

**Meeting Agenda of the  
TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMISSION  
February 11, 2016  
8:30 a.m.**

**Community Room of the Pueblo Municipal Justice Center, 200 South Main Street**  
Agenda items marked with \* indicate additional materials are included in the packet.

**Individuals Requiring Special Accommodations Should Notify the City MPO's  
Office (719) 553-2244 by Noon on the Friday Preceding the Meeting.**

- 1. Call Meeting to Order**
- 2. Introductions and Public Comments (non-agenda items only).**
  - Alan Nelms – Appointed by PACOG Board December 3, 2015
- 3. Approval of Minutes\***

January 14, 2016  
**Action Requested: Approve/Disapprove/Modify**
- 4. CDOT Region II TIP/STIP Policy Agenda Item(s)**

*There are no Policy TIP Amendment Notifications for February*
- 5. CDOT Region II TIP/STIP Administration Agenda Item(s)**

*There are no Policy TIP Amendment Notifications for February*
- 6. Prioritization of 2040 LRTP Trail Projects\***
  - City Projects
  - Pueblo West Projects
  - County Projects
- 7. CDOT Updates – Wendy Pettit**
  - FY 20 Addition to the TIP/STIP\*
  - Transit Town Hall Meetings\*
- 8. CDOT FAST Act Information Memo\***
  - FAST Act Priorities Ballot\*
- 9. Staff Reports:**
  - **FHWA – National Performance Management Measures: Assessing Pavement and Bridge Conditions for the National Highway Performance Program\***
  - **Faster 2017 and FTA 2016 Transit Capital Funding Recommendations\***
  - **Public Participation Plan Review**
  - **Senate Bill 09-228 Transfer Scenarios FY 15-FY 17**
  - **Safe Routes to School Grant Applications**
  - **West Pueblo Connector Update**
  - **Job Recruitment Update**
  - **Consolidated Planning Grant (CPG) Update**

- ***Transit Study RFP Update***

***10. Items from TAC members or scheduling of future agenda items.***

***11. Adjourn at or before 10:30 am.***

**Minutes of the  
TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMISSION  
January 14, 2016  
8:30 a.m.**

**Community Room of the Municipal Justice Center, 200 South Main Street**  
**Agenda Items Marked with \* indicate additional materials included in packet**

**1. Call Meeting to Order**

*Chairman: Scott Hobson*

*Time of Call: 8:35 a.m.*

*MPO Members Present: Scott Hobson, Reyna Quintana*

*TAC Members Present: Alf Randall, Dan Centa, Darrin Tangeman, Joan Armstrong, Michael Snow, Pepper Whittlef, Wendy Pettit*

*CAC Members Present: Kristin Castor, Salvatore Piscitelli*

*Others Present:*

**2. Introductions and Public Comments (non-agenda items only).**

*Alan Nelms will be the new CAC member who will replace Meagan Murillo's position. He was appointed as a CAC member at the December PACOG meeting. He was unable to attend today's meeting as he had a commitment prior to his appointment to the CAC, but plans to be here for all the monthly meetings starting in February.*

**3. Approval of Minutes of the regular meeting held on November 5, 2015**

*Motion to Approve: Salvatore Piscitelli*

*Second: Alf Randall*

*Unanimous*

**4. CDOT Region II TIP/STIP Regular Agenda Item(s)**

*There were no Policy Notifications for January.*

**5. CDOT Region II TIP/STIP Administrative Notification**

*CDOT Region II had notification of three (3) administrative amendments to the PACOG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) in the MPO/TPR area.*

Project Name: **2015 Emergency and Permanent Repair Funding**  
STIP Number: SR27006.005  
Project Location and Description: North Creek - North  
Federal Program Funds: **\$ 459,960**  
State Matching Funds: **\$**  
Local Matching Funds: **\$ 114,990**  
Other Project Funds: **\$**  
**TOTAL PROJECT FUND AMENDMENT: \$ 574,950**

Project Name: **2015 Emergency and Permanent Repair Funding**  
STIP Number: SR27006.006  
Project Location and Description: North Creek - South  
Federal Program Funds: **\$ 472,680**  
State Matching Funds: **\$**  
Local Matching Funds: **\$ 118,170**  
Other Project Funds: **\$**  
**TOTAL PROJECT FUND AMENDMENT: \$ 590,850**

Project Name: **2015 Emergency and Permanent Repair Funding**  
STIP Number: SR27006.007  
Project Location and Description: Overton Road  
Federal Program Funds: **\$ 2,297,060**  
State Matching Funds: **\$**  
Local Matching Funds: **\$ 574,265**  
Other Project Funds: **\$**  
**TOTAL PROJECT FUND AMENDMENT: \$ 2,871,325**

*All three of these amendments relate to flood recovery and funding for county roads. Alf Randall stated that all the temporary repairs have already been completed and paid for by the County. The plan is to refund the County's money with the funds in these amendments. The permanent repairs require an 80/20 split in costs, so the County will need to fund 20% of the project costs. He stated that they are hoping to use the refunded money from the temporary repairs for the permanent repairs.*

## **6. Prioritization of 2040 L RTP Trail Projects**

*Scott discussed the importance of getting a list of prioritized trail project put into the 2040 L RTP. He stated that if an individual entity wanted to apply for a grant for a particular project, the list would be able to be cited that it is a part of the 2040 plan, therefore helping obtain grant money for that project. The City of Pueblo created a list, which was included in the packet. What is needed is a list from the County and from Pueblo West. It was, however, mentioned that this list will not guarantee funding for the project and that the list can be very vague and broad as it is not a fiscally constrained list. Pepper Whittlef mentioned that the City of Pueblo list needs to have a few changes. First, the **Wildhorse Project should read: "18<sup>th</sup> St. to Hwy 50" because it currently terminates at 18<sup>th</sup> St.** In addition, Pepper requested we add another project to the priorities list for the City of Pueblo. The additional project is the proposed trail from Highway 47, along Fountain Creek, to the Northern City Limits. The list will be modified to accommodate these requested changes.*

*Dan Centa asked how we will integrate the priorities lists into the 2040 plan. Scott replied that a list will be created which will become part of the plan, but will be separated into the different entities: City, County, and Pueblo West. Dan Centa then asked what the upper constraint of this list should be and Scott replied that it should be a list of projects that could be conceivable completed in the next 25 years. He said that we want to make sure they are prioritized because if you give a list of 40 projects **and you apply for grant money for number 15, but you don't have money for number 1 yet, you would have to explain why through the grant application process.** This would make obtaining grant money that much more difficult.*

*Kristin Castor pointed out that in creating these lists, it is important to look at getting people riding bikes and in wheelchairs from point A to point B as well.*

*After more discussion, it was stated that the ultimate goal is just to come up with a list from each of the entities (City, County, and Pueblo West) and then we will meet as a group and decide on a final version of the list to put into the 2040 L RTP. The results of the final list will be presented at the next TAC meeting on February 11<sup>th</sup>, 2016. **Due to this, Scott asked if we need to delay the board's approval of the 2040 plan so that we can get the list incorporated first.** He said that it would move the approval*

to the end of February and asked CDOT if this was ok. Michael Snow replied that it was ok because the rule is that the MPO has 5 year from the last approved plan to get a new plan approved. Since the last plan was approved in June of 2011, we have until June of 2016 to get the 2040 LRTP approved and passed by PACOG. This would also extend the comment period and an announcement of that should be put out for the public.

A meeting time for the City, County and Pueblo West to meet and discuss their lists was set for Wednesday, February 3, 2016 at 1:30pm. This list will also be taken to the PACE meeting to be discussed on Monday, February 8, 2016. Reminder to those involved will be sent out.

## **7. Prioritization of 2040 LRTP Trail Projects**

The DRAFT 2040 LRTP is out for review at the City Planning office, the CDOT office and all of the libraries within the MPO except for the library at the YMCA. We will extend the comment period to a week before the February PACOG meeting.

## **8. PACOG Planning Review Report – Review Recommendations\***

Scott provided an additional handout to the packet which highlighted the 24 recommendations within 10 different areas given to PACOG from the Planning Review Report. Scott asked the TAC if this was something that we want to review as a group and get feedback on how to move forward, or if it should be done by the MPO staff and reported back to the TAC as to how the changes are progressing. Dan Centa stated that he felt the staff reporting to the TAC was appropriate, but Michael Snow pointed out that the recommendations in the report are not just items that should be handled by the MPO staff, nor were they the sole responsibility of the City of Pueblo. He stated that the TAC can have an impact and input on the issues. He also mentioned that he feels that there are areas that the TAC should read through to help the MPO staff make the appropriate changes.

Scott came up with the idea that the MPO staff could look at each of the 10 areas and break out the ones that the TAC/CAC could focus on and help the staff to address. All were in favor of this method of approach.

## **9. Staff Reports**

- **West Pueblo Connector** - Scott stated that the project was awarded to Matrix and a kick-off meeting was held on January 6, 2016. At the meeting a map of the project study area was created. This map was an additional handout at the meeting. The project is being done to look at potential alignments of the new road, a proposed budget, and the best location for a bridge over the railroad. The next meeting will held on February 2, 2016 at 10:00am in the planning conference room to discuss ownership, environmental issues, and traffic information that has already been obtained. When the project is further along in the process, the consultants will come in to the TAC meeting discuss constraints.
- **Job Recruitment** – First, the Transportation Project Manager Position deadline was January 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2016. There have been 10 applications put in, but are currently being screened by civil service. Scott mentioned that they may hold a test, but he is hoping that they will just do time and experience. He hopes to interview for a position in early February and would like to have a representative of Pueblo West and the County to be on the interview panel. Second, the Transportation Technician position went through internal recruitment first, but no applications were submitted. It is now in the external stage until January 24, 2016. There will be a testing process for this position.
- **Demographic Data** – Scott would like to try to get someone to do the demographic data like Don Vest was doing. He isn't sure if we want to look at getting a full time position or try to get a contracted person to do the work. It was mentioned that we may want to reach out to the university to see if we can get someone to sustain this data to the level that Don Vest did.
- **Federal Highway Bill** – Scott stated that the new federal highway bill was passed. He said

that funding for freight is an added emphasis to the bill in order to look at priority freight corridors. He said that currently, Colorado only has I-25 and I-70 as priority freight corridors. Scott also mentioned that safety is a remaining significant funding area in the newly passed bill. In addition, the new Transportation Alternative Program (TAP) is being combined with the Surface Improvements Program.

- **Consolidated Planning Grant (CPG)** – Scott stated that the CPG contract for the next two years will be going to the PACOG board the month on January 24, 2016.
- **RTA** – Scott informed the TAC that the City, County, the two Chambers of Commerce and the United Way are looking at getting a survey out to the public to obtain what the public's priorities are. The survey would also obtain what the public's priorities on funding for public services are. Discussion of this type of a survey was made by the TAC and most seemed to feel that this type of survey would be a waste of time and money. Darrin Tangeman recommended working with an actual scientific survey person out of UCCS, as Pueblo West is also currently working with them. Dan Centa stated that we need a more constrained survey strategy that will discuss what percentage of a passed tax (if passed) would be spent on each category – sidewalks, roadways, pedestrian improvements, etc.

