Meeting Agenda of the 
TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE 
October 10, 2019
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) 553-2242 by Noon on the Friday Preceding the Meeting.

AGENDA

1. Call Meeting to Order

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

3. Approval of Minutes*
   September 12, 2019
   Action Requested: Approve/ Disapprove/ Modify

4. CDOT Region 2 Updates (Informational)

5. Major Projects for the 10-Year STIP and 25-Year LRTP* (Discussion)

6. CDOT - Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) - Call for Projects* (Informational)

7. Notice of Funding Availability - Capital Transit Projects* (Informational)

8. West Pueblo Connector* (Informational)

9. 1A Projects Update (Informational)

10. Statewide Year 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (Discussion)

11. Items from TAC Members or scheduling of future Agenda Items (Roundtable Discussion)

12. Adjourn at or before 10:30 am
Minutes of the
TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMISSION
September 12, 2019
8:30 a.m.

CDOT’s San Isabel Conference Room, 5615 Wills Blvd, Pueblo, CO 81008

Agenda items marked with * indicate additional materials are included in the packet.

Individuals Requiring Special Accommodations Should Notify the City MPO’s Office (719) 553-2242 by Noon on the Friday Preceding the Meeting.

AGENDA

1. Call Meeting to Order
Chairman: John Adams
Time of Call: 8:34 a.m.
MPO Members Present: John Adams, Bart Mikitowicz, Hannah Haunert
TAC Members Present: Wendy Pettit, Ben Valdez, Greg Pedroza
CAC Members Present: Kristen Castor, Kevin Sparks, Joe Garcia
Others Present: Aaron Willis, Teresa Guagliardo

2. Introductions and Public Comments (non-agenda items only)
Introduction were made for Greg Pedroza (Interim Aviation Director), Ben Valdez (Pueblo Transit Director), and Teresa Guagliardo (Pueblo County – Traffic Engineer Specialist).

3. Approval of Minutes of the regular meeting held on August 8, 2019
Motion to Approve: Joe Garcia
Second: Kevin Sparks
Unanimous:

4. TIP/STIP Administration Modifications Agenda Item(s)
CDOT Region 2 requests for PACOG MPO/TPR TIP amendment(s)
TAP Roll-Forward and Administrative Modifications FY 2019-22 TIP*
(Informational)
Project Name: US50-C Mill and Overlay from 4th St. to Baxter Rd. and Drainage
STIP Number: SR26867.059
Project Location and Description: Surface Treatment
Federal Program Funds-Design: $558,833
State Matching Funds: $116,167
TOTAL PROJECT FUND AMENDMENT: $675,000
This request is for additional funding needed to cover the final cost adjustments, asphalt quality incentives, and roadway smoothness incentive shortages.

5. CDOT Region 2 Updates (Informational)
CDOT will be getting ready to do their 2nd round of TPR meetings for the corridor needs and project information. Wendy Pettit said that CDOT is still looking for more information on the Senate Bill 1 and 267 funding (bonding).

John Adams said that he met with Region 2 and Pueblo West to review 2016 projects
between Pueblo West, Pueblo County, and City of Pueblo and to see which ones are needing to be done. It was discussed which project needs to happen. The State is doing a 10-year project plan and 25-year project plan.

John Adams said we will identify the 1st and 2nd year for the 267 funding. Statewide Transportation Advisory Committee will recommend the 2 years to the Transportation Commission.

6. Pueblo Transit Possible Additional Route Change (Informational)
Ben Valdez said that he didn’t have time to do a map but will have something next meeting. He said that he wants to add a northern circular transfer loop system that takes about 30 minutes. This will hit all the shops along Hwy 50 W and out to the CSU-P. He would need to add two ADA accessible pads that cost $10k-$12k each. Wendy Pettit said there may be funds out of the MMO. She said to talk to Ajin to find out more information. The only major problems would be adding the pad in front of the gated community and there is no easement on the Frontage Rd/Kachina Dr. Greg Pedroza requested a bus stop going out to the Airport. Ben said that he would have to use a van because it wouldn’t work for adding additional time onto a 30-minute route.

Kristen Castor suggested more transportation out to the airport because of the potential jobs. She also said that the Taxi service is not ADA accessible.

7. Bike/Ped Plan (Update)
Bart Mikitowicz handed out a packet of the survey results. He said that the demographics were close. There were 234 responses.

Kristen Castor asked about the ADA Plan Settlement Agreement, Bart said that he hasn’t seen Sam and has not spoke to Dan Centa (Interim PW Director) about it. He said that the infrastructure is in place and there is a list of inspectors.

Greg Pedroza suggested to focus on the Educational piece. Bart Mikitowicz said that he likes hands on (colored lanes). Bart suggested P.S.A, billboards, schools, etc… Wendy Pettit said that the Safe Routes to Schools Funding could be used for educating school kids.

8. Major Projects for the 10-Year STIP and LRTP (Discussion)
John Adams said that our next meeting we will have a list of these projects. He said we are looking at an RTA (Rural Transportation Authority) that will start next year. We are looking into what Denver has for an RTA and will tweak it for our own.

9. West Pueblo Connector* (Informational)
John Adams said that the draft was finally sent to him (see attachment in packet). Aaron Willis and Wendy Pettit said that everyone should get together to go over the P.E.L. study to make sure it is what is required by CDOT. It was pointed out that we would want to see alternative C1. The two issues with the C1 alternative will be dealing with the Railroad and funding ($36m).

