
159 / 160	San Luis - Alamosa ⁽⁵⁾	F	-	C	8	-	-	-	113,000	57,000	\$283	113,000	57,000	\$283
Huerfano-Las Animas Counties														
US 160	Walsenburg - Trinidad	F	-	C	8	-	-	-	88,000	44,000	\$220	88,000	44,000	\$220
CO 12	Stonewall - Trinidad	F	-	C	8	-	-	-	75,000	38,000	\$188	75,000	38,000	\$188
I-25	Trinidad - Pueblo	F	-	C	6	-	-	-	149,000	75,000	\$373	149,000	75,000	\$373
CO 71	Trinidad - La Junta	F	-	C	6	-	-	-	141,000	71,000	\$353	141,000	71,000	\$353
TOTAL						\$4,989,000	\$3,375,000	\$20,825	\$4,117,000	\$1,898,000	\$13,941	\$9,106,000	\$5,273,000	\$34,766

(1) Most corridors have year-round service so only one letter is listed. Where service levels are seasonal, multiple letters are listed with the higher level of service in the peak season.
(2) Most corridors have year-round service so only one number is listed. Where service levels are seasonal, multiple numbers are listed. S = Summer; W = Winter; SF = Spring & Fall.
(3) Costs are listed in thousands. Costs are a combination of actual (for existing services where information was provided) and estimated for other existing and proposed services.
(4) Service between Greeley and Loveland has been funded and is anticipated to begin in 2008. Existing numbers reflect the proposed services.
(5) A private company, with some public funding, is operating limited services in the Antonito and San Luis corridors.

SkyRide	Peak Vehicles	Annual Ridership	Trips Weekday	Annual Veh Mi.	Annual Veh Hr.	Annual Op. Expense
AA	5	170,713	39	351,800	10,497	\$741,000
AB	4	345,290	38	672,805	19,509	\$1,377,000
AF	6	372,338	54	666,296	21,766	\$1,536,000
AS	7	583,508	124	905,086	13,853	\$978,000
AT	8	535,774	65	822,469	24,312	\$1,716,000
SUBTOTAL	30	2,007,623	320	3,418,456	89,936	\$6,348,000
Regional	Peak Vehicles	Annual Ridership	Trips Weekday	Annual Veh Mi.	Annual Veh Hr.	Annual Op. Expense
B/BF/BX: Boulder-Denver	23	1,629,220	192	1,524,420	49,466	\$3,503,000
BOLT: Boulder-Longmont	8	386,564	66	408,419	18,134	\$1,284,000
CC: Coal Creek-Denver	2	12,495	4	23,715	740	\$52,000
CS/CV/CX: Pine Jct/Conifer	8	186,915	22	219,810	6,248	\$468,000
DD: Boulder-CO Blvd	6	91,800	17	175,185	7,370	\$522,000
DM: Boulder-Fitzsimons	3	19,890	6	70,125	2,703	\$191,000
ES/EV/EX: Evergreen	7	122,655	21	177,480	5,814	\$435,000
GS: Golden-Boulder	5	101,235	22	159,885	5,508	\$390,000
HX: 28th St Boulder-Civic Ctr	6	151,470	16	118,575	3,902	\$276,000
J: Longmont-East Boulder	3	58,905	10	73,695	3,137	\$222,000
L/LX: Longmont-Denver	11	239,411	42	436,577	14,522	\$1,028,000
N: Nederland-Boulder	2	94,257	28	184,172	6,318	\$447,000
P: Parker-Denver	6	151,215	14	105,315	3,774	\$283,000
R: Brighton-Denver	4	75,990	17	121,380	4,794	\$359,000
S: Denver-East Boulder	3	39,780	9	74,205	2,627	\$186,000
T: Boulder-Greenwood Plaza	3	50,490	6	91,800	3,162	\$224,000
U: Pine Jct/Conifer-DTC	3	30,345	6	62,730	2,168	\$162,000
Y: Lyons-Boulder	1	17,340	8	33,150	893	\$63,000
SUBTOTAL	104	3,459,977	506	4,060,638	141,275	\$10,095,000
TOTAL	134	5,467,600	826	7,479,094	231,212	\$16,443,000