#### **10. Items from TAC members or scheduling of future agenda items**

None

#### **11. Adjournment**

Chairman Scott Hobson adjourned the meeting at 10:30am

## City of Pueblo Trail Priorities

- Wildhorse Creek from 18<sup>th</sup> St. to Highway 50 \*
- Highway 50 from Wills to P. Blvd
- Crossing over I-25 and Fountain Creek from Mineral Palace Park
- Levee Trail
- Northern and Prairie to State Fairgrounds
- Highway 47 along Fountain Creek to Northern City Limits
- Goodnight Arroyo / AVC Trails
- Joe Martinez/Spaulding to Wildhorse Creek \*
- Trail Connections to Arkansas River Trail at the following locations:
  - Adjacent to Reservoir Road
  - South of Dutch Clark Stadium
  - Spring Street
  - City Park

## Trail Bridges across Arkansas River

- Nature Center to Chain-of-Lakes
- North of Union Avenue – Connects trail on levee to trail along bluff  
(In conjunction with levee project)
- South of 4<sup>th</sup> Street – Connects trail on levee to trail along bluff  
(In conjunction with levee project)

**Note: Items marked with an \* are projects which are connecting trail projects.**



## **Pueblo West Trail Priorities**

January 2016

- State Park trail extension to Kenosha (and Sweetwater) \*
- Purcell Blvd. - Hahns Peak to Liberty Point
- Joe Martinez Blvd. – Purcell to McCulloch \*
- East/West trail to connect to the City Spaulding trail \*
- Sierra Vista trail - Spaulding under US-50 to Industrial
- Williams Creek trail – McCulloch to US-50 @ Pueblo Blvd. \*
- Edwin James Memorial trail – new Fire Station #2 to Honor Farm Boundary \*
- Wildhorse Creek Trail - US-50 to Jaroso Park \*
- Nichols Rd connection to State Park \*

**Note: Items marked with an \* are projects which are connection trail projects.**



## **Pueblo County Trail Priorities**

- SH227 - Dry Creek / Dry Creek to 27<sup>th</sup> / 27<sup>th</sup> to Baxter
- Bessemer Ditch
- Roselawn / Salt Creek
- St. Charles Mesa Safe Routes to Schools



**REGION 2 RPP/FASTER SAFETY PLAN**

**FISCAL YEAR 2017-2020 (4-YEAR PLAN) (January 20, 2016)**



| Region | TPR/MPO | Responsible Program | Hwy     | Project Name   | RPP 2016     | FSA 2016     | RPP 2017     | FSA 2017     | RPP 2018     | FSA 2018     | RPP 2019     | FSA 2019 | RPP 2020     | FASTER 2020  | 2016-2020 RPP TOTAL | 2016-2020 FASTER SAFETY TOTAL |
|--------|---------|---------------------|---------|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------|--------------|--------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|
| 2      | CFR     | North               | US24G   | US24G PASSING LANE   |              |              |              | \$ 482,039   |              | \$ -         |              |          | \$ 2,000,000 | \$ 3,517,861 | \$ 2,000,000        | \$ 3,999,900                  |
| 2      | CFR     | North               | US285D  | US285D PASSING LANE  |              |              |              | \$ 550,690   |              | \$ 4,449,310 |              |          |              |              | \$ -                | \$ 5,000,000                  |
| 2      | CFR     | North               | US285D  | US285D/SH9 INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENT                            |              |              | \$ 1,000,000 |              |              | \$ 1,000,000 |              |          |              |              | \$ 1,000,000        | \$ 1,000,000                  |
| 2      | CFR     | North               | SH67    | SH67/SH115 DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS                               | \$ 418,025   |              |              |              |              |              | \$ 3,331,975 |          |              |              | \$ 3,750,000        | \$ -                          |
| 2      | CFR     | North               | US24    | US 24 EAST PLANNING & ENVIRONMENTAL LINKAGE STUDY              | \$ 1,000,000 |              |              |              |              |              |              |          |              |              | \$ 1,000,000        | \$ -                          |
| 2      | CFR     | Traffic             | SH115   | SH115 CANON CITY TO FLORENCE - PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS         |              |              |              |              |              |              | \$ 250,000   |          |              |              | \$ 250,000          | \$ -                          |
| 2      | CFR     | Traffic             | US50A   | US50A PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENT IN CANON CITY                     |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |          | \$ 2,000,000 |              | \$ 2,000,000        | \$ -                          |
| 2      | CFR     | North               | US50A   | US 50 A PASSING LANE EAST OF SLAIDA                            |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |          |              | \$ 3,500,000 | \$ -                | \$ 3,500,000                  |
|        |         |                     |         |  | \$ 1,418,025 | \$ -         | \$ 1,000,000 | \$ 1,032,729 | \$ -         | \$ 5,449,310 | \$ 3,581,975 | \$ -     | \$ 4,000,000 | \$ 7,017,861 | \$ 10,000,000       | \$ 13,499,900                 |
| 2      | PACOG   | South               | SH96A   | SH96A/CHESTER - SIGNAL IMPROVEMENTS                            |              |              |              | \$ 650,000   |              |              |              |          |              |              | \$ -                | \$ 650,000                    |
| 2      | PACOG   | South               | US50A   | US50A WEST - WESTBOUND WIDENING IN PUEBLO                      | \$ 1,750     |              |              | \$ 600,000   | \$ 3,100,000 | \$ 7,400,000 | \$ 2,300,000 |          |              | \$ 6,000,000 | \$ 5,401,750        | \$ 14,000,000                 |
| 2      | PACOG   | South               | US50A   | US50A WEST - RAMP EB ADD ONE LANE (#19751)                     |              | \$ 2,388,076 |              | \$ 2,500,000 |              |              |              |          |              |              | \$ -                | \$ 4,888,076                  |
| 2      | PACOG   | South               | I-25    | I-25/1ST TO ILEX RAMP  |              | \$ 5,497,482 |              | \$ 1,824,368 |              |              |              |          |              |              | \$ -                | \$ 7,321,850                  |
| 2      | PACOG   | South               | I-25    | EROSION MITIGATION AT I-25 & FIRST STREET IN PUEBLO (no money) |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |          |              |              | \$ -                | \$ -                          |
| 2      | PACOG   | SOut                | I-25    | I-25 CORRIDOR MANAGEMENT & HAZMAT CLEANUP                      | \$ 1,450,000 |              |              |              |              |              |              |          |              |              | \$ 1,450,000        | \$ -                          |
| 2      | PACOG   | No money            | Various | PUEBLO PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS                                 |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |          |              |              | \$ -                | \$ -                          |
| 2      | PACOG   | South               | SH50C   | SH50C DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS                                    |              |              |              |              | \$ 1,000,000 |              |              |          |              |              | \$ 1,000,000        | \$ -                          |
| 2      | PACOG   | Traffic             | US50A   | US50A ACCESS MANAGEMENT PLAN BETWEEN FORTINO AND I-25          |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |          | \$ 250,000   |              | \$ 250,000          | \$ -                          |
|        |         |                     |         |  | \$ 1,451,750 | \$ 7,885,558 | \$ -         | \$ 5,574,368 | \$ 4,100,000 | \$ 7,400,000 | \$ 2,300,000 | \$ -     | \$ 250,000   | \$ 6,000,000 | \$ 8,101,750        | \$ 26,859,926                 |
| 2      | PPACG   | North               | I-25A   | I-25 NB ACCELERATION LANE AT SOUTH ACADEMY                     | \$ 600,000   |              |              | \$ 500,000   |              |              |              |          |              |              | \$ 600,000          | \$ 500,000                    |

**REGION 2 RPP/FASTER SAFETY PLAN**

**FISCAL YEAR 2017-2020 (4-YEAR PLAN) (January 20, 2016)**



| Region | TPR/MPO | Responsible Program | Hwy    | Project Name  | RPP 2016     | FSA 2016     | RPP 2017     | FSA 2017     | RPP 2018     | FSA 2018 | RPP 2019     | FSA 2019     | RPP 2020     | FASTER 2020 | 2016-2020 RPP TOTAL | 2016-2020 FASTER SAFETY TOTAL |
|--------|---------|---------------------|--------|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|
| 2      | PPACG   | North               | I-25A  | I-25 / CIMMARON INTERCHANGE RAMP                                      | \$ 7,417,000 | \$ 4,831,410 | \$ 4,000,000 |              |              |          |              |              |              |             | \$ 11,417,000       | \$ 4,831,410                  |
| 2      | PPACG   | Traffic             | US24A  | US24A WILDLIFE FENCING  |              |              |              | \$ 800,000   |              |          |              |              |              |             | \$ -                | \$ 800,000                    |
| 2      | PPACG   | North               | SH21B  | Powers Accel/Decel Lane   |              | \$ 2,200,000 |              |              |              |          |              |              |              |             | \$ -                | \$ 2,200,000                  |
| 2      | PPACG   | North               | I-25A  | I-25 North Widening   |              | \$ 1,300,000 |              |              |              |          |              |              |              |             | \$ -                | \$ 1,300,000                  |
| 2      | PPACG   | North               | US24A  | US24A @ 21ST STREET INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENT                          | \$ 1,000,000 |              | \$ -         | \$ 1,500,000 |              |          |              |              |              |             | \$ 1,000,000        | \$ 1,500,000                  |
| 2      | PPACG   | North               | US24A  | US 24 @ 31ST STREET INTERSECTION                                      | \$ 500,000   |              | \$ -         |              |              |          |              |              |              |             | \$ 500,000          | \$ -                          |
| 2      | PPACG   | North               | SH21   | SH 21 ROW PRESERVATION  |              |              | \$ 1,600,000 |              | \$ 200,000   |          |              |              |              |             | \$ 1,800,000        | \$ -                          |
| 2      | PPACG   | North               | SH21   | SH 21 CORRIDOR DESIGN   |              |              |              |              | \$ 400,000   |          |              |              | \$ 500,000   |             | \$ 900,000          | \$ -                          |
| 2      | PPACG   | North               | SH21   | SH21 WIDENING, PLATTE TO FOUNTAIN                                     | \$ 268,225   |              | \$ 2,231,875 |              |              |          |              |              |              |             | \$ 2,500,100        | \$ -                          |
| 2      | PPACG   | North               | US24A  | US24 Wellington Gulch Sediment Remove                                 | \$ 25,000    |              |              |              |              |          |              |              |              |             | \$ 25,000           | \$ -                          |
| 2      | PPACG   | North               | US24G  | US24G Overlay constitution to Garrett                                 |              |              |              | \$ 1,700,000 |              |          |              |              |              |             | \$ -                | \$ 1,700,000                  |
| 2      | PPACG   | North               | US24A  | US24A @ 8TH STREET (ROW & DESIGN)                                     |              |              |              |              | \$ 1,000,000 |          |              |              |              |             | \$ 1,000,000        | \$ -                          |
| 2      | PPACG   | North               | US24G  | US 24G EAST PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL LINKAGE STUDY                  |              |              |              |              |              |          |              |              | \$ 1,000,000 |             | \$ 1,000,000        | \$ -                          |
| 2      | PPACG   | North               | I-25   | I-25 PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL LINKAGE STUDY MONUMENT TO CASTLE ROCK |              |              |              |              |              |          |              |              | \$ 1,000,000 |             | \$ 1,000,000        | \$ -                          |
|        |         |                     |        |   | \$ 9,810,225 | \$ 8,331,410 | \$ 7,831,875 | \$ 4,500,000 | \$ 1,600,000 | \$ -     | \$ -         | \$ -         | \$ 2,500,000 | \$ -        | \$ 21,742,100       | \$ 12,831,410                 |
| 2      | SCTPR   | South               | US160A | US160A - PASSING LANE & SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS                           |              |              |              |              |              |          | \$ 1,600,000 | \$ 4,000,000 |              |             | \$ 1,600,000        | \$ 4,000,000                  |
| 2      | SCTPR   | Traffic             | I-25C  | SH 160/I-25C IN WALSENBERG - PED BIKE IMPROVEMENTS                    | \$ 282,073   |              |              |              | \$ 1,000,000 |          |              |              |              |             | \$ 1,282,073        | \$ -                          |
| 2      | SCTPR   | South               | I-25A  | I-25A EXIT 52 SB DECELERATION LANE                                    |              |              |              |              | \$ 500,000   |          |              |              |              |             | \$ 500,000          | \$ -                          |
| 2      | SCTPR   | South               | I-25A  | I-25A EXIT 11 FRONTAGE ROAD ACCESS IMPROVEMENTS                       |              |              | \$ 500,000   |              |              |          |              |              | \$ 3,000,000 |             | \$ 3,500,000        | \$ -                          |
| 2      | SCTPR   | South               | I-25A  | HAZARDOUS MATERIALS CLEAN-UP AMACO STATION                            | \$ -         |              |              |              |              |          |              |              |              |             | \$ -                | \$ -                          |
|        |         |                     |        |   | \$ 282,073   | \$ -         | \$ 500,000   | \$ -         | \$ 1,500,000 | \$ -     | \$ 1,600,000 | \$ 4,000,000 | \$ 3,000,000 | \$ -        | \$ 6,882,073        | \$ 4,000,000                  |
| 2      | SETPR   | South               | US287  | US287/US 50 IMPROVEMENTS WITH CONCRETE PAVING PROJECT                 |              |              |              |              | \$ 2,300,000 |          |              |              |              | \$ 800,000  | \$ 2,300,000        | \$ 800,000                    |