10. Items from TAC Members or scheduling of future agenda items (Roundtable Discussion)
John Adams said that the top 3 priorities are Road Condition/Safety, Road Congestion/Growth, and Air Pollution from Your Transportation Plan Survey. The Regional concerns are Growth/Congestion, Road Condition/Safety, and Lack of Travel Options. Asset Management is going to be called Asset Maintenance.
11. Adjournment

Chairman John Adams adjourned the meeting at 9:43 a.m.
### Pueblo Area Council of Governments
#### 10-Year Development Highway/Bridge Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID#</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Interstate-25</td>
<td>City Center (1st)</td>
<td>13th St</td>
<td>$200,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13th St</td>
<td>U.S. Highway 50B</td>
<td>$128,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>US50B</td>
<td>North of 29th St</td>
<td>$62,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>U.S. Highway 50A West–Widen US50B Westbound from Pueblo Blvd. to Purcell Blvd., including interchange at Purcell Blvd., with pedestrian crossing improvement at McCulloch Blvd.</td>
<td>Pueblo Blvd.</td>
<td>Purcell Blvd.</td>
<td>$40,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>US Highway 50A - Add the third through lane on US50A eastbound and westbound between Purcell Blvd. and McCulloch Blvd. Construct an grade separate interchange at US50A/McCulloch. Improve the median safety and Intersections on US50A between McCulloch and Swallows</td>
<td>Purcell Blvd.</td>
<td>Swallows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>U.S. Highway 50C Drainage Improvements</td>
<td>1 Block E. of 36th Lane</td>
<td>1 Block West of 36th Lane</td>
<td>$5,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>SH-45 North Extension Study</td>
<td>U.S. Highway 50A</td>
<td>Interstate-25 at Exit 108</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Dillion Drive E- of I-25 Frontage Construct new 2-lane facility in addition a Round-About at 104 West of I-25</td>
<td>MP 107.5 South of Purcell Blvd</td>
<td>108.5 N. of Purcell Blvd</td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>I-25 Exit 108 Replace Single Box Covert</td>
<td>MP 108.5 108.5 North of Purcell</td>
<td>MP 108.5 South of Dillion</td>
<td>$11,350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>US50B and SH47 Interchange Improvements - Roadway Slopes</td>
<td>SH47</td>
<td>W. of Langdon Lane</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>SH96A between Newman and Veta (MP 53.5-54.68) and between Orman and Evans (MP 54.27-54.66)</td>
<td>Oman Ave.</td>
<td>Evans Ave.</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>I-25 Southbound Rest Area</td>
<td>I-25 Southbound Lane</td>
<td>North of Pueblo</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Pueblo Council of Governments
#### 10-Year Multi-Modal/Pedestrian Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID#</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Pueblo Transit Administration and Maintenance Facility</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$54,121,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>SRDA Vehicle and Storage Facility</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$3,879,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>North Pueblo Park-N-Ride</td>
<td>North End of Pueblo</td>
<td>Pueblo Crossing Area</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID#</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>U.S. 50 Access Management Plan</td>
<td>Interstate-25</td>
<td>Fortino Boulevard</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>SH 96A West of Pueblo - Shoulder Widening, Bridge Rail Replacement, Bike Lane and Other Safety Improvements</td>
<td>West of Pueblo</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>SH 78 - Raised Median between Bandera Parkway and Surfwood Lane with intersection improvements</td>
<td>Bandera Parkway</td>
<td>Surfwood Lane</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>US 50B Drainage Improvements</td>
<td>Pueblo</td>
<td>Granada</td>
<td>$30,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>US 50C Drainage Improvements</td>
<td>Santa Fe Drive</td>
<td>U.S. Highway 50B</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35A</td>
<td>Pueblo Boulevard - US 50 to Platteville Road</td>
<td>U.S. Highway 50</td>
<td>Railroad Crossing</td>
<td>$11,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35B</td>
<td>Pueblo Blvd. Platteville Road to I-25 Exit 108</td>
<td>Drew Dix Boulevard</td>
<td>Railroad Crossing</td>
<td>$24,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Railroad Purcell Boulevard</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Railroad Crossing</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>US50B East @ Troy to Pueblo Airport – Guardrail</td>
<td>Troy</td>
<td>Pueblo Memorial Airport</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>SH165</td>
<td>Check With County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>SH78 at MP 20 &amp; MP28 bridge widening and shoulder widening</td>
<td>MPO 20 to MP28</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>SH78 raised median between Banadera Pkwy and Surfwood Lane</td>
<td>Banadera Pkwy</td>
<td>Surfwood Lane</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>SH47 four(4) lane extension to US50B (approximately .5 mile ) Interchange Improvements.</td>
<td>13TH Street to 50B</td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Drainage improvement at US50B/the RR crossing (MP319.09) and US50B Airport Road interchange (MP321.64)</td>
<td>RR Crossing</td>
<td>Airport Road</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>SH50B – Add 1 Lane Each Direction East to County Line</td>
<td>46th Lane</td>
<td>Otero County Line</td>
<td>$210,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CDOT Accepting Applications for Transportation Alternatives Funding

DENVER - The Colorado Department of Transportation is currently accepting applications for the Transportation Alternatives Program for fiscal years 2021 through 2023. Federal funds are allocated under TAP for projects that expand travel choice, strengthen the local economy, improve quality of life and protect the environment. It also includes projects that enhance non-motorized forms of travel like biking and walking.

Over the three-year period, CDOT will be awarding approximately $29.4 million to TAP projects throughout the state. The interim draft application deadline is Dec. 2, 2019. Final applications must be submitted by Jan. 20, 2020.

Eligible applicants include local governments, regional transportation authorities, transit agencies, natural resource or public land agencies, schools or school districts, tribal governments, and/or any other local or regional government entity. Non-profits may apply by partnering with any of the above entities.

Projects are selected via a competitive scoring process based on criteria identified in the TAP Guidelines and Application on the CDOT website: https://www.codot.gov/programs/planning/grants/tap-fiscal-years-2021-23.

Please visit this website for more information about eligibility, who to contact, and other important information.

###

WHOLE SYSTEM. WHOLE SAFETY.
To heighten safety awareness, CDOT recently announced its Whole System — Whole Safety initiative. This project takes a systematic statewide approach to safety combining the benefits of CDOT’s programs that address driving behaviors, our built environment and the organization’s operations. The goal is to improve the safety of Colorado’s transportation network by reducing the rate and severity of crashes and improving the safety of all transportation modes. The program has one simple mission—to get everyone home safely.