EXISTING RTD REGIONAL SERVICES

INTERIM RURAL REGIONAL SERVICES

Corridor	Existing		Proposed		Existing Annual			Additional Annual			Total Annual		
	LOS	Daily Trips ⁽¹⁾	LOS	Added Trips ⁽¹⁾	Miles	Riders	Op Costs ⁽³⁾ (thousands)	Miles	Riders	Op Costs ⁽³⁾ (thousands)	Miles	Riders	Op Costs ⁽³⁾ (thousands)
South Front Range													
I-25 South Pueblo-Colorado Spgs	F	-	B	Long-term	-	-	-	50,000	25,000	\$168	50,000	25,000	\$168
I-25 South Colorado Spgs-Denver	A+	42	A+	None	795,000	140,000	\$1,600	-	-	-	795,000	140,000	\$1,600
North Front Range													
I-25 North Fort Collins-Denver	F	-	B	16	-	-	-	297,000	149,000	\$370	297,000	149,000	\$370
US 85 Greeley-Denver	F	-	C	Long-term	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	\$0
US 287 Berthoud-Longmont	F	-	B	16	-	-	-	60,000	30,000	\$150	60,000	30,000	\$150
US 34 Loveland-Greeley ⁽⁴⁾	B	24 in 2008	A	Long-term	180,000	90,000	\$450	-	-	-	180,000	90,000	\$450
I-70 Corridor													
I-70 Grand Jct-Parachute	F	-	B	16	-	-	-	298,000	149,000	\$1,416	298,000	149,000	\$1,416
I-70 Parachute-Rifle	F	-	C	8	-	-	-	55,000	28,000	\$261	55,000	28,000	\$261
I-70 Rifle-Glenwood Spgs	B	18	B	None	188,000	76,000	\$724	-	-	-	188,000	76,000	\$724
I-70 Glenwood Spgs-Dotsero	F	-	C	8	-	-	-	61,000	31,000	\$290	61,000	31,000	\$290
I-70 Dotsero-Gypsum	C	12/9	C	None	1,400,000	849,000	\$5,675	-	-	-	1,400,000	849,000	\$5,675
I-70 Gypsum-Vail	A+	183/102	A+	None	-	-	-	64,000	32,000	\$304	64,000	32,000	\$304
I-70 Vail-Copper Mountain	F	-	C	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	\$0
I-70 / 119 Frisco-ID Spgs-Blk Hawk	F	-	C	Long-term	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	\$0
Routes Feeding I-70 Corridor													
Hwy 82 Aspen-Glenwood Spgs	A+	83/73	A+	None	1,888,000	1,985,000	\$10,597	-	-	-	1,888,000	1,985,000	\$10,597
CO 24 Leadville-Vail	D	6	B	10	103,000	50,000	\$402	172,000	86,000	\$1,000	275,000	136,000	\$1,402
CO 91 Leadville-Frisco	F	-	C	Long-term	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	\$0
CO 9 Fairplay-Frisco	F	-	C	Long-term	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	\$0
Winter Park and Grand Lake													
US 34 Grand Lake - Granby	F	-	C	Long-term	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	\$0
US 40 Granby - Winter Park	D	4	C	4-W	12,000	30,000	\$45	36,000	23,000	\$173	48,000	53,000	\$218
Steamboat Springs													
US 40 Craig - Steamboat Spgs	D	6-W; 4-S	B/C	Long-term	103,000	35,000	\$276	137,000	17,000	\$377	240,000	52,000	\$653
Hwy 131 Yampa - Steamboat Spgs	F	0	C/F	6-W; S-LT	-	-	-	31,000	11,000	\$85	31,000	11,000	\$85

Corridor	Existing		Proposed		Existing Annual			Additional Annual			Total Annual			
	LOS	Daily Trips	LOS	Added Trips	Miles	Riders	Costs	Miles	Riders	Costs	Miles	Riders	Costs	
Montrose, Telluride, and Gunnison Areas														
62 / 550	Montrose - Placerville	F	-	C	6	-	-	121,000	81,000	\$765	121,000	81,000	\$765	
CO 145	Placerville - Norwood	C	6	C	2	33,000	\$157	11,000	6,000	\$52	44,000	23,000	\$209	
CO 145	Norwood - Nucla	F	-	C	6	-	-	25,000	38,000	\$361	25,000	38,000	\$361	
CO 145	Placerville - Telluride	C	9	B	Long-term	56,000	\$266	43,000	22,000	\$204	99,000	50,000	\$470	
CO 145	Telluride - Cortez	F	-	C	Long-term	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	\$0	
CO 135	Gunnison - Crested Butte	C/F	10-W; 0-S	B/C	Long-term	110,000	\$413	-	-	-	110,000	55,000	\$413	
Durango														
US 160	Cortez - Durango	F	-	D	4	-	-	50,000	25,000	\$187	50,000	25,000	\$187	
US 550	Farmington/Aztec-Durango	F	-	D	4	-	-	41,000	21,000	\$152	41,000	21,000	\$152	
CO 172	Ignacio - Durango	C	8	B	Long-term	54,000	\$108	-	-	-	54,000	10,000	\$108	
US 160	Bayfield - Durango	C	8	B	Long-term	67,000	\$112	-	-	-	67,000	10,000	\$112	
US 160	Pagosa Spgs - Bayfield	F	-	C	Long-term	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	\$0	
San Luis Valley														
US 160	South Fork - Alamosa	F	-	D	4	-	-	64,000	32,000	\$160	64,000	32,000	\$160	
285 / 160	Saguache - Alamosa	F	-	D	4	-	-	71,500	36,000	\$179	71,500	36,000	\$179	
US 285	Antonito - Alamosa ⁽⁵⁾	F	-	D	4	-	-	39,000	20,000	\$98	39,000	20,000	\$98	
159 / 160	San Luis - Alamosa ⁽⁵⁾	F	-	D	4	-	-	56,500	29,000	\$142	56,500	29,000	\$142	
Huerfano-Las Animas Counties														
US 160	Walsenburg - Trinidad	F	-	C	6	-	-	88,000	44,000	\$220	88,000	44,000	\$220	
CO 12	Stonewall - Trinidad	F	-	C	6	-	-	75,000	38,000	\$188	75,000	38,000	\$188	
I-25	Trinidad - Pueblo	F	-	C	4	-	-	100,000	50,000	\$250	100,000	50,000	\$250	
CO 71	Trinidad - La Junta	F	-	C	Long-term	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
TOTAL						4,989,000	3,375,000	\$20,825	2,046,000	1,023,000	\$7,551	7,035,000	4,398,000	\$28,376

(1) Most corridors have year-round service so only one letter is listed. Where service levels are seasonal, multiple letters are listed with the higher level of service in the peak season.

(2) Most corridors have year-round service so only one number is listed. Where service levels are seasonal, multiple numbers are listed. S = Summer; W = Winter; SF = Spring & Fall.

(3) Costs are listed in thousands. Costs are a combination of actual (for existing services where information was provided) and estimated for other existing and proposed services.

(4) Service between Greeley and Loveland has been funded and is anticipated to begin in 2008. Existing numbers reflect the proposed services.

(5) A private company, with some public funding, is operating limited services in the Antonito and San Luis corridors.