**REGION 2 RPP/FASTER SAFETY PLAN**

**FISCAL YEAR 2017-2020 (4-YEAR PLAN) (January 20, 2016)**



| Region | TPR/MPO | Responsible Program | Hwy    | Project Name  | RPP 2016      | FSA 2016      | RPP 2017     | FSA 2017      | RPP 2018     | FSA 2018      | RPP 2019     | FSA 2019      | RPP 2020     | FASTER 2020    | 2016-2020 RPP TOTAL | 2016-2020 FASTER SAFETY TOTAL |
|--------|---------|---------------------|--------|---|---------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|
| 2      | SETPR   | South               | US50B  | US50B PASSING LANES - BETWEEN PUEBLO COUNTY & LAMAR     |               |               |              |               |              |               | \$ 600,000   | \$ 5,300,000  |              |                | \$ 600,000          | \$ 5,300,000                  |
| 2      | SETPR   | South               | US287A | US287A - PASSING LANE                                   |               |               |              |               |              |               | \$ 600,000   | \$ 3,549,310  |              | \$ 1,450,690   | \$ 600,000          | \$ 5,000,000                  |
| 2      | SETPR   | South               | US50B  | US50B DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS - MANZANOLA, SWINK, GRANADA |               |               |              |               | \$ 200,000   |               | \$ 800,000   |               |              |                | \$ 1,000,000        | \$ -                          |
| 2      | SETPR   | South               | US50B  | US50B EAST CORRIDOR STUDIES EA/EIS AND DESIGN           |               |               |              |               |              |               | \$ 199,900   |               |              |                | \$ 199,900          | \$ -                          |
| 2      | SETPR   | South               | SH385  | SH 385 REALIGNMENT AND BRIDGE REPLACEMENT (DESIGN ONLY) |               |               | \$ 350,000   |               |              |               |              |               |              |                | \$ 350,000          | \$ -                          |
|        |         |                     |        |   | \$ -          | \$ -          | \$ 350,000   | \$ -          | \$ 2,500,000 | \$ -          | \$ 2,199,900 | \$ 8,849,310  | \$ -         | \$ 2,250,690   | \$ 5,049,900        | \$ 11,100,000                 |
| 2      |         |                     |        | REGION 2 RPP FLEXIBLE FUND                              | \$ 102,718    |               | \$ -         |               | \$ -         |               | \$ -         |               |              |                | \$ 102,718          |                               |
|        |         | North               |        | STORMWATER TREATMENT (VARIOUS LOCATIONS)                | \$ 150,000    |               |              |               |              |               |              |               |              |                | \$ 150,000          |                               |
|        |         | under way           |        | SIGNAL REPLACEMENT (SH21A and Fontaine) (#20225)        |               |               |              | \$ 375,000    |              |               |              |               |              |                |                     | \$ 375,000                    |
|        |         | under way           |        | REGION 2 FY14 SIGNAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT (#19682)       |               | \$ 70,000     |              | \$ 890,000    |              |               |              |               |              |                |                     | \$ 960,000                    |
|        |         |                     |        | <b>ROLL FORWARD UTILIZATION</b>                         |               | \$ 3,500,000  |              |               |              |               |              |               |              |                |                     | \$ 3,500,000                  |
|        |         |                     |        | <b>TOTAL PLANNED</b>                                    | \$ 13,214,791 | \$ 16,286,968 | \$ 9,681,875 | \$ 12,372,097 | \$ 9,700,000 | \$ 12,849,310 | \$ 9,681,875 | \$ 12,849,310 | \$ 9,750,000 | \$ 15,268,551  | \$ 52,028,541       | \$ 69,626,236                 |
|        |         |                     |        | <b>YEARLY ALLOCATION</b>                                | \$ 13,214,791 | \$ 12,014,217 | \$ 9,681,875 | \$ 12,364,692 | \$ 9,700,000 | \$ 12,849,310 | \$ 9,681,875 | \$ 13,336,165 | \$ 9,681,875 | \$ 13,842,483  | \$ 51,960,416       | \$ 64,406,867                 |
|        |         |                     |        | <b>DIFFERENCE</b>                                       | \$ -          | \$ (772,751)  | \$ -         | \$ (7,405)    | \$ -         | \$ -          | \$ -         | \$ 486,855    | \$ (68,125)  | \$ (1,426,068) | \$ (68,125)         | \$ (1,719,369)                |





**COLORADO**  
Department of Transportation  
Division of Transit & Rail

4201 E. Arkansas Ave., Rm. 227  
Denver, CO 80222

**DATE:** January 20, 2016  
**TO:** Transportation Commission  
**FROM:** Mark Imhoff, Director - Division of Transit & Rail  
**SUBJECT:** State Transit Town Halls

Purpose

Inform the Transit & Intermodal Committee of the upcoming Transit Town Hall meetings.

Action

No action required.

Background

Annual Transit Town Halls are conducted to keep the public and the transit Grant Partners aware of changes to the CDOT policy, process, requirements or new programs; and to gather input.

Details

The Division of Transit & Rail has finalized the schedule for the annual Transit Town Halls. Held in March each year, the Transit Town Halls are the primary opportunity for the public and our grant partners to provide input on policy issues facing CDOT. Each year, DTR staff travel around the state to host these meetings. This year DTR will not only be soliciting input on general policy issues, but these town halls will be the first opportunity for the public and Grant Partners to begin the discussion on CDOT's method of distributing federal transit funding.

This past year saw a significant increase in requests for federal funding across the transit programs which highlighted the fact that the distribution process has not been reviewed in many years. DTR will be seeking input on concerns and issues with funding for transit operations, vehicles, facilities, and equipment as well as considerations for new transit systems, such as the Winter Park system, which recently won a tax initiative to fund a community transit system.

There are four regional meetings scheduled and an online/telephone session will be added later in March.

Monday, March 7, 2016  
CDOT Headquarters Auditorium  
4201 East Arkansas Avenue  
Denver, CO 80222  
9:00 - 14:00

Thursday, March 10, 2016  
Glenwood Springs City Hall  
101 West 8th Street  
Glenwood Springs, CO 81601  
9:00-14:00

Wednesday, March 9, 2016  
Durango Public Library - Program Room  
1900 East 3rd Avenue  
Durango, CO 81301-5027  
9:00 - 14:00

Wednesday, March 16, 2016  
Pueblo Police Department Community Room  
200 South Main Street  
Pueblo, CO 81003  
9:00 - 14:00







## COLORADO

Department of Transportation

Office of Policy and Government Relations

### MEMORANDUM

TO: STATEWIDE TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
 FROM: RON PAPSDORF, FEDERAL AFFAIRS AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT LIAISON  
 DATE: JANUARY 22, 2016  
 SUBJECT: FIXING AMERICA'S SURFACE TRANSPORTATION (FAST) ACT - DETAILED OVERVIEW

#### BACKGROUND

On December 4, 2015, President Obama signed into law the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act. The FAST Act authorizes Federal highway, transit, and rail programs for five years from 2016 to 2020 and represents the first long-term comprehensive surface transportation legislation since 2005.

The FAST Act is a five year (FY 2016 - FY 2020) \$300 billion highway, transit, highway safety and rail bill. It provides approximately \$225 billion in contract authority over five years for the Federal-aid Highway program, increasing funding from \$41 billion in FY 2015 to \$47 billion in FY 2020. The bill continues to distribute nearly 93 percent of all Federal-aid Highway program contract authority to State DOTs through formula programs. The bill creates a new National Highway Freight program (approximately \$1.2 billion a year) that is distributed to the States by formula and creates a new discretionary program for Nationally Significant Freight and Highway Projects (approximately \$900 million a year). The FAST Act gradually increases the percentage of the Surface Transportation Program that is suballocated by population from 50 percent in FY 2015 to 55 percent in FY 2020. The bill also includes a \$7.6 billion rescission of unobligated Federal-aid Highway contract authority in FY 2020.

The FAST Act provides approximately \$61 billion over five years for Federal transit programs including \$48.9 billion in Highway Trust Fund contract authority and roughly \$12 billion in funding from the General Fund. For highway safety the bill provides \$4.7 billion for NHTSA (\$3.7 from the HTF) and \$3.2 billion for the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration. The FAST Act authorizes approximately \$10 billion over five years for the Federal Railroad Administration and Amtrak.

For Colorado, the bill increases highway formula funding from \$516 million in 2015 to \$542 million in 2016 and grows to \$592 million in 2020. Overall, this represents an increase of about \$250 million over MAP-21 funding levels over the five years of the bill. On the transit side, funding increases from \$111.5 million in 2015 to \$114.6 million in 2016 and grows to \$124.8 million in 2020. Overall, this represents an increase of about \$40 million over MAP-21 funding levels over the five years of the bill.

This memorandum details some of the key components of the FAST Act by broad subject area. At future STAC meetings, based on input from the Committee, we will delve deeper into each subject area. As you review this information, please consider the subject areas about which you are most interested in receiving more details.



## Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act Funding Summary for Colorado

| Highway Programs  | 2016                 | 2017                 | 2018                 | 2019                 | 2020                 | Total                  |
|---|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------------|
| National Highway Performance Program                            | \$297,705,132        | \$304,312,514        | \$310,098,755        | \$316,507,189        | \$323,099,910        | \$1,551,723,500        |
| Surface Transportation Block Grant Program                      | \$137,015,364        | \$140,516,942        | \$143,558,486        | \$146,342,615        | \$149,830,157        | \$717,263,564          |
| Surface Transportation Block Grant Set-aside                    | \$10,486,329         | \$10,486,329         | \$10,703,299         | \$10,703,299         | \$10,703,299         | \$53,082,555           |
| STBGP Set-aside: Recreational Trails Program                    | \$1,591,652          | \$1,591,652          | \$1,591,652          | \$1,591,652          | \$1,591,652          | \$7,958,260            |
| Highway Safety Improvement Program                              | \$29,431,653         | \$30,085,816         | \$30,649,742         | \$31,201,622         | \$31,834,485         | \$153,203,318          |
| Railway-Highway Crossings Program                               | \$3,236,539          | \$3,308,462          | \$3,380,386          | \$3,452,309          | \$3,524,232          | \$16,901,928           |
| CMAQ Program  | \$42,132,383         | \$43,067,485         | \$43,886,376         | \$44,689,751         | \$45,597,422         | \$219,373,417          |
| Metropolitan Planning   | \$5,266,924          | \$5,373,578          | \$5,486,478          | \$5,604,275          | \$5,734,725          | \$27,465,980           |
| National Freight Program  | \$15,546,723         | \$14,870,779         | \$16,222,667         | \$18,250,501         | \$20,278,334         | \$85,169,004           |
| <b>Total</b>  | <b>\$542,414,715</b> | <b>\$553,615,574</b> | <b>\$565,579,859</b> | <b>\$578,345,232</b> | <b>\$592,196,236</b> | <b>\$2,832,151,616</b> |
| Transit Programs  | 2016                 | 2017                 | 2018                 | 2019                 | 2020                 | Total                  |
| 5303: Metropolitan Planning                                     | \$1,807,282          | \$1,844,151          | \$1,882,878          | \$1,922,795          | \$1,963,558          | \$9,420,664            |
| 5304: Statewide Planning  | \$372,263            | \$379,857            | \$387,834            | \$396,056            | \$404,452            | \$1,940,462            |
| 5307+5340: Urbanized Area Formula                               | \$74,345,208         | \$75,863,206         | \$77,506,323         | \$79,505,365         | \$81,219,297         | \$388,439,399          |
| 5329(3): State Safety Oversight Program                         | \$536,630            | \$547,362            | \$558,857            | \$570,704            | \$582,803            | \$2,796,356            |
| 5310: Enhanced Mobility for Adults and People with Disabilities | \$3,781,419          | \$3,857,047          | \$3,938,045          | \$4,021,532          | \$4,106,788          | \$19,704,831           |
| 5311+5340: Non-urbanized Area Formula                           | \$11,158,622         | \$11,408,398         | \$11,674,316         | \$11,948,201         | \$12,228,030         | \$58,417,567           |
| 5311(b)(3): RTAP  | \$158,456            | \$161,625            | \$165,019            | \$168,518            | \$172,090            | \$825,708              |
| 5311(c)(1): Indian Reservation Formula                          | \$182,995            | \$182,995            | \$182,995            | \$182,995            | \$182,995            | \$914,975              |
| High Intensity Fixed Guideway                                   | \$13,880,464         | \$14,116,715         | \$14,360,514         | \$14,607,801         | \$14,859,341         | \$71,824,835           |
| High Intensity Motor Bus  | \$420,108            | \$427,258            | \$434,634            | \$442,121            | \$449,735            | \$2,173,856            |
| 5339: Bus and Bus Facilities Formula                            | \$6,225,267          | \$6,382,263          | \$6,550,237          | \$6,723,078          | \$6,899,443          | \$32,780,288           |
| 5339: Statewide Allocation                                      | \$1,750,000          | \$1,750,000          | \$1,750,000          | \$1,750,000          | \$1,750,000          | \$8,750,000            |
| <b>Total</b>  | <b>\$114,620,730</b> | <b>\$116,922,894</b> | <b>\$119,393,670</b> | <b>\$122,241,185</b> | <b>\$124,820,552</b> | <b>\$597,988,941</b>   |

Note: Estimates are Pre-Obligation Limitations



## **SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM**

FAST Act changes the name of the Surface Transportation Program to the Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBGP). Along with the name change come other important updates:

- Increased local funding: Currently, 50 percent of STP funding is sub-allocated to local areas by population. Under FAST Act's new STBGP, this gradually increases to 55 percent over the course of the five-year bill.
- Transportation alternatives: Under current law, the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) is a standalone program for funding bike, pedestrian, and other alternative projects. FAST Act deletes the existing federal authorization for TAP and moves it into the STBGP as a set-aside. TAP is currently funded at \$820 million annually; FAST increases that figure to \$835 million in FY 2016 and FY 2017 and then to \$850 million per year.
  - Must use competitive process to allocate the funds.
  - MPOs over 200,000 may flex up to 50% of STP Set Aside for use on any STBGP-eligible project.
  - Adds requirement that MPOs must distribute funds 'in consultation with State'.
- The off-system bridge set-aside is retained under the STBGP, funded at \$777 million per year. Colorado funding under this program is approximately \$10.5 million per year.
- Maintains all existing eligibilities of old STP program and adds several new eligibilities:
  - Safe Routes to Schools
  - Boulevards and other roadways largely in the right-of-way of former Interstate routes or other divided highways
  - Workforce development, training, and education
  - Projects that facilitate direct intermodal interchange, transfer, and access into and out of a port terminal
  - Costs associated with providing Federal Credit Assistance (TIFIA)
  - Public Private Partnerships

## **HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY**

- A State in which an automated traffic enforcement system is installed shall expend apportioned Highway Safety Program funds to conduct a biennial survey that includes: a list of automated traffic enforcement systems in the State; adequate data to measure the transparency, accountability, and safety attributes of each automated traffic enforcement system; and a comparison of each automated traffic enforcement system with Speed Enforcement Camera Systems Operational Guidelines and Red Light Camera Systems Operational Guidelines.
- Within 1 year, the Secretary, in consultation with the heads of other Federal agencies as appropriate shall conduct a study on marijuana-impaired driving. The study will examine:
  - Methods to detect marijuana-impaired driving.
  - A review of impairment standard research for driving under the influence of marijuana.
  - Methods to differentiate the cause of a driving impairment between alcohol and marijuana.
  - State-based policies on marijuana impairment.
  - The role and extent of marijuana impairment in motor vehicle accidents.