ABOUT CDOT
CDOT has approximately 3,000 employees located throughout Colorado, and manages more than 23,000 lane miles of highway and 3,429 bridges. CDOT also manages grant partnerships with a range of other agencies, including metropolitan planning organizations, local governments and airports. It also administers Bustang, the state-owned and operated interregional express service. Governor Polis has charged CDOT to further build on the state’s intermodal mobility options.
Notice of Funding Availability
2020 CDOT Consolidated Call for Capital Projects
CDOT Division of Transit and Rail
September 30, 2019

PART 1 Introduction and Definitions

Introduction

The Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) Division of Transit and Rail (DTR) is issuing a Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA), requesting applications for capital transit projects to be initiated in 2020. This NOFA sets forth guidelines for submitting an application, applicant and project eligibility, evaluation criteria, regulations and processes, and the schedule for this call.

CDOT has over $34 million available in federal and state funds for transit capital projects. Funds may be used for items defined as capital assets by the Federal Transit Administration (see Part 6 for listing).

If selected for award, CDOT’s expectation is that subrecipients will begin implementing their projects no more than six months after the announcement of an award.

Applications are due to CDOT by 5:00 p.m. on Monday, November 18, 2019. Applications submitted after this deadline will not be accepted or considered for funding.

Applications must be submitted through COTRAMS, DTR’s online award management system. We strongly recommend that you use Google Chrome when submitting your application.

If you have not received any transit-related funds from CDOT in the past three years, you must complete and submit a New Applicant Questionnaire to Kenneth Mooney at kenneth.mooney@state.co.us as soon as possible but no later than 5:00 p.m. on Friday, November 1, 2019.

Potential applicants are strongly encouraged to read the guidance provided herein.

Definitions

1. **Alternatively-fueled rolling stock** (alt-fuel rolling stock): For the purpose of the Settlement Program, this includes vehicles fueled by electric battery, hydrogen fuel cell, and compressed natural gas (CNG) buses that are fueled by renewable natural gas (RNG)

2. **Acquisition vehicle**: For the purpose of the Settlement Program, the specific alternatively-fueled bus(es) identified to replace the qualifying vehicle(s) of like size,
capacity, and class. For this round of Settlement Program funding, this definition includes only battery electric buses, hydrogen fuel cell-powered buses, and compressed natural gas (CNG) buses that are fueled using renewable natural gas (RNG).

3. **Capital transit asset**: Rolling stock, facility, infrastructure or equipment with a useful life of at least one year, and which is eligible for capital assistance.

4. **Colorado Beneficiary Mitigation Plan (BMP)**: The State of Colorado’s Beneficiary Mitigation Plan summarizes how Colorado plans to use funds in the Volkswagen Diesel Emissions Settlement Trust (Trust), of which the State of Colorado was designated an eligible beneficiary, including certain categories of eligible mitigation actions determined appropriate to achieve the goals of the Trust. For this CCCP, this definition refers to the 2019 BMP.

5. **Closed door service**: Refers to transit service that is limited to a particular clientele, such as the participants in a particular program or the residents of a particular facility, as opposed to being offered to the public at large or to any senior or person with a disability.

6. **Equivalent vehicle**: For the purpose of the Settlement program, a diesel-fueled bus of like size, capacity, and class to the qualifying vehicle identified for replacement, the cost of which is used to calculate the incremental cost.

7. **Expansion vehicle**: Rolling stock acquired to add to the agency’s existing fleet, where the acquired rolling stock expands the agency’s fleet and/or service.

8. **Incremental cost**: The difference between the cost of an alt-fuel vehicle and an equivalent vehicle not powered by an alternative fuel of like size, capacity, and class -- as related to the incentive formula defined in the BMP.

9. **Large Urbanized Area (Large UZA)**: Census-designated area with a population over 200,000.

10. **Open door public transportation**: Services that are open to any member of the public, in the case of public transportation programs, as opposed to services that are limited to a particular sub-group of the general population.

11. **Open door specialized transportation**: Service available to any elderly or disabled person in need and not limited to a particular clientele or facility.

12. **Qualifying vehicle**: The specific diesel-fueled bus(es) identified for replacement using Settlement Program funds, which is drivable and has been registered, insured, and operated in Colorado for the previous two (2) years (generally from the date of application). Operated means three (3) or more preventative maintenance cycles OR
15,000 or more transit revenue service miles OR 1,250 or more transit revenue service hours amassed during the previous two (2) years.

13. **Replacement vehicle**: rolling stock acquired to replace existing rolling stock, where the existing rolling stock is replaced and removed from the agency’s fleet, or is converted to a spare vehicle when there is a low spare ratio.

14. **Revenue vehicle**: rolling stock used in providing transit service for passengers.

15. **Rolling stock**: buses, vans, train cars, gondola cabins, SUVs, and cars, or other passenger vehicles.

16. **Rural area (also called non-urbanized area)**: Census-designated area with a population under 50,000; for the Senate Bill 267 program, rural definition is by county, not Census-designated area.

17. **Settlement Program**: CDOT's Settlement Transit Bus Replacement Program for alt-fuel vehicles, as defined in the BMP.

18. **Small Urbanized Area (Small UZA)**: Census-designated area with a population between 50,000 and 200,000

19. **Spare vehicle**: A rolling stock vehicle that it is not normally used in regular revenue service, but, rather, is used as a backup vehicle for those instances when full time vehicles must be removed from regular revenue service for repairs or servicing.

20. **Specialized transportation/services**: Services specifically designed to meet the transportation needs of elderly persons, persons with disabilities, veterans, low income persons, or others with special needs.

21. **Support vehicle**: A vehicle operated by a transit agency for a purpose other than passenger revenue services, such as a staff car or a maintenance response truck.