**FREIGHT**

In general, the FAST Act places additional emphasis on freight planning and freight movement. It creates a National Multimodal Freight Policy, to be administered by the US Department of Transportation Undersecretary for Policy, to improve the condition and performance of the National Multimodal Freight Network (NMFN).

- States are encouraged to form State Freight Advisory Committees and mandates that all States receiving National Highway Freight Program formula funds create a State Freight Plan (SFP) within two years of enactment and updated every five years.
- The Act also establishes a National Highway Freight Network (NHFN) consisting of:
  - A primary highway freight network (PHFN) of 41,518 miles already identified by FHWA
  - Critical Rural Freight Corridors
    - Must meet minimum criteria
    - No more than 150 miles in Colorado
  - Critical Urban Freight Corridors
    - Designated by MPOs over 500,000 in consultation with the State, or
    - By the State in consultation with MPOs with less than 500,000 population
    - No more than 75 miles in Colorado
  - Any portion of the interstate system not include above
- Creates a new formula distribution National Freight Program that will provide Colorado with \$85 million over five years for freight infrastructure improvements. In General, formula funds are used “to improve the movement of freight on the National Highway Freight Network.”
  - Each State’s formula distribution is based upon the number of Primary Highway Freight System (PHFS) miles in that State relative to all PHFS miles. For States whose formula proportion is greater than or equal to two percent, it may obligate funds to any of the NHFN elements except for interstates that are not part of the PHFS. For States whose formula proportion is less than two percent, it may obligate funds to any segment of the NHFN, including all interstates.
  - Colorado is a “low primary highway freight system mileage” state so is eligible to use funds for projects on any component of the NHFN and not just the PHFN.
- Creates a new \$800 million per year (grows to \$1 billion in 2020) Nationally Significant Freight and Highway Projects Program that will provide grants to highway, bridge, rail-grade crossing, intermodal and freight rail projects costing more than \$100 million. The program allows up to \$500 million to be allocated to freight rail and/or intermodal projects.
  - Grant Authority: Except as otherwise provided, each grant shall be at least \$25m.
  - Eligible Applicants: A State or group of states; MPOs with a population over 200,000; local governments or groups of local governments; political subdivisions of a State or local government; special purpose district or public authority; Federal land management agency; tribal government or group of tribal governments; multistate or multijurisdictional group of any of the above entities.
  - Eligible Projects:
    - Highway freight project on the National Highway Freight Network;



- Highway or bridge project on the NHS;
- A freight project that is:
  - A freight intermodal or freight rail project, or
  - Within the boundaries of a public or private freight rail, water (including ports), or intermodal facility and that is a surface transportation infrastructure project necessary to facilitate direct intermodal interchange, transfer or access into or out of the facility, or
  - A railway-highway grade separation project.
- Has eligible project costs reasonably expected to exceed:
  - \$100m, or
  - For a project located in one state, 30% of the federal-aid highway apportionment to the State in the most recent FY, or
  - For a project located in more than one state, 50% of the federal-aid highway apportionment to the State with the largest apportionment in the most recent FY.
- Limitation: No more than \$500m of the total amount in the program (2016-2020) may be used for a freight project that is an intermodal or freight rail project or within the boundaries of a public or private freight rail, water, or intermodal facility.
- Small Projects: 10% of grant funding is reserved each fiscal year for projects that do not satisfy the minimum project cost thresholds. Each small project grant shall be at least \$5m.
- Project Requirements:
  - Generate national or regional economic, mobility, or safety benefits;
  - Be cost-effective;
  - Contribute to accomplishment of one or more of the national goals described in section 150;
  - Based on results of preliminary engineering;
  - With respect to non-federal financial commitments:
    - One or more stable and dependable sources are available to construct, maintain, and operate the project; and
    - Contingency amounts are available to cover unanticipated cost increases.
  - Cannot be easily and efficiently completed without Federal funding or financial assistance available to the project sponsor;
  - Project reasonably expected to begin construction no more than 18 months after date of obligation of funds.
- Rural Areas: The Secretary shall reserve at least 25% of funds (including amount for small projects) each fiscal year for grants in rural areas. Rural area means an area outside an urbanized area with a population over 200,000.
- Federal Share: The Federal share of a project assisted with a grant under this program may not exceed 60%. Other Federal assistance may be used to satisfy the non-federal (40%) share of a project except that the total Federal assistance may not exceed 80% of the total project cost.



## TRANSIT

- Improvements to landscaping and streetscape must be 'functional' to be eligible as an associated transit improvement.
- Bicycle storage shelters and parking facilities and the installation of equipment are eligible.
- Plans and TIPs for each Metro Area shall provide for intermodal facilities that support intercity transportation, including intercity buses and intercity bus facilities and commuter vanpool providers.
- Transportation plans must include the identification of intercity bus facilities.
- Fixed Guideway Capital Investment Grants:
  - Removes weekend service requirement for corridor-based bus rapid transit projects.
  - Increases maximum size of small start grant from \$75 million to \$100 million and the maximum size of small start project from \$250 million to \$300 million.
  - Redefines Corridor-Based Bus Rapid Transit Project to mean a small start project that emulates rail fixed guideway systems, the majority of which does not operate in a separated right-of-way dedicated for public transportation use during peak periods.
- Creates a new pilot program for innovative coordinated access and mobility to provide grants for innovative projects that improve the coordination of transportation services and non-emergency medical transportation (including the deployment of technology).
- Grants or loans may not be used to pay incremental costs of incorporating art or non-functional landscaping into facilities, including the costs of an artist on the design team.
- Re-creates a competitive grant bus program which includes a 10% rural set-aside and a cap that not more than 10% of all grant amounts can be awarded to a single grantee.
  - Allows States to submit statewide applications for bus needs, which would allow the State to distribute competitively awarded funds.
  - The competitive bus program includes \$55 million annually for no/low emission buses and grows from \$268 million in 2016 to \$344 million by 2020.
  - Each State will receive \$1.75 million each fiscal year in formula grants.
  - Non-Federal share may be provided from revenues generated from value capture financing mechanisms.
  - Creates a new pilot program under which an eligible recipient of formula grant funds in an urbanized area with population of not less than 200,000 and not more than 999,999 may elect to participate in a State pool.
    - The purpose of a State pool is to allow transfers of formula grant funds among the designated recipients in a manner that supports their transit asset management plans.
    - A State, and eligible recipients in the State, may submit to the Secretary a request for participation in the program.
    - A participating State shall develop an allocation plan for FY 2016 through 2020 to ensure that an eligible recipient participating in the pool receives an amount that equals the amount that would have otherwise been available.



## PASSENGER RAIL

For the first time, Amtrak funding is separated into the Northeast Corridor and the National Network. The bill directs the creation of at least two distinct accounts for the Northeast Corridor and the National Network to assign all revenues, appropriations, grants and other forms of financial assistance, compensation, and other sources of funds, including operating surplus, commuter payments and state payments. If Amtrak determines that a transfer between the accounts is necessary, Amtrak may transfer funds between the Northeast Corridor and National Network accounts if Amtrak notifies the Amtrak Board of Directors, including the Secretary, at least 10 days prior to the expected date of transfer.

The National Network is funded at \$5.454 billion over five years while the Northeast Corridor is funded at \$2.596 billion.

## PLANNING AND PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT

The FAST Act makes no significant changes to the performance-based planning and programming policy requirements included in MAP-21. This includes no new national-level performance measures beyond what is currently being developed through the Federal rule-making process. The Act does change to a “shall” regarding the inclusion of description of performance measures and the system performance report in a State’s long-range transportation plan.

The Act also includes new provisions to enable the USDOT to better support State DOTs, MPOs, and FHWA in the collection and management of data for performance-based planning and programming. This includes data analysis activities related to vehicle probe data, household travel behavior data, travel demand model data and performance management prediction tools. These data-related activities are funded at \$10 million per year nationally over the duration of the FAST Act.

- Each metropolitan planning organization is encouraged to consult with officials responsible for other types of planning activities that are affected by transportation in the area (including State and local planned growth, economic development, *tourism*, *natural disaster risk reduction*, environmental protection, airport operations, and freight movements) or to coordinate its planning process, to the maximum extent practicable, with such planning activities.
- The metropolitan planning process for a metropolitan planning area shall provide for consideration of projects and strategies that will “*improve resiliency and reliability of the transportation system*” and reduce or mitigate stormwater impacts of surface transportation.
- Directs planners to include considerations to enhance travel and tourism.
- Emphasize intermodal transfer facilities and accessibility effects of intercity bus services and facilities.
- ‘Private transportation’ should include consideration of intercity bus operators and employer-based commuting programs.

## ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The project delivery provisions in the FAST Act contain many important streamlining measures. The Act requires USDOT to allow States to assume Federal responsibility for project design, plans, specifications, estimates, contract awards and inspection of projects, to the maximum extent practicable. The Act also allows USDOT operating administrations to adopt the NEPA environmental documents and assessments developed by other operating



administrations. It expands the multimodal categorical exclusion established in MAP-21 to provide the authority for any DOT operating administration to use a CE of another operating administration.

- Exempts ‘common post-1945 concrete steel bridge or culvert’ from individual review.
- Establishes a 45 day response time for comments from cooperating agencies.
- Requires lead agency to prepare a ‘complete’ document including permits.
- Accelerated decision making in environmental reviews.
  - Allows errata sheets
  - Single document for FEIS and ROD to the extent practicable and consistent with Federal law.
  - Requires Secretary to make publicly available no later than 18 months after bill’s enactment the status and progress of projects requiring an EA or EIS and the names of participating agencies not participating in development of project purpose and need and range of alternatives.
- Participating agencies shall limit their comments to subject matter areas within the special expertise or jurisdiction of the agency.
- The lead agency may eliminate from detailed consideration an alternative proposed in an EIS regarding a project if the alternative was considered in a metropolitan planning process or a State environmental review process by an MPO or a State or local transportation agency under certain circumstances.
- Allows lead agency or cooperating agency to adopt or incorporate by reference an entire planning product for use in NEPA under certain conditions.

#### **DESIGN AND PROJECT DELIVERY**

- Creates an option to bundle small bridge projects to increase efficiency. Projects bundled under this subsection shall have the same financial characteristics, including the same funding category or subcategory and the same Federal share.
- HSIP funds may be used for the installation of vehicle-to-infrastructure communication equipment, pedestrian hybrid beacons, roadway improvements that provide separation between pedestrians and motor vehicles, including medians and pedestrian crossing islands, a physical infrastructure safety project not described elsewhere.
- The Secretary shall also consider the ‘Highway Safety Manual’ of the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials and the ‘Urban Street Design Guide’ of the National Association of City Transportation Officials to develop criteria for project design on the NHS.
- A State may allow a local jurisdiction to use a roadway design publication that is different from the roadway design publication used by the State in which the local jurisdiction is located for the design of a project on a roadway under the ownership of the local jurisdiction (other than a highway on the Interstate System) if:
  - the local jurisdiction is a direct recipient of Federal funds for the project;
  - the roadway design publication—
    - is recognized by the Federal Highway Administration; and
    - is adopted by the local jurisdiction;
  - The design complies with all other applicable Federal laws.



- The Secretary shall encourage each State and MPO to adopt standards for the design of Federal surface transportation projects that provide for the safe and adequate accommodation of all users of the surface transportation network, including motorized and non-motorized users, in all phases of project planning, development and operation.

## INNOVATION

- Directs the Secretary to establish an advanced transportation and congestion management technologies deployment initiative to provide grants to eligible entities to develop model deployment sites for large scale installation and operation of advanced transportation technologies funded at \$60 million per year.
  - Grants shall be awarded to not less than 5 and not more than 10 eligible entities. Eligible entities are State or local governments, MPOs with population over 200,000, or other political subdivisions of a State or local government or multijurisdictional groups or consortia of research institutions or academic institutions.
  - Grants may not exceed \$12 million to a single recipient in a fiscal year. The Federal share is limited to 50%.
  - Grant awards shall consider geographic and technology diversity.
  - Grants may be used to deploy advanced transportation and congestion management technologies, including advanced traveler information systems; advanced transportation management technologies; infrastructure maintenance, monitoring, and condition assessment; advanced public transportation systems; transportation system performance data collection, analysis, and dissemination systems; advanced safety systems, including vehicle-to-vehicle and vehicle-to-infrastructure communications, technologies associated with autonomous vehicles, and other collision avoidance technologies; integration of intelligent transportation systems with the Smart Grid; electronic pricing and payment systems; or advanced mobility and access technologies, such as dynamic ridesharing and information systems to support human services for elderly and disabled individuals.
- The goals of the Intelligent Transportation System Program are amended by adding: “enhancement of the national freight system and support to national freight policy goals.”
- The Secretary shall establish a program to provide grants to States or groups of States to demonstrate user-based alternative revenue mechanisms that utilize a user fee structure to maintain the long-term solvency of the Highway Trust Fund.
  - Geographic diversity shall be considered in awarding grants.
  - The grant program is funded at \$15 million in 2016 and \$20 million per year for fiscal years 2017 through 2020.
  - The Federal share is limited to 50%.

## FINANCING

- TIFIA is funded at \$275 million in 2016 and increases to \$300 million in 2020. A roll-over provision is included so that unused TIFIA allocations accumulate year to year rather than being redistributed.



- The bill also updates the TIFIA program to enable it to be better utilized by rural areas and more accessible for small projects and makes transit-oriented development projects eligible to apply for TIFIA loans.
- Modifies the cost parameters for eligible projects. All eligible projects are now expected to cost at least \$50 million. Adds project cost exceptions for transit-oriented development (costs must equal or exceed \$10 million), rural projects (\$10 million to \$100 million), and local infrastructure projects (equal to or greater than \$10 million).
- Redefines a rural infrastructure project as a project located in an area that is outside an urbanized area of 150,000 people or more.
- Sets a limit for TIFIA funding used towards small projects with project costs of less than \$75 million.
- Adds a requirement that MPOs must be consulted on the placement and amount of tolls on an HOV facility located on the Interstate System if the facility is located in an MPO.
- Authorizes the Secretary to establish a National Surface Transportation and Innovative Finance Bureau to provide assistance and communicate best practices and financing and funding opportunities to eligible entities; administer the application processes for TIFIA, RRIF, the qualified highway or surface freight transfer facilities bonding program, and the new Nationally Significant Freight and Highway Projects program; promote innovative financing best practices; reduce uncertainty and delays in environmental reviews and permitting; and reduce costs in project delivery and procurement.
- Requires the Secretary of Transportation to establish a Council on Credit and Finance. The Council shall review applications for assistance submitted under TIFIA, RRIF, the qualified highway or surface freight transfer facilities bonding program, and the new Nationally Significant Freight and Highway Projects program.

#### MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

- Funds apportioned to a State under HSIP may not be used to purchase, operate, or maintain an automated traffic enforcement system, except a system located in a school zone.
- Vehicle-to-infrastructure communication equipment is specified as an eligible expenditure under the Highway Performance Program and the Surface Transportation Block Grant Program.
- Secretary shall designate national electric vehicle charging and hydrogen, propane, and natural gas fueling corridors within 1 year.
  - Corridors will identify near- and long-term need for, and location of, electric vehicle charging infrastructure, hydrogen fueling infrastructure, propane fueling infrastructure, and natural gas fueling infrastructure at strategic locations along major national highways.
  - Secretary shall solicit nominations from State and local officials.
- Designates I-70 between Denver and Salt Lake City as a High Priority Corridor on National Highway System.





**COLORADO**  
Department of Transportation  
Office of Policy and Government Relations

**STATEWIDE TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
FIXING AMERICA’S SURFACE TRANSPORTATION (FAST) ACT BRIEFINGS**

**PRIORITIES BALLOT**

Please rank 1 through 10 in priority order (1=highest priority, 10=lowest priority)

- \_\_\_\_\_ Surface Transportation Block Grant Program
- \_\_\_\_\_ Financing
- \_\_\_\_\_ Highway Traffic Safety
- \_\_\_\_\_ Freight
- \_\_\_\_\_ Transit
- \_\_\_\_\_ Passenger Rail
- \_\_\_\_\_ Planning and Performance Management
- \_\_\_\_\_ Environmental Review
- \_\_\_\_\_ Design and Project Delivery
- \_\_\_\_\_ Innovation







## MAP-21 Pavement NPRM

January 2016



## MAP-21 NPRMs Status (as of January 2016)

| Rule   | Responsible        | NPRM Closed                     | Final Rule Expected     | Notes   |
|--|--------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| Safety Performance Measure (PM1)                                   | SCOPM              | June 2014                       | February 19, 2016       | Sent to OMB on November 12, 2015 (90 day review)      |
| Highway Safety Improvement Program                                 | SCOHTS             | June 2014                       | January 29, 2016        | Sent to OMB on August 19, 2015 (90 day review)        |
| FHWA/FTA Metropolitan and Statewide Planning                       | SCOP               | September 2014                  | July 29, 2016           | FHWA/FTA staff developing final rule                  |
| CMAQ Weighting Factors   | SCOE/SCOP          | October 2014                    | May 27, 2016            | Sent to OST on November 10, 2015                      |
| Planning and Environmental Linkage (supplemental to Planning NPRM) | SCOE/SCOP          | November 2014                   | See Planning NPRM Above | Combined with updated Metro/Statewide Planning        |
| Pavement/Bridge Performance Measure (PM2)                          | SCOPM              | May 2015                        | July 17, 2016           | FHWA staff developing final rule                      |
| Asset Management Plan  | SCOP-TAM           | May 2015                        | July 17, 2016           | FHWA staff developing final rule                      |
| System Performance Measure (PM3)                                   | SCOPM              | To be Published<br>Jan 29, 2016 | Unknown<br>(Q2 2016*)   | Sent to OMB on August 20, 2015 (90 day review)        |
| (FTA) National Transit Safety Program                              | SCOFT<br>SCOPM     | October 2015                    | Unknown                 |   |
| (FTA) Transit Asset Management Plans                               | SCOFT/<br>SCOP-TAM | November 2015                   | Unknown<br>(Q4 2016)    | FTA intent is to publish final rule by December 2016. |

- **GREEN:** The date is likely to be met at this time. There is a strong possibility that the rule will be published close to the date indicated.
- **ORANGE:** There is some uncertainty about whether the date is likely to be met. There is a possibility that the rule will be published later than what is indicated.
- **RED:** It is unlikely that the date will be met. There is a strong likelihood that the rule will be published later than what is indicated.

2



## Performance Measures

| Performance Element  | Performance Requirements for NHPP  |
|----------------------|--|
| Performance Measures | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not later than 18 months after date of enactment USDOT, in consultation with State DOTs, MPOs, and other stakeholders will promulgate a rulemaking that establishes measures.</li> <li>• Provide not less than 90 days to comment on regulation.</li> <li>• Take into consideration any comments.</li> <li>• Limit performance measures to those described under 23USC150(c).</li> <li>• For purposes of carrying out National Highway Performance Program USDOT will establish Measures for States to use to assess:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Condition of Pavements                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Interstate System</li> <li>▪ National Highway System (excluding the Interstate)</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Condition of Bridges                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ National Highway System</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Performance of:                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Interstate System</li> <li>▪ National Highway System (excluding the Interstate)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• USDOT will establish the data elements that are necessary to collect and maintain standardized data to carry out a performance-based approach</li> </ul> |

3



## Performance Target Setting

| Performance Element | Performance Requirements for NHPP  |
|---------------------|--|
| Performance Targets | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States must coordinate, to the maximum extent practical with relevant MPOs in selecting a target to ensure for consistency</li> <li>• MPOs must coordinate, to the maximum extent practical, with the relevant State/s in selecting a target to ensure consistency</li> <li>• Coordination required with public transportation providers.</li> <li>• States and MPOs must integrate other performance plans into the performance-based process</li> </ul> |

4



| Performance Element | Performance Requirements for NHPP  |
|---------------------|--|
| Performance Plans   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Asset Management Plan                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Risk-based asset management plan</li> <li>○ States encouraged to include all infrastructure assets within the right-of-way</li> <li>○ Plan Contents                                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ pavement and bridge inventory and conditions on the NHS,</li> <li>▪ objectives and measures,</li> <li>▪ performance gap identification,</li> <li>▪ lifecycle cost and risk management analysis,</li> <li>▪ a financial plan, and</li> <li>▪ investment strategies</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ USDOT, in consultation with State DOTs, will establish the process to develop the plan through a rulemaking no later than 18 months after 10/1/2012</li> <li>○ States must have a plan developed consistent with the process by the 2nd fiscal year, otherwise federal share for NHPP will be reduced to 65%</li> <li>○ Process certification                                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ USDOT 90 days review period to determine certification</li> <li>▪ States have 90 days to cure deficiencies if not certified</li> <li>▪ Recertification required every 4 years</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• Management Systems                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ USDOT will establish minimum standards for States to use in developing and operating:                                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Bridge management systems</li> <li>▪ Pavement management systems</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Minimum standards established through a rulemaking                                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Minimum 90 day comment period</li> <li>▪ USDOT will promulgate a rulemaking not later than 18 months after date of enactment</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> |

5



| Performance Element       | Performance Requirements for NHPP   |
|---------------------------|---|
| Target Achievement        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "A State that does not achieve or make significant progress toward achieving the targets... for 2 consecutive reports"                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Document in 23USC150(e) report actions the State will take to improve their ability to achieve the target</li> </ul> </li> </ul>   |
| Special Performance Rules | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interstate Pavement Condition                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Minimum condition level established by USDOT through rulemaking</li> <li>○ Condition falls below threshold set by USDOT for 2 consecutive reports then:                                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ NHPP funding set aside to address Interstate pavement</li> <li>▪ STP funds transferred to NHPP to address Interstate pavement conditions</li> <li>▪ This obligation requirement stays in effect until the minimum thresholds can be met (checked annually)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• National Highway System Bridge Condition                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Greater than 10% of total deck area of bridges on the NHS are located on bridges classified as structurally deficient for 3 consecutive years then:                                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ NHPP funding set aside to address bridge conditions on the NHS</li> <li>▪ This obligation requirement remains in place until minimum condition requirement is met (checked annually)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> |

6



## Performance Reporting

| Performance Element   | Performance Requirements for NHPP   |
|-----------------------|---|
| Performance Reporting | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State Report on Performance Progress               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Required initially by October 1, 2016 and every 2 years thereafter</li> <li>○ Report includes:                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Condition and performance of NHS</li> <li>▪ Effectiveness of investment strategy for the NHS</li> <li>▪ Progress in achieving all State performance targets</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• Metropolitan System Performance Report               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Required in transportation plan every 4 or 5 years</li> <li>○ Report includes:                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Evaluate condition and performance of transportation system</li> <li>▪ Progress achieved in meeting performance targets in comparison with the performance in previous reports</li> <li>▪ Evaluation of how preferred scenario has improved conditions and performance, where applicable</li> <li>▪ Evaluation of how local policies and investments have impacted costs necessary to achieve performance targets, where applicable</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• Statewide Transportation Plan               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ No required frequency</li> <li>○ Optional report on system performance</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |

7



## CDOT NPRM Comments

Attached Document

8



## PD-14 Pavement Metrics

● Target Achieved   
 ● Target not Achieved

| Highways  |     |     |                                      |
|---|-----|-----|--------------------------------------|
| Achieve 80% High/Moderate Drivability Life for Interstates based on condition standards and treatments set for traffic volume categories.                 | 80% | 89% | <span style="color: green;">●</span> |
| Achieve 80% High/Moderate Drivability Life for NHS, excluding Interstates, based on condition standards and treatments set for traffic volume categories. | 80% | 78% | <span style="color: red;">●</span>   |
| Achieve 80% High/Moderate Drivability Life for the state highway system based on condition standards and treatments set for traffic volume categories.    | 80% | 73% | <span style="color: red;">●</span>   |

2014 Report

9



## MAP-21 - Pavement

| Pavement Condition Measures                 |       |   |               |
|---|-------|---|---------------|
| Interstate System                           |       | Non-Interstate NHS System                   |               |
| Percentage of pavement in "Good" condition  |       | Percentage of pavement in "Good" condition  |               |
| Percentage of Pavements in "Poor" condition |       | Percentage of Pavements in "Poor" condition |               |
| Pavement Condition Thresholds               |       |   |               |
|   | Good  | Fair  | Poor          |
| IRI (inches/mile)                           | <95   | 95-170<br>95-220*                           | >170<br>>220* |
| Cracking (%)                                | <5    | 5-10  | >10           |
| Rutting (inches)                            | <0.20 | 0.20-0.40                                   | >0.40         |
| Faulting (inches)                           | <0.05 | 0.05-0.15                                   | >.15          |

10



## Draft Statewide and MPO Data

---

Attached Document

Source: CDOT DTD – July 2015

11



Questions?