22. **Vehicle (Rolling Stock) Overhaul**: Rolling stock overhaul is an eligible capital expense as preventive maintenance. Overhauls are usually done to make sure rolling stock reaches its useful life. Overhaul does not extend the useful life of rolling stock. For rolling stock to be overhauled, it must have accumulated at least 40 percent of its useful life.
**Funding and Program Information**

Funds are available through several federal and state transit programs administered by CDOT. The table below lists these funding sources and the estimated or anticipated amount available under each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Program</th>
<th>Amount Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEDERAL PROGRAMS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>FTA Section 5310: Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural 5310 (all areas outside of urban areas)</td>
<td>$253,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Urban 5310 (Boulder, Grand Junction, Greeley, Longmont, Lafayette/Louisville/Erie, and Pueblo)</td>
<td>$557,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>FTA Section 5311: Rural Public Transit (all areas outside of urban areas)</em></td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>FTA Section 5339 Formula Program: Bus and Bus Facilities</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Urban 5339 ((Boulder, Grand Junction, Greeley, Longmont, Lafayette/Louisville/Erie, and Pueblo)</td>
<td>$1,660,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural 5339 (all areas outside of urban areas)</td>
<td>$3,649,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$7,119,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STATE PROGRAMS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>FASTER</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Local Competitive** | $4,100,000  
---|---  
**Urban Area Set-Asides (Denver, Co Springs, Ft. Collins)** | $3,900,000  
**Settlement Program*** | $5,000,000*  
**Senate Bill 228** | $2,000,000  
**Senate Bill 267 (Rural and Urban)** | $12,000,000  
**SUBTOTAL** | **$27,000,000**  
**TOTAL** | **$34,119,000**

*With the recent addition of $12 million in contingency funds, the Settlement Program now has approximately $16 million available, expected to be optimally awarded over a period of the next 2-4 years.

CDOT does not administer certain FTA funds. Specifically, Section 5310 and Section 5339 funds for large urban areas are awarded directly by the FTA to the designated recipients of those areas—Mountain Metropolitan Transit, RTD and TransFort. Section 5307 funds are awarded directly to both the three large areas as well as to the six small urban areas (Boulder, Grand Junction, Greeley, Longmont, Louisville/Lafayette/Erie, and Pueblo).

Below is a brief description of each of the funding programs.

- **FTA Section 5311** funding is available for general public transportation services in non-urbanized (less than 50,000 population) areas of Colorado.
- **Section FTA 5310** funding is designed to provide capital and operating funding assistance for services designed to meet the needs of seniors and persons with disabilities. Operating and mobility management funds are made available through a separate call for operating projects. Funds are made available specifically for rural, small urbanized areas and large urbanized areas. CDOT only administers the funds for rural and small urbanized areas, and currently for the Denver large urbanized area in cooperation with the Denver Regional Council of Governments.
- **The FTA Section 5339 Formula Program** offers capital funding to public agencies or private nonprofit organizations engaged in public transportation. CDOT administers Section 5339 Formula funding for rural and small urbanized areas. Section 5339 formula
funds for the state’s three large urbanized areas are provided directly by the FTA to the
designated recipients in those three areas.

- **State FASTER** Transit funds are offered for public transportation and open door
  specialized transportation in both rural and urbanized areas.

- **Settlement** funds are made available only for the direct replacement of passenger
  revenue vehicles that are diesel-fueled. Funds are provided for the purchase of capital
  assets necessary to replace those vehicles with a zero-emission vehicle—namely, electric
  battery, hydrogen fuel cell or compressed natural gas (CNG) vehicles fueled by
  renewable natural gas (RNG). The funds are available for both rural and urbanized
  areas.

- **State Senate Bill 228** funds in this call are provided only for the purchase of rolling stock
  replacements, in both rural and urbanized areas, for the purpose of State of Good
  Repair.

- **State Senate Bill 267** funds are provided for transit-related capital improvements, such
  as vehicle storage facilities, maintenance facilities, and transit facilities, with a
  requirement that at least 25% of funds be spent in counties under 50,000 populations.

It is important to note the following:

- FASTER and Section 5310 capital funding for the Denver large urbanized area has
  already been made available and awarded, in a separate call for capital and operating
  projects, in April, 2019, during the CDOT/DRCOG Joint Call.

- A separate set-aside of FASTER funds is made to the state’s three large urbanized areas:
  Colorado Springs, Denver and Fort Collins, provided respectively to the FTA’s designated
  recipients—Mountain Metro Transit, RTD and TransFort, for public transportation.
  Because these areas are guaranteed these funds and do not have to compete for them,
  they are not eligible to compete for additional FASTER funds for public transportation.
  Included within these three large urban areas are the cities of Manitou Springs,
  Fountain, Loveland, most of Berthoud, Timnath, Windsor, and Denver’s suburbs that lie
  within the large urbanized area. However, providers of open door transportation for
  seniors and persons with disabilities in the large urban areas of Colorado Springs and
  Fort Collins are eligible to compete for FASTER funds; providers of such services in the
  Denver large urbanized area are **not** eligible for FASTER in this call for projects, since
  those funds were already made available in the separate call for projects mentioned
  above.

- In the 2019 CCCP, only construction-related projects in rural counties were eligible for
  Senate Bill 267 funds. For this 2020 CCCP, additional funding has been added, and **both
  urban and rural projects** are now eligible for SB 267 funds.
PART 3  Local Match

Federal and state funds may be used to fund up to 80% of project costs. All awards require a minimum local match of 20%, with the notable exception of the Settlement program, as detailed later in Part 3. Local match funds must be in cash, except that donated or previously purchased land for a construction project can be used as match if sufficiently documented through a recent appraisal and if not originally purchased with federal funds.

Local match can come from many sources, including state (non-CDOT) or local appropriations, tax revenues, private donations, revenue from service contracts, and income generated from advertising and concessions—provided its use as match is not prohibited or disallowed by that funding source. Local match may also consist of any non-DOT federal funds that are eligible to be expended for transportation. Examples of types of programs that are potential sources of local match include employment, training, aging, medical, community services, and rehabilitation services.

State funds administered by CDOT can be used to match a federal award, providing up to 80% of the required 20% matching funds for the federal award, provided such funds are specifically approved by DTR. The subrecipient must still provide a 20% local match for its state-funded award. This means that the subrecipient will pay only 4% of the total project cost: 80% federal, 16% state (80% of 20%), and 4% local (20% of 20%). Since this type of funding arrangement rapidly draws down available funding and reduces the number of projects awarded, CDOT will carefully assess requests of this type. It is CDOT’s intention that state funds be used as local match for federal funds only in situations where worthy projects cannot proceed without the additional capital assistance, due to a specified financial hardship.