### Contacts:

William Johnson [will.Johnson@state.co.us](mailto:will.Johnson@state.co.us)

12



**COLORADO**

**Department of Transportation**

Office of the Chief Engineer

4201 E. Arkansas Ave., Room 262  
Denver, CO 80222

May 8, 2015

Gregory G. Nadeau  
Deputy Administrator, Federal Highway  
Administration  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
1200 New Jersey Avenue S.E.  
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Docket No. FHWA-2013-0053

Dear Deputy Administrator Nadeau:

The Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) is pleased to provide comments on Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) "National Performance Management Measures: Assessing Pavement Condition for the National Highway Performance Program and Bridge Condition for the National Highway Performance Program"; Proposed Rule (Docket Number FHWA-2013-0053) published in the Federal Register on January 5, 2015.

CDOT is supportive of the MAP-21 performance management provisions and believe that the performance management principles can be implemented along with the performance-based transportation planning provisions in a manner that advances a safer and more efficient transportation system without imposing undue regulatory burdens on CDOT. There are some recognized challenges ahead in the effort to achieve those goals and CDOT will continue to engage with U.S. DOT to address these challenges and work together.

CDOT has provided some comments to the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO), and concurs with comments submitted to the docket on April 23, 2015 by AASHTO on behalf of all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. While CDOT supports many aspects of the proposed regulations, there are several areas in which we have important concerns, and we recommend that FHWA take action to address those concerns and improve the proposal in finalizing this regulation. The concerns are organized into major commenting areas using a template provided by AASHTO.

CDOT appreciates the opportunity to provide these comments and look forward to working with FHWA in implementing the final rules. If you would like to discuss the comments and issues documented in this letter, please contact William Johnson, CDOT's Asset Management Branch Manager at (303) 512-4808.

Sincerely,

Joshua Laipply, P.E.



Overarching Comments

1. January 22 FHWA webinar made clear that a downward condition trend goal is allowed for a State DOT. This is anticipated for CDOT in early years until backlog of lower condition highways is addressed. Any reported condition at least 0.1% or more above the established annual goal is considered significant progress by FHWA. This is a good thing given the reality of condition and funding.
2. The interstates can only decline in condition until maximum 5% is in poor condition. NHS can continue to decline in our condition trend and goals. This can help us realize anticipated short funding and decreasing condition over time.
3. Local, non-state, NHS must be included in the condition reporting and goals. This will increase the DOTs' obligation to commit their available funds to meeting or exceeding condition goals for statewide reporting. If significant progress is not made, states will be required to dedicate increased funding to the larger state and local NHS and will likely utilize funds needed for other non-NHS critical statewide network components. Lower volume remote roadways critical to rural public and commercial traffic will likely be negatively impacted. 409.109(f) requires DOT to document action to take (likely funding increase to NHS) to remedy 2-year documented lack of significant progress.
4. Does the FHWA anticipate current national funding, and its distribution, are sufficient to maintain or improve the goals set forth in the new rule? Will added funds be made available if not? 490.109(e)(5)(B) states that "lack of funding" is considered an "Extenuating circumstance" that FHWA considers grounds to declare "progress not determined" for a DOT.
5. Is there a national process to ensure equivalent data collection quality and reporting is done for all State DOTs? This is important to ensure each is reporting the same caliber of data for condition comparison nationally. We have seen significant changes in data accuracy and consistency between data collection companies in Colorado alone.
6. Are bridge approach slabs included in the bridge area that will be extracted by the FHWA from the DOT-submitted HPMS pavement data? Is there any adjacent length of pavement that will also be removed at each bridge location? The length of approach slabs, if they exist, is not within the NBI data annually reported to FHWA and is not used to calculate bridge deck area.
7. How are sealed cracks considered - equal to unsealed cracks? See data collection procedure.
8. Is any crack identified within the width of any pavement location deem that entire area as "cracked", or will the sub-portion of the pavement with a crack be compared to the entire surface at that location? Transverse vs longitudinal... how is crack area to be calculated.
9. Accounting statement identifies the 10-year cost as \$196.4 million (pg12). However, you can't just have one subjective sentence, "The FHWA believes that the proposed rule would surpass this threshold and, as a result, the benefits of the rule would outweigh the costs," brush aside \$196.4 million price tag. A quantitative analysis should be included identifying how the benefits outweigh the costs.
10. States should not be held accountable for assets that they do not own.

**Subpart A—General Information**

**490.101 Definitions**

The definition of Mainline Highway conflicts with 490.309 (c)(1)(i) which says states shall collect data "for the full extent of the mainline highway of the NHS." According to the definition of Mainline Highway, this means the states need to collect data on ALL through travel lanes. CDOT believes the intent is that states collect one lane's worth of data on NHS.



**490.103 Data Requirements - see 409.309 for pavement specific requirements**

CDOT has no specific comment, and defers to AASHTO comments.

**490.105 Establishment of Performance Targets**

1. CDOT supports having the ability to establish separate performance targets for the State and MPO NHS; however, a performance period of 4 years, with a mid-performance period of 2 years, may not allow significant time to demonstrate improvement to asset condition. States must have the ability to set a fiscally constrained target that may result in a short-term (2 or 4 year) reduction or sustain in asset condition.
2. Additionally, this section says that states may develop additional targets for urbanized and non-urbanized areas; however, section 490.109 (e) states that FHWA will not assess progress achieved for additional targets, what's the advantage of setting additional targets?

**490.107 Reporting on Performance Targets**

CDOT has no specific comment, and defers to AASHTO comments.

**490.109 Assessing Significant Progress toward Achieving the Performance Targets for the National Highway Performance Program**

CDOT requests that FHWA clarify whether a sudden, unforeseen reduction in Federal Funding is considered a valid explanation for why a target is missed.

**490.111 Incorporation by reference**

CDOT has no specific comment.

**Subpart C—National Performance Management Measures for the Assessing Pavement Condition**

**490.301 Purpose.**

CDOT agrees with subsection (e); however, this is not how the rule making is set up. No consideration is given to “regional differences in establishing the minimum levels for pavement condition on the Interstate System.” CDOT would prefer regional differences per this statement. “Since there are no regional considerations for interstates, states’ funding should be adjusted based upon their regional climate.”

**490.303 Applicability.**

CDOT has no specific comment.

**490.305 Definitions.**

CDOT has no specific comment, and defers to AASHTO comments.

**490.307 National Performance Management Measures for Assessing Pavement Condition.**

CDOT has no specific comment, and defers to AASHTO comments.

**490.309 Data requirements.**

1. The right-most travel lane (data collection lane) in mountain areas is often one of three lanes with the other two designated for primary non-commercial through traffic lanes. These truck lanes are often rehabilitated with more routine single-lane surface treatments to address their rapid deterioration from heavily loaded tires with chains. The remaining lanes are deteriorate at a much lower rate and are treated at more conventional pavement rehabilitation and PM treatment cycles. Can selected high mountain interstate locations designate the adjacent lane for data collection and reporting?
2. The right-most travel lane (data collection lane) in highly urban areas is often congested with vehicles struggle to get onto and off of the highway. Collecting data in this lane would be inefficient. Can an alternate lane be selected for data collection in these areas?
3. Why not allow states to identify their data collection lane, with the requirement that the same data collection lane be used each year for repeatability?
4. 1/10 mile reporting is too granular for national assessment of highways. While Colorado collects data in 1/10 mile segments, we aggregate it and average it to larger project lengths for Pavement Management purposes. From a project perspective, CDOT would never design and construct a 1/10 mile project. Larger aggregations of data, especially for national level analysis, makes sense. CDOT



recommends a 1-mile minimum and up to 5 mile maximum for data analysis. (We can easily deliver you the raw 1/10<sup>th</sup> mile data, if you insist.)

5. You ask for exactly 1/10-mile increments of data, unless the sample length or highway length is odd. Why not just ask states for sample length rounded to the 1/10<sup>th</sup> mile?
6. Colorado (and other states) collect data in accordance with our linear referencing system, which is based upon anchor points instead of true-length. This creates 1/10<sup>th</sup> mile segments that are sometime longer or shorter than 528 feet.
7. Collecting IRI on highly congested and signalized roads can cause erratic numbers because the vehicle cannot achieve/maintain proper speeds. If a state cannot collect accurate data on such a segment, how will that be treated in FHWA's analysis? Will those segments automatically be flagged as "Poor" IRI? According to section 490.313, this segments will be "Poor"
8. For rutting, the 5-point collection is very different than the Automated Transverse Profile equipment. Colorado found our reported depth increased when upgrading to the Automated Transverse. These two methods are very different and not comparable.
9. Only one single data collection method should be required for each distress type, e.g. either line laser OR 5-point laser measure for rut depth reporting.\
10. 490.309 (b)(1)(i)(A) - "from the full extent of the mainline highway" statement creates a conflict with definitions and designated lanes for data collection because mainline highway is defined as all travel lanes.
11. "Estimating conditions from data samples of the full extent of the mainline highway is not permitted". This statement is in conflict with prescribed methodology. For interstates CDOT is only collecting one lane per direction which in effect is sampling to estimate conditions on the remaining lanes.
12. AASHTO R55 is not sufficient for determining percent of area cracked. It allows agencies to exclude non-wheel path areas from crack identification. The intent, as we read it, is that percent of pavement cracked is supposed to include the entire pavement width.
13. We would like guidance on how to calculate "area cracked" for length based cracking distresses on asphalt pavements. For example, if a 1/10 mile asphalt pavement has 400 linear feet of longitudinal cracking and 7 transverse cracks that total 70 feet long, what is the area of cracking? Linear distresses do not easily translate into an area. (Area-based distresses, like fatigue, can be used to calculate a "percent cracked" fairly easily.)
14. R55 and PP67 will yield extremely different cracking results. These two methods are not comparable, and will negatively impact state-by-state comparisons for states using different methods.

#### **490.311 Calculation of Pavement Metrics.**

CDOT has no specific comment, and defers to AASHTO comments.

#### **490.313 Calculation of Performance Management Measures.**

1. The rut threshold for poor is > 0.4 inches. Based upon Colorado's experience with chain laws and studded tires, this should be higher... like, 0.7 inches... especially if a Transverse Profile is being used to calculate rut.
2. Where did the 0.4 rut threshold for poor come from? If not connected to documented safety performance, this is a very low value.
3. Highly recommend that FHWA reevaluate the distress category breaks after the first year of reporting. Who knows what the combines Good/Fair/Poor of these metrics will be? Essentially, tossing rutting, cracking, faulting, and IRI into a Good/Fair/Poor blender for the first time may have unforeseen results. Are these the right distress ranges? Are these distress be properly combined into a larger metric? Do different distressed deserve different weights in the overall conversion to Good/Fair/Poor?

#### **490.315 Establishment of minimum level for condition of Pavements.**

1. Setting a 5% target for minimum condition level for Interstate Pavements in poor condition may not translate well to states with Interstates in severe climates. State DOTs face different environmental conditions, political environments, and economic conditions. An arbitrary value of 5.0 percent does



not account for these realities. Either increase the 5% minimum, or allow states to work with FHWA Division Offices to set their own targets. Or, fund states with severe climates accordingly so that they can achieve this target.

2. This is the first time these specific metrics (rut, cracks, IRI, and faulting) will be combined in this specific manner to calculate Good/Fair/Poor. Prudence dictates that State DOTs should not set a minimum level for interstates until we see what the current nation-wide condition is. It would be unfair to set a 5% minimum for Poor interstates if we are nationally at 15% Poor.

#### **490.317 Penalties for not maintaining minimum Interstate System pavement condition.**

CDOT has no specific comment, and defers to AASHTO comments.

#### **490.319 Other requirements.**

CDOT requests clarification on who will have approval authority for data quality management plans and how will FHWA ensure consistency from one state to another? Concerned that some DOTs may be held to higher standards than others based solely on Division office personnel and their interpretation of "acceptable".