CDOT requires written letters of support and commitment from partners in a project that will need to make a commitment to the project (e.g., organizations providing some, or all, of the local match, providing land or right-of-way for a project, or agreeing to share a multimodal facility). Applicants should not submit general letters of support, however.

The Settlement program fund does not require a local match and offers an incentive by awarding a portion of the local match required for State and Federal awards.
PART 4  Application Process

CDOT offers two types of capital applications through COTRAMS for:

1. **Revenue Service Vehicle** purchase requests.
2. **Other Capital** project requests (which includes non-revenue vehicles such as service vehicles).

Within those two general categories are subcategories into which each project must fit, as follows:

A. Revenue Service Vehicles
   1) Replacement Vehicles:
      a. Acquire rolling stock to replace existing rolling stock.
      b. Acquire bus(es) fueled by electric battery, hydrogen fuel cell, or RNG to replace diesel-fueled bus(es) under the Settlement Program.
   2) Expansion Vehicles:
      a. Acquire rolling stock for fleet and/or service expansion.

B. Other Capital Projects
   1) Facilities, infrastructure, equipment, engineering and environmental studies, planning projects, vehicle overhauls, and service vehicle purchases

One vehicle and one other capital project application will be released to each current DTR subrecipient through COTRAMS. If an applicant plans to submit requests for multiple replacement vehicles, the applicant may bundle those replacement vehicles into one single application; requests for replacement and expansion vehicles, though, must be submitted in two separate applications—one for replacements and one for expansions. **In order to submit multiple applications, you will need to request additional application(s) from Audrey Dakan at audrey.dakan@state.co.us or (303) 757-9771.**

The minimum federal or state capital assistance request amount is $25,000, except in cases where an applicant is requesting state funds to be used as local match for federal funds. There is no maximum request, but applicants should take into consideration the amounts available and CDOT’s preference to provide some geographic equity.

Applications must be submitted electronically through COTRAMS (https://cotrams.force.com/cdotcommunity/login), CDOT’s on-line award management system. If you are a current and active CDOT subrecipient you should have a user ID and password for the website. If you have forgotten your COTRAMS user ID and/or password, or
need any help accessing COTRAMS, contact system administrator Audrey Dakan immediately (audrey.dakan@state.co.us) to reset your login credentials.

If you are not a current subrecipient, or have not received transit funds in the last three years, you will need to first complete and submit a New Applicant Questionnaire prior to submitting an application. The questionnaire, in MS Word format, is attached to this NOFA. This questionnaire is intended to determine eligibility for federal and/or state funding and ability to meet DTR’s threshold criteria for managing funds. This questionnaire will also inform potential applicants of the requirements of DTR funding and indicate which funding programs might be the most appropriate. DTR may also arrange a phone call and possibly an on-site visit so that questions can be answered to make the application process more clear and to allow CDOT to become more familiar with the applicant. If it is determined that you are eligible and meet threshold criteria, you will be given a COTRAMS user ID and password so that you can submit your application in COTRAMS. You’ll also be given COTRAMS training. Please fill out the questionnaire and submit it to Ken Mooney (kenneth.mooney@state.co.us) as soon as possible but no later than 5:00 p.m. November 1, 2019, in order to allow maximum time to complete the application.

PART 5   Applicant Eligibility

DTR staff will use the following applicant eligibility guidelines to determine the appropriate funding source(s) for each applicant. However, applicants can state their preference for (or against) a certain source(s) for a particular project(s) in their application(s).

Federal funds: Applicant eligibility for FTA funding assistance is defined based on each particular program, as set forth below:

FTA Section 5310: Private nonprofit agencies are eligible applicants for projects funded through the Section 5310 program. Public entities are eligible if (a) the public entity has been named by the State (CDOT) as the coordinating body for specialized transportation in their area, or if (b) the public entity certifies there is no available private nonprofit agency providing service.

The specialized services under Section 5310 do not have to be open door, unlike the eligibility criteria for State FASTER funds. However, all things being equal, open door programs will receive a higher priority. Additionally, DTR will not fund “residential” vehicles that are located at housing facilities because they normally have a very limited usage and clientele.

Section 5311: Public and private nonprofit agencies, as well as tribal governments, providing public transportation in rural areas.

Section 5339: Public agencies or private nonprofit organizations engaged in public transportation. Section 5339 funds for the Denver, Fort Collins and Colorado Springs large
urbanized areas are administered by their designated recipient of FTA Section 5307 funds, not by CDOT.

**State funds:**

**FASTER:** Eligible applicants of local competitive State FASTER funding assistance are local public and private nonprofit entities, as well as tribal governments, that offer public transportation or open-door specialized transportation.

**Settlement Program:** Eligible applicants include local public agencies, private nonprofit entities and tribal governments, but only for the replacement of their Class 4-8 vehicles, which refers to larger buses, starting at Class 4, which is a larger body-on-chassis diesel-fueled bus.

**Senate Bill 267, and Senate Bill 228:** Eligible applicants include local public agencies, private nonprofit entities and tribal governments that offer public transportation, as well as those that offer open-door or closed door specialized transportation.

CDOT will largely determine the eligibility of each applicant project based on the Agency Profile and staff knowledge of each applicant’s operation, along with the information provided in the application. Staff will consider funding projects from each of the programs for which an applicant and each project is eligible, subject to availability and scoring of the project. CDOT will consider three service area factors, based on whether an applicant serves a rural area, a small urbanized area or a large urbanized area. If any applicant serves more than one of the three areas, it is important that their application point out where each proposed project will serve. For example, “Replacement vehicle 1 will serve both a rural area and a small urbanized area, though most services will be provided in the small urbanized area.”