### **Subpart D—National Performance Management Measures for Assessing Bridge Condition**

#### **490.401 Purpose.**

##### **NPRM Bridge Performance Management Measure**

1. The NPRM Bridge Performance Management Measure is a lag measure focused on the percent of Structurally Deficient (SD) deck area on the National Highway System (NHS). As a lag measure there is little focus on the measures that could tell CDOT or any other agency in advance that there will be an acceleration of bridges dropping into SD. Measures that lead the SD measure are increases in: leaking expansion joints over substructure elements, unsealed decks, failed deck seals, debris collections that accelerate deterioration, and failed steel protection systems where needed to protect steel elements from water and anti-icing/deicing chemicals. In my opinion, the above measures that lead to SD increases should be part of the NPRM Bridge Performance Management Measures.
2. The NPRM Bridge Performance Management Measure does not directly address the following safety and mobility risks:
  - Scour Critical Bridges
  - Vertical Clearance below current design requirements
  - Live Load carrying capacity below current design requirements
  - Traffic safety components such as bridge rail, transitions, approach guardrail, and guardrail ends not up to current standard
  - Lateral Clearance below current design requirements

In CDOT's opinion, the above safety and mobility risks should be part of the NPRM Bridge Performance Management Measures. The first three are part of the current CDOT RBAMP. The last two should be included in the next update to the RBAMP. The measures could be based on the percent of bridges that do not meet the requirements with a goal of reducing the percentage over time to a fiscally constrained goal.

The following NPRM documents referenced are:

- "Asset Measures (Pavement and Bridge) 1 column"
- NPRM "2015-03167"

#### **490.403 Applicability.**

#### **490.405 Definitions.**

##### **Structurally Deficient Definition**

1. The definition of Structurally Deficient (SD) under NPRM is identical to the historical definition of SD which is:
  - A condition rating of 4 or less for



- Item 58 - Deck; or
- Item 59 - Superstructures; or
- Item 60 - Substructures; or
- Item 62 - Culvert and Retaining Walls.(1) or
- An appraisal rating of 2 or less for
  - Item 67 - Structural Condition; or
  - Item 71 - Waterway Adequacy.(2)

2. Reference the web page at <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/bridge/0650dsup.cfm>

**490.407 National performance management measures for assessing bridge condition.**

CDOT has no specific comment, and defers to AASHTO comments.

**490.409 Calculation of National performance management measures for assessing bridge condition.**

**Good, Fair, and Poor (GFP) definitions**

1. The NPRM proposed bridge Good, Fair, and Poor (GFP) definitions are different from the historical definitions of GFP. This difference has an impact on the Colorado Bridge Enterprise (CBE) because there will have be a maintenance of the historical definition or an adoption of the proposed definitions.
2. CDOT recommends that the historical GFP definition be maintained until the NPRM definition is formally adopted. After the National Performance Management Measures are adopted then we recommend that CBE formally adopt the new definitions along with the appropriate changes to the selection guidance.

The proposed NPRM definitions are based on NBI condition values for Deck, Superstructure, Substructure, and Culvert. Specifically:

- **Good** = NBI condition value greater than or equal to 7
- **Fair** = NBI condition value equal to 5 or 6
- **Poor** = NBI condition value less than or equal to 4

The historical GFP definitions are:

- **Poor** = Sufficiency Rating less than 50 and status of Structurally Deficient or Functionally Obsolete
- **Fair** = Sufficiency Rating from 50 and 80 and status of Structurally Deficient or Functionally Obsolete
- **Good** = All remaining major bridges that do not meet the criteria for Poor or Fair

**Deck Area Calculation**

- The deck area calculation in the NPRM is identical to the current method of calculating deck area which is:
  - The product of NBI Items 49 - Structure Length, and 52 - Deck Width. In the case of a roadway on fill carried across a pipe(s) or culvert in which headwalls do not affect the flow of traffic, NBI Item 32 - Approach Roadway Width is utilized instead of Item 52 - Deck Width, to calculate the deck area.

**490.411 Establishment of minimum level for condition for bridges.**

**NBI and NBE Submittal Date**

The NPRM will change the annual NBI and NBE submittal date from April 1st to March 15th. The two week advancement to the schedule can be accommodated but may be a challenge the first year or two because it will impact other annual priority reports.

**490.413 Penalties for not maintaining bridge condition.**

CDOT has no specific comment, and defers to AASHTO comments.



Draft MAP-21 Pavement Performance Metric Data (Source: 2014 data)

| Statewide                            |                  |                    |
|--------------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| ON-System NHS IRI                    | Centerline Miles | % Centerline Miles |
| Good (95 inches/mile or less)        | 4420.811         | 100%               |
| Acceptable (170 inches/mile or less) | 0                | 0%                 |
| Not Collected*                       | 2.161            | 0%                 |
| Total                                | 4422.972         | 100%               |
| OFF-System NHS IRI                   | Centerline Miles | % Centerline Miles |
| Good (95 inches/mile or less)        | 20.015           | 4%                 |
| Acceptable (170 inches/mile or less) | 190.619          | 39%                |
| Poor (above 170 inches/mile)         | 220.933          | 46%                |
| Not Collected*                       | 53.145           | 11%                |
| Total                                | 484.712          | 100%               |
| OFF-System NHS CDOT Abandonments     | Centerline Miles | % Centerline Miles |
| Good (95 inches/mile or less)        | 0.71             | 1%                 |
| Acceptable (170 inches/mile or less) | 30.825           | 64%                |
| Poor (above 170 inches/mile)         | 14.683           | 30%                |
| Not Collected*                       | 2.29             | 5%                 |
| Total                                | 48.508           | 100%               |

| DRCOG                                    |                  |                    |
|--|------------------|--------------------|
| OFF-System NHS IRI - DRCOG               | Centerline Miles | % Centerline Miles |
| Good (95 inches/mile or less)            | 4.81             | 2%                 |
| Acceptable (170 inches/mile or less)     | 118.262          | 39%                |
| Poor (above 170 inches/mile)             | 156.792          | 52%                |
| Not Collected*                           | 24.258           | 8%                 |
| Total                                    | 304.122          | 100%               |
| OFF-System NHS CDOT Abandonments - DRCOG | Centerline Miles | % Centerline Miles |
| Good (95 inches/mile or less)            | 0.21             | 2%                 |
| Acceptable (170 inches/mile or less)     | 7.27             | 55%                |
| Poor (above 170 inches/mile)             | 4.374            | 33%                |
| Not Collected*                           | 1.34             | 10%                |
| Total                                    | 13.194           | 100%               |

| PPACOG                               |                  |                    |
|--------------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| OFF-System NHS IRI - PPACOG          | Centerline Miles | % Centerline Miles |
| Good (95 inches/mile or less)        | 15.205           | 9%                 |
| Acceptable (170 inches/mile or less) | 69.747           | 40%                |
| Poor (above 170 inches/mile)         | 62.531           | 35%                |
| Not Collected*                       | 28.887           | 16%                |
| Total                                | 176.37           | 100%               |

| OFF-System NHS CDOT Abandonments - PPACOG | Centerline Miles | % Centerline Miles |
|---|------------------|--------------------|
| Good (95 inches/mile or less)             | 3.5              | 10%                |
| Acceptable (170 inches/mile or less)      | 20.555           | 60%                |
| Poor (above 170 inches/mile)              | 9.419            | 27%                |
| Not Collected*                            | 0.95             | 3%                 |
| Total                                     | 34.424           | 100%               |

| PACOG                                |                  |                    |
|--------------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| OFF-System NHS IRI - PACOG           | Centerline Miles | % Centerline Miles |
| Good (95 inches/mile or less)        | 0                | 0%                 |
| Acceptable (170 inches/mile or less) | 1.07             | 55%                |
| Poor (above 170 inches/mile)         | 0.89             | 45%                |
| Not Collected*                       | 0                | 0%                 |
| Total                                | 1.96             | 100%               |

| OFF-System NHS CDOT Abandonments - PACOG | Centerline Miles | % Centerline Miles |
|--|------------------|--------------------|
| Good (95 inches/mile or less)            | 0                | 0%                 |
| Acceptable (170 inches/mile or less)     | 0                | 0%                 |
| Poor (above 170 inches/mile)             | 0.89             | 100%               |
| Not Collected*                           | 0                | 0%                 |
| Total                                    | 0.89             | 100%               |

| GV                                   |                  |                    |
|--------------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| OFF-System NHS IRI - GV              | Centerline Miles | % Centerline Miles |
| Good (95 inches/mile or less)        |                  | 0%                 |
| Acceptable (170 inches/mile or less) | 0.29             | 29%                |
| Poor (above 170 inches/mile)         | 0.72             | 71%                |
| Not Collected*                       |                  | 0%                 |
| Total                                | 1.01             | 100%               |

\*Not collected in 2014 because NHS was not finalized in time to submit for collection

\*IRI Performance Rating from FHWA -The Mobility Goal of the 1998 FHWA National Strategic Plan included a performance indicator to "increase the percentage of miles on the NHS that meet owner-agency managed pavement performance for acceptable ride quality to 93% within 10 years." Defined as International Roughness Index (IRI) less than or equal to 170 inches of roughness/mile. In 2006, this goal was further modified to make good ride quality, NHS roads with the reported IRI of 95 inches/mile (or less), as the primary performance target and the secondary performance target, 170 inches/mile (or less).

Source <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/pavement/smoothness/>



## MAP-21 Bridge NPRM

October 2015



### MAP-21 NPRMs Status (as of 10/19)

| Rule   | Responsible        | NPRM Closed                                  | Final Rule Expected | Notes  |
|--|--------------------|--|---------------------|--|
| Safety Performance Measure   | SCOPM              | June 2014                                    | February 1, 2016    | Waiting for USDOT Secretary Signature          |
| Highway Safety Improvement Program                                 | SCOHTS             | June 2014                                    | December 1, 2015    | Sent to OMB on August 19, 2015 (90 day review) |
| FHWA/FTA Metropolitan and Statewide Planning                       | SCOP               | September 2014                               | March 25, 2016      | FHWA/FTA staff developing final rule           |
| CMAQ Weighting Factors   | SCOE/SCOP          | October 2014                                 | March 11, 2016      |  |
| Planning and Environmental Linkage (supplemental to Planning NPRM) | SCOE/SCOP          | November 2014                                | n/a                 | Combined with updated Metro/Statewide Planning |
| Pavement/Bridge Performance Measure                                | SCOPM              | May 2015                                     | May 23, 2016        | FHWA staff developing final rule               |
| Asset Management Plan  | SCOP-TAM           | May 2015                                     | May 10, 2016        | FHWA staff developing final rule               |
| System Performance Measure   | SCOPM              | To be Published December 9, 2015             | Unknown (Q2 2016*)  | Sent to OMB on August 20, 2015 (90 day review) |
| (FTA) National Transit Safety Program                              | SCOPT<br>SCOPM     | October 2015                                 | Unknown             |  |
| (FTA) Transit Asset Management Plans                               | SCOPT/<br>SCOP-TAM | NPRM Closes on Nov. 30, 2015 (FTA-2014-0020) | Unknown (Q4 2016)   | NPRM published on 8/30/2015                    |
| (FTA) Transit Agency Safety Plans                                  | SCOPT              | To be Published Dec. 17, 2015                | Unknown             | Sent to OMB on Sept. 16, 2015 (90 day review)  |



## MAP-21 NPRMs Status

Source: <http://www.transportation.gov/regulations/report-on-significant-rulemakings>.

Color coding is Matt Hardy's (AASHTO Program Director for Planning and Policy) personal assessment of when to expect an NPRM or final rule to be published

- **GREEN:** The date is likely to be met at this time. There is a strong possibility that the rule will be published close to the date indicated.
- **ORANGE:** There is some uncertainty about whether the date is likely to be met. There is a possibility that the rule will be published later than what is indicated.
- **RED:** It is unlikely that the date will be met. There is a strong likelihood that the rule will be published later than what is indicated.
- \* Indicates Matt Hardy's estimate as to date of final publication since FHWA has not provided a final rule publication estimate as of the date of this document.