CDOT will also consider three service population factors, based on whether an applicant provides public transportation, open door specialized transportation or closed door specialized transportation. If any applicant serves more than one of the three service populations, it is important that their application point out where each proposed project will serve. For example, “Expansion vehicle #2 will be used primarily for closed door specialized services in Madison County, not for our rural public transportation program,” or, “The facility will be located in a rural area of Elm County, where we serve the general public, but will also be used by the open door specialized transportation service we provide in Monroe County.” Providing this vital information in the Project Description portion of the application will greatly assist CDOT.

Applicants must be prepared to take full responsibility for carrying out the proposed project. Project sponsorship cannot be transferred or reassigned to another agency without prior written approval from CDOT. CDOT encourages agencies to collaborate and select the most appropriate applicant agency prior to submitting an application and not to assume that CDOT will approve any project sponsorship change.
PART 6  Project Eligibility

Funds may be used for any items defined as a capital asset by the Federal Transit Administration. However, CDOT will not accept requests for funding office-related equipment and staff vehicles, nor for the leasing of capital assets, nor for operating or administrative expenses in this call. Eligible work elements or activities for capital assets, include, but are not limited to, the purchase, acquisition, or construction of:

- Rolling stock (buses, vans, train cars, gondola cabins);
- Design or construction of transit stations, transfer facilities, bus storage and/or maintenance facilities, and other transit facilities;
- Design or construction of multimodal facilities, such as facilities that accommodate some combination of services of multi-regional or statewide significance, such as regional bus service, Amtrak, and Greyhound/intercity bus service;
- Design or construction of Park-and-ride facility improvements;
- Technology improvements that enable enhanced transit services in high priority corridors, including signal prioritization and ITS;
- Technology improvements that significantly improve the coordination of human services transportation by means of mobility management tools such as call centers;
- Wayfinding signage between modes (e.g., signage for intermodal facilities, intercity bus stations, Amtrak, park-and-rides, etc.);
- HOV, HOT, queue jump, and bus pull-out lanes, Bus Rapid Transit projects, and bus lanes;
- Bike racks, lockers and bike parking at multimodal stations;
- Enhanced modal connections, such as trails, sidewalks and bike lanes leading to major transit stations, provided they have a transit connection and enhance transit ridership; and
- Design/engineering and environmental studies, including preliminary or final plans;
- Vehicle overhaul;
- Support vehicles.
Studies that address operational, marketing, or planning topics should instead seek funding through CDOT’s separately-solicited FTA Section 5304 program, which normally offers a maximum award of $40,000.

For any projects that are related to the design and/or engineering of facilities to be constructed, a Title VI equity analysis or Environmental Justice analysis (through the NEPA process), regarding the impacts of determining the site or location of the facility on minority and low-income persons must be conducted. This analysis should be conducted during the planning stage for any type of building construction, including, but not limited to, vehicle storage facilities, maintenance facilities, and operation centers.

Due to limited funding, CDOT continues to put an emphasis on a fix-it-first approach for traditional funding programs, such as FTA-5310, 5311 and 5339—that is, giving higher priority to the replacement and overhaul of buses, facilities, and equipment, rather than on new or expansion capital or planning projects. This does NOT mean, however, that expansion or planning projects will not be funded—only that an applicant seeking funding for expansion projects must make a very strong case, with documented justification and evidence of sustainability, in order to be considered. Replacement requests that do not score well on their merits, though, will not be automatically prioritized higher than expansion equipment or facilities that do score well.

In general, project eligibility for the FTA programs and FASTER includes all of the project types listed above. However, the other State programs are limited to certain project types, as set forth below.

Project eligibility for the Senate Bill 267 program is limited to facility and infrastructure projects that would typically have a useful life of at least 25 years, such as a facility or park and ride.

Project eligibility for the Settlement program is limited to the direct replacement of passenger transit vehicles that are diesel-fueled and Class 4 or higher (over 14,000 pounds), with an alternative fuel (electric, hydrogen, or RNG) vehicle. Also eligible is charging equipment associated with that vehicle(s), as well as reasonable costs associated with installing that equipment. Further details on eligibility are included in Part 13 below.

Project eligibility for the Senate Bill 228 program is limited to replacement vehicles and can be used in any part of the state.
PART 7  Threshold (Minimum) Criteria for Applicants

Applicants must have the financial and managerial capability and capacity to manage any funds awarded, ensure satisfactory completion of the applied-for project, and be willing and able to follow all federal, state, local, and tribal regulations and guidelines. Applicants must also meet the following minimum criteria:

A.  **Legal Standing:** Applicants must be registered on the official U.S. Government System of Award Management (SAM) system, SAM.gov, and not be, at the time of award, suspended, debarred, ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in federally-assisted transactions and procurements. If an agency is not registered at the time of application, they must demonstrate their willingness and ability to register with SAM.gov, and provide proof of that registration to CDOT, before they can be awarded funds.

B.  **Financial Management and Capacity:** Applicants must have financial policies and procedures; an organization structure that defines, assigns, and delegates authority; and financial management systems in place to match, manage, and charge only allowable cost(s) to the award.

Federal, state and Settlement Program funds are awarded on a reimbursement basis; that is, the subrecipient must incur the project costs upfront and submit sufficient evidence of those project costs to DTR for reimbursement. Therefore, the subrecipient must have the financial ability and cash flow to incur those costs upfront and wait for reimbursement from CDOT. However, exceptions can be authorized for smaller subrecipients who demonstrate a financial hardship.

C.  **Technical Capacity:** Applicants must have the capability and resources necessary to operate and manage the award and project on an ongoing basis; ensure conformity and compliance with all applicable federal, state, local, and tribal regulations and guidelines; ensure project schedules, budgets, and performance objectives are achieved; and obtain all necessary prior approvals and/or waivers before incurring costs or taking any actions.

D.  **Procurement:** Applicants must have its own documented procurement procedures which reflect applicable state, local, and tribal laws and regulations, and conform to applicable federal law and standards at 2 CFR 200.318-326.