3



## Performance Measures

| Performance Element  | Performance Requirements for NHPP  |
|----------------------|--|
| Performance Measures | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not later than 18 months after date of enactment USDOT, in consultation with State DOTs, MPOs, and other stakeholders will promulgate a rulemaking that establishes measures.</li> <li>• Provide not less than 90 days to comment on regulation.</li> <li>• Take into consideration any comments.</li> <li>• Limit performance measures to those described under 23USC150(c).</li> <li>• For purposes of carrying out National Highway Performance Program USDOT will establish Measures for States to use to assess:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Condition of Pavements                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Interstate System</li> <li>▪ National Highway System (excluding the Interstate)</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Condition of Bridges                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ National Highway System</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Performance of:                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Interstate System</li> <li>▪ National Highway System (excluding the Interstate)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• USDOT will establish the data elements that are necessary to collect and maintain standardized data to carry out a performance-based approach</li> </ul> |

4



## Performance Target Setting

| Performance Element | Performance Requirements for NHPP  |
|---------------------|--|
| Performance Targets | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States must coordinate, to the maximum extent practical with relevant MPOs in selecting a target to ensure for consistency</li> <li>• MPOs must coordinate, to the maximum extent practical, with the relevant State/s in selecting a target to ensure consistency</li> <li>• Coordination required with public transportation providers.</li> <li>• States and MPOs must integrate other performance plans into the performance-based process</li> </ul> |

5



## TAMPS

| Performance Element | Performance Requirements for NHPP  |
|---------------------|--|
| Performance Plans   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Asset Management Plan                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Risk-based asset management plan</li> <li>○ States encouraged to include all infrastructure assets within the right-of-way</li> <li>○ Plan Contents                                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ pavement and bridge inventory and conditions on the NHS,</li> <li>▪ objectives and measures,</li> <li>▪ performance gap identification,</li> <li>▪ lifecycle cost and risk management analysis,</li> <li>▪ a financial plan, and</li> <li>▪ investment strategies</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ USDOT, in consultation with State DOTs, will establish the process to develop the plan through a rulemaking no later than 18 months after 10/1/2012</li> <li>○ States must have a plan developed consistent with the process by the 2nd fiscal year, otherwise federal share for NHPP will be reduced to 65%</li> <li>○ Process certification                                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ USDOT 90 days review period to determine certification</li> <li>▪ States have 90 days to cure deficiencies if not certified</li> <li>▪ Recertification required every 4 years</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• Management Systems                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ USDOT will establish minimum standards for States to use in developing and operating:                                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Bridge management systems</li> <li>▪ Pavement management systems</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Minimum standards established through a rulemaking                                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Minimum 90 day comment period</li> <li>▪ USDOT will promulgate a rulemaking not later than 18 months after date of enactment</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> |

6



## Target Achievement and Special Rules

| Performance Element       | Performance Requirements for NHPP   |
|---------------------------|---|
| Target Achievement        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "A State that does not achieve or make significant progress toward achieving the targets... for 2 consecutive reports"               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Document in 23USC150(e) report actions the State will take to improve their ability to achieve the target</li> </ul> </li> </ul>   |
| Special Performance Rules | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interstate Pavement Condition               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Minimum condition level established by USDOT through rulemaking</li> <li>◦ Condition falls below threshold set by USDOT for 2 consecutive reports then:                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ NHPP funding set aside to address Interstate pavement</li> <li>▪ STP funds transferred to NHPP to address Interstate pavement conditions</li> <li>▪ This obligation requirement stays in effect until the minimum thresholds can be met (checked annually)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• National Highway System Bridge Condition               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Greater than 10% of total deck area of bridges on the NHS are located on bridges classified as structurally deficient for 3 consecutive years then:                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ NHPP funding set aside to address bridge conditions on the NHS</li> <li>▪ This obligation requirement remains in place until minimum condition requirement is met (checked annually)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> |

7



## Performance Reporting

| Performance Element   | Performance Requirements for NHPP   |
|-----------------------|---|
| Performance Reporting | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State Report on Performance Progress               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Required initially by October 1, 2016 and every 2 years thereafter</li> <li>◦ Report includes:                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Condition and performance of NHS</li> <li>▪ Effectiveness of investment strategy for the NHS</li> <li>▪ Progress in achieving all State performance targets</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• Metropolitan System Performance Report               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Required in transportation plan every 4 or 5 years</li> <li>◦ Report includes:                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Evaluate condition and performance of transportation system</li> <li>▪ Progress achieved in meeting performance targets in comparison with the performance in previous reports</li> <li>▪ Evaluation of how preferred scenario has improved conditions and performance, where applicable</li> <li>▪ Evaluation of how local policies and investments have impacted costs necessary to achieve performance targets, where applicable</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• Statewide Transportation Plan               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ No required frequency</li> <li>◦ Optional report on system performance</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |

8



## CDOT NPRM Comments

Attached Document

9



## PD-14 Bridge Metrics

● Target Achieved
 ● Target not Achieved

| Bridges   | Annual Objective | 2014 Results |                                      |
|---|------------------|--------------|--------------------------------------|
| Maintain the percent of NHS total bridge deck area that is not structurally deficient at or above 90%.  | 90% or greater   | 95%          | <span style="color: green;">●</span> |
| Maintain the percent of state highway total bridge deck area that is not structurally deficient at or above 90%.  | 90% or greater   | 94%          | <span style="color: green;">●</span> |
| Percentage of CDOT-owned bridges over waterways that are scour critical   | 5%               | 7%           | <span style="color: red;">●</span>   |
| Percentage of bridge crossings over Interstates, U.S. routes and Colorado state highways with a vertical clearance less than the statutory maximum vehicle height of 14 feet-6 inches | 0.4%             | 0.4%         | <span style="color: green;">●</span> |
| Percentage of bridge crossings over Interstates, U.S. Routes and Colorado state highways with a vertical clearance less than the minimum design requirement of 16 feet-6 inches       | 4.8%             | 4.8%         | <span style="color: green;">●</span> |
| Percentage of CDOT-owned bridges posted for load  | 0%               | 0.1%         | <span style="color: red;">●</span>   |
| Percentage of CDOT-owned bridges with a load restriction  | 3%               | 3%           | <span style="color: green;">●</span> |
| Percentage of leaking expansion joint by length on CDOT-owned bridges   | 15%              | 19%          | <span style="color: red;">●</span>   |
| Percentage of CDOT-owned bridge deck area that is unsealed or otherwise unprotected   | 30%              | 31%          | <span style="color: red;">●</span>   |

10



## MAP-21 - Bridge

| Bridge Condition Performance Measures |   |
|---------------------------------------|---|
|                                       | Percentage of NHS Bridges Classified as in "Good" Condition |
|                                       | Percentage of NHS Bridges Classified as in "Poor" Condition |

| NBI Bridge Condition Rating Thresholds for NHS Bridges |                             |               |             |                   |
|--|-----------------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------------|
| Bridge   | NBI Rating Scale (from 0-9) | 9 8 7<br>Good | 6 5<br>Fair | 4 3 2 1 0<br>Poor |
|  | Deck (Item 68)              | ≥ 7           | 5 or 6      | ≤ 4               |
|  | Superstructure (Item 59)    | ≥ 7           | 5 or 6      | ≤ 4               |
|  | Substructure (Item 60)      | ≥ 7           | 5 or 6      | ≤ 4               |
| Culvert  | Culvert (Item 62)           | ≥ 7           | 5 or 6      | ≤ 4               |

11



## Draft Statewide and MPO Data

| Current Bridge Condition - Proposed Measure |              |              |             |
|---|--------------|--------------|-------------|
|   | Good         | Fair         | Poor        |
| <b>NHS Total</b>                            | <b>53.1%</b> | <b>41.9%</b> | <b>5.0%</b> |
| Denver Regional Council of Governments      | 56.8%        | 39.0%        | 4.2%        |
| Grand Valley                                | 32.1%        | 67.9%        | 0.0%        |
| North Front Range                           | 52.2%        | 38.4%        | 9.4%        |
| Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments      | 53.7%        | 45.7%        | 0.6%        |
| Pueblo Area Council of Governments          | 44.0%        | 41.5%        | 14.5%       |
| MPO Total                                   | 54.8%        | 40.8%        | 4.4%        |
| Non-MPO                                     | 50.2%        | 43.7%        | 6.1%        |

Source: CDOT Staff Bridge – October 2015

12



## Questions?

### Contacts:

William Johnson [will.Johnson@state.co.us](mailto:will.Johnson@state.co.us)



### Recommended Funding Awards for FTA FY16: January 20, 2016

**Table A: FTA FY16 Section 5310 Rural Capital Awards**

| Applicant  | Project  | Project Type    | 2016 Request | Total Score | Recommended FY16 FTA Award |
|--|--|-----------------|--------------|-------------|----------------------------|
| Inspiration Field                                      | Replacement Truck  | Vehicle Replace | \$31,394     | 9.3         | \$31,394                   |
| Blue Peaks   | Vehicle Acquisition 2016   | Vehicle Replace | \$49,060     | 9.3         | \$49,060                   |
| Inspiration Field                                      | Replacement Van  | Vehicle Replace | \$30,064     | 8.8         | \$30,064                   |
| Inspiration Field                                      | Replacement Bus  | Vehicle Replace | \$52,408     | 8.8         | \$52,408                   |
| Cripple Creek Care Center                              | Bus Replacement Request - 2016   | Vehicle Replace | \$64,889     | 8.7         | \$64,889                   |
| Montrose County Senior Citizens Transportation, Inc.   | Two Body on Chassis Vehicles (1 of 2 vehicles requested, both awarded) | Vehicle Replace | \$56,000     | 8.6         | \$56,000                   |
| Montrose County Senior Citizens Transportation, Inc. * | 1 Type II BOC and 1 minivan  | Vehicle Replace | \$106,400    | 8.5         | \$106,400                  |
| Grand County Council on Aging                          | One ADA Van  | Vehicle Replace | \$34,000     | 8.3         | \$34,000                   |
| Mountain Valley Developmental Services (Garfield)      | Vehicle Replacement  | Vehicle Replace | \$60,000     | 8           | \$60,000                   |
| Johnstown Senior Center                                | ADA Bus Acquisition  | Vehicle Replace | \$64,000     | 7.9         | \$64,000                   |
| Montrose County Senior Citizens Transportation, Inc.   | Two Body on Chassis Vehicles (1 of 2 vehicles requested, both awarded) | Vehicle Replace | \$56,000     | 7.1         | \$56,000                   |
| <b>Total</b>   |  |                 |              |             | <b>\$604,215</b>           |

**Table B: FTA FY16 Section 5310 Small Urbanized Capital Awards**

| Applicant                             | Project  | Project Type    | 2016 Request | Total Score | Recommended FY16 FTA Award |
|---------------------------------------|--|-----------------|--------------|-------------|----------------------------|
| Via Mobility Services                 | Replace Three Body-on-Chassis Paratransit Buses (1 of 3 vehicles requested, all 3 awarded) | Vehicle Replace | \$45,200     | 9.5         | \$45,200                   |
| Via Mobility Services                 | Replace Three Body-on-Chassis Paratransit Buses (1 of 3 vehicles requested, all 3 awarded) | Vehicle Replace | \$45,200     | 9.5         | \$45,200                   |
| Via Mobility Services                 | Rebuild Three Body-on-Chassis Paratransit Buses (1 of 3 rebuilds requested, all 3 awarded) | Vehicle Rebuild | \$9,120      | 9.5         | \$9,120                    |
| Via Mobility Services                 | Replace Three Body-on-Chassis Paratransit Buses (1 of 3 vehicles requested, all 3 awarded) | Vehicle Replace | \$45,200     | 9           | \$45,200                   |
| Via Mobility Services                 | Rebuild Three Body-on-Chassis Paratransit Buses  | Vehicle Rebuild | \$9,120      | 9           | \$9,120                    |
| Via Mobility Services                 | Rebuild Three Body-on-Chassis Paratransit Buses (1 of 3 rebuilds requested, all 3 awarded) | Vehicle Rebuild | \$9,120      | 8.5         | \$9,120                    |
| Via Mobility Services                 | Rebuild Three Body-on-Chassis Paratransit Buses (1 of 3 rebuilds requested, all 3 awarded) | Vehicle Rebuild | \$9,120      | 8           | \$9,120                    |
| Senior Resource Devt. Agency (Pueblo) | Replacement vehicle  | Vehicle Replace | \$55,300     | 8           | \$55,300                   |
| Mesa County                           | Bus Replacement-FASTER 2017 (2)  | Vehicle Replace | \$272,000    | 8           | \$272,000                  |
| <b>Total</b>                          |  |                 |              |             | <b>\$499,380</b>           |

**Table C: FTA FY16 Section 5310 Large Urbanized Capital Awards**

| Applicant                       | Project                        | Project Type    | 2016 Request | Total Score | Recommended FY16 FTA Award |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|-------------|----------------------------|
| Seniors Resource Center (Adams) | A-Lift Fleet Replacements      | Vehicle Replace | \$128,000    | 7.75        | \$128,000                  |
| Seniors Resource Center (Fleet) | SRC Fleet Vehicle Replacements | Vehicle Replace | \$128,000    | 7.5         | \$120,000                  |
| Easter Seals Colorado           | BOC Replacement                | Vehicle Replace | \$50,440     | 7           | \$50,440                   |
| <b>Total</b>                    |                                |                 |              |             | <b>\$298,440</b>           |