E.  **Timely implementation:** Applicants must demonstrate their ability and commitment to implement their proposed project in a timely fashion once funding has been awarded and contracted. It is CDOT’s expectation that subrecipients will move promptly to procure and implement their projects. Subrecipients that fail to implement projects on a timely basis may harm their chances for winning awards in future applications.

It is especially important that the above capability and capacity is specifically addressed by applicants that have not previously received funds through DTR or by applicants that have had
delays or other problems implementing projects awarded funding by CDOT. These agencies should address their financial and award management capability and experience, as well as steps taken to correct any past problems, as appropriate.

PART 8  Evaluation Criteria for Applications and Projects

All applications and projects will be evaluated based on the elements described below. Be sure the answers, information, and supporting documentation provided are relevant, complete, and thorough enough that the nature of the proposed projects (its goals and objectives, purpose, beneficiaries, budget, etc.) is clear and easily understood.

Projects will be evaluated based on the type of project—that is, based on whether they are rolling stock, facilities, equipment or studies, and, further, whether they are replacements or expansions. Please note that the sub-criteria will not be weighted equally and that some will not be pertinent. For example, if a criterion has four sub-criteria, evaluators do not assign 25% weighting to each; they are given flexibility in assigning scores. One exception is on replacement rolling stock scores, where there are metrics for comparing need. Also, some consideration may be given to geographic equity.

Projects will be evaluated using the following metrics:

(1) For Replacement of Revenue Vehicles:

Metric 1: Vehicles will be scored based on the extent they have reached the minimum useful life established by the FTA and CDOT for that particular vehicle type. The weighting will be 50% age and 50% miles driven. Vehicles which have not reached minimum useful life in either age or miles will not be considered for funding (especially for FTA funds), except as set forth in Metric 2 below.

Metric 2: Vehicles which have not reached minimum useful life in either age or miles will be considered for funding once vehicles meeting Metric 1 have been awarded and there are sufficient state funds. Vehicles which have not reached minimum useful life in either age or miles will be scored based on 40% age, 40% miles, and 20% special considerations. Special considerations will be based on an evaluation of information provided by the applicants, which would include documentable, verifiable, data-based evidence of specific issues, maintenance problems, or other relevant factors related to the need for replacement of the vehicle. Special considerations may be given to applicants with a lower fleet spare ratio.
Table 2 FTA and CDOT Rolling Stock Minimum Useful Life Standard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CDOT Category</th>
<th>Representative Vehicles</th>
<th>No. Seats</th>
<th>Approx. Weight</th>
<th>Price Range</th>
<th>Useful Life Minimum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heavy-Duty Large Bus</td>
<td>Most models from Gillig, MCI, NABI, and New Flyer</td>
<td>27-40</td>
<td>33,000-40,000 lbs</td>
<td>$400,000-$575,000</td>
<td>12 years or 500,000 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy-Duty Small Bus</td>
<td>Thomas Transit Liner, Bluebird Q-Bus</td>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>26,000-33,000 lbs</td>
<td>$230,000-$375,000</td>
<td>10 years or 350,000 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium-Duty and Purpose-Built Bus</td>
<td>Champion Defender</td>
<td>22-30</td>
<td>16,000-26,000 lbs</td>
<td>$85,000-$200,000</td>
<td>7 years or 200,000 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light-Duty Mid-Sized Bus (Cutaway van chassis with dual rear wheels)</td>
<td>Most BOC vehicles (e.g., Startrans Candidate and Senator; Starcraft Allstar)</td>
<td>16-25</td>
<td>10,000-16,000 lbs</td>
<td>$60,000-$75,000</td>
<td>5 years or 150,000 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light-Duty Vehicles</td>
<td>Vans, minivans, SUVs, Sedans</td>
<td>3-14</td>
<td>6,000-14,000 lbs</td>
<td>$20,000-$65,000</td>
<td>4 years or 100,000 miles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(2) For Expansion of Revenue Vehicles:

Metric 1: Demonstrated Need and Readiness: Higher priority will be awarded to projects that clearly demonstrate the need for the expanded service in terms of documented ridership, or needs studies and community support, that demonstrate an effective business case and can demonstrate they are truly ready to implement the expansion;

Metric 2: Special Considerations: Applicants who have a capital replacement plan/asset management plan, who can show strong institutional commitment, and who can show a strong financial commitment, will be given a higher priority.

(3) For Facilities, Design, and Equipment:

Metric 1: Readiness and Demonstrated Timetable: For facilities, higher priority will be given to those have NEPA clearance finalized, at least 30% design completed, and site location selected and purchased. For facilities, design, and equipment, higher priority will be given to applicants with a record of completion of past or existing projects.

Metric 2: Project Purpose, Cost Savings, and Efficiency: Higher priority will be given to those projects that have a high degree of local and regional support, have a well-developed and defensible business case, and support or provide significant transit operational and utilization benefits.

Metric 3: Special Considerations. Higher priority will be given to those projects that demonstrate they were developed in partnership with the local community. In the case of requests for the expansion of existing facilities, higher priority will be applied to projects that demonstrate the need for the facility and for growth in the program it supports. Applicants that adequately demonstrate funding, financial capacity, and capability to sustain the service and project over time will be also be given higher priority.
For Planning Studies

Metric 1: Project Purpose and Demonstrated Need: The project does not qualify for FTA Section 5303 or 5307 (in urbanized areas) or 5304 funding, is relevant to other transit agencies in the state, has been vetted with the local transit provider, and the study is ready to proceed upon award.

The evaluation criteria for the new Settlement program varies slightly, putting more of an emphasis on the alternative fuel planning and capabilities of the applicant. These are outlined in Part 12 below.

For the SB 267 program, the following evaluation criteria are considered, in addition to those described in (3) above. They are as follows:

1. Project Readiness – The project has already undergone a significant level of planning and is ready to proceed in the short term and complete construction in approximately 3 years.

2. Strategic Nature – Project is of regional or statewide significance or is part of a statewide programmatic need.

3. Planning Support – The project is supported by relevant planning documents (e.g., Transit Development Program, Intercity Bus Plan, corridor NEPA documents, local plan documents)

4. Statewide Transit Plan Goal Areas – Supports statewide plan goal areas of system preservation and expansion, mobility/accessibility, transit system development and partnerships, environmental stewardship, and economic vitality.

5. Expected Life - The project results in a facility or infrastructure asset that carries an expected life cycle longer than the SB267 financing term of 25 years.

6. Supports Statewide System – Supports a statewide transportation system, with consideration of transportation needs throughout the region and the state.

Other factors that may be taken into consideration when evaluating projects are:

- extent to which a project will serve minority and low-income persons; and
- equitable geographic distribution of project funds across the state.
PART 9  Selection Methodology

DTR staff will evaluate and score applications for replacement vehicles. A selection committee made up of CDOT staff (DTR, DTD, the Policy and Government Relations Office, Office of Civil Rights) will evaluate and score applications for expansion vehicles and other capital projects. Applications for Settlement Funding will be reviewed and evaluated by a secondary selection committee made up of representatives from State agencies on the intra-agency Settlement Fund steering committee, including, but not limited to, the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE), CDOT, Regional Air Quality Council (RAQC), and Colorado Energy Office (CEO). This selection committee will review only the applicants’ alternative fuel implementation plans and make recommendations for vehicles and related charging equipment awards. DTR may also solicit input from CDOT’s Region Planners regarding infrastructure, planning, and large capital purchase projects; applicants are strongly urged to discuss their projects with their Region Planner.

A recommended project list will then be presented to the DTR director for approval. After approval, DTR will issue Award Letters for selected projects in COTRAMS to the agencies for review and acceptance. Once all Award Letters are accepted and returned to DTR, DTR will publicize the project list to all applicants, and DTR and the Regions will take all steps necessary to set up and budget projects. Then, DTR and Region staff will begin statement of work and contract negotiations with the awarded subrecipients. State-funded contracts cannot be executed before the start of Fiscal Year 2021 (July 1, 2020) unless a project is budgeted with funds from a prior fiscal year.

PART 10  Application Protest

All applicants, including those not awarded funding, will be notified of funding award decisions, including those not awarded funding. DTR will publicize the award list of projects that were selected, as well as, for transparency purposes, comments indicating the primary reason(s) an application or project may have received an insufficient score. If an application is denied, the grounds therefore will be given to the applicant.

The Department (CDOT DTR), recognizing the substantial financial impact its grant programs can have on organizations and individual applications, will provide applicants with the right to protest a grant denial or award amount decision of DTR. This right is provided in order to ensure the proper administration of the Division of Transit and Rail programing, encourage thorough review of applications and denials, promote a transparent exchange of information, and provide an opportunity to applicants to avail themselves of the Department. The Department fully recognizes the important implications of its grant funding decisions, and it is the Department’s firm belief that applicants whose requests are denied or whose award
amounts are reduced should have the opportunity for further review and consideration by the Department.

For this reason, the Department hereby provides all applicants who have had an application for a grant denied or reduced the opportunity for further consideration and review, followed by a final agency decision. To exercise this opportunity, applicants must, within 30 days after receipt of the formal grant notification:

- Send a protest letter to the Director of the Division of Transit and Rail at the following address: 2829 W. Howard Ave., Denver, CO 80204.

- State in the subject line of the letter that it is a protest of a grant decision requiring a response within 45 days. (This ensures Department staff are aware of the immediacy of the letter.)

- Clearly state in the letter the application to which it applies and the grounds for protest.

While the Department does not want to unnecessarily burden applicants with what to include in their protest letter, these requirements and procedures ensure the Department timely receives the protest and has sufficient information to meaningfully evaluate the decision. The Department shall have no obligation to respond to any letter which fails to conform to the above requirements.

Upon receipt of the protest letter, the Director of the DTR may contact the applicant to discuss the matter further. If the Director of the DTR and the applicant are unable to resolve the issue upon contact, the Director of the DTR will refer the protest to the Chief of the Office of Innovative Mobility. The Chief of the office of Innovative Mobility will consult with appropriate executive management on the matter and will, thereafter, issue a letter containing the final decision of the agency on the issue. Unless extended by agreement of the Department and the applicant, The Chief of the Office of Innovative Mobility shall issue a final agency decision no later than 45 days after the Department’s receipt of the protest letter.

Applicants are encouraged to continue applying for any grants for which they may be eligible in the meantime.
PART 11  Nondiscrimination

The Colorado Department of Transportation, in accordance with the provisions of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 252, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000d to 2000d-4) and the Regulations, hereby notifies all bidders that it will affirmatively ensure that any contract entered into pursuant to this advertisement, disadvantaged business enterprises will be afforded full and fair opportunity to submit bids in response to this invitation and will not be discriminated against on the grounds of race, color, or national origin in consideration for an award.

All subrecipients of CDOT-administered transit grants are required by the FTA to have submitted to CDOT various Civil Rights documents. In particular, if awarded funding, agencies must submit a Title VI Civil Rights Non-discrimination Plan that conforms to the FTA requirements in Circular FTA C 4702.1B. This also includes a Limited English Proficiency (LEP) Plan describing how you plan to provide language assistance services.

Subrecipients of CDOT-administered transit grants that employ 50 or more transit-related employees or requested/received over $1 million in operating/capital or over $250,000 in federal transit planning funds in the previous federal fiscal year are required to have submitted to CDOT an Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) plan that conforms to the requirements in Circular FTA C 4704.1A.

Questions about civil rights can be directed to Anna Marriotti at anna.marriotti@state.co.us or (303) 757-9493.

PART 12  Schedule

Following is the schedule CDOT will generally adhere to for the CY 2020 project selection process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Application/Evaluation/Selection Milestone</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Notice &amp; Application Development</td>
<td>Call for projects officially broadcast by DTR</td>
<td>9/30/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applications Due to DTR via COTRAMS</td>
<td>11/18/2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Review, Scoring & Selection | Initial application screening (subrecipient eligibility and threshold criteria/project eligibility) by DTR  
Applications evaluated by review committees  
DTR conducts conference call with each CDOT Region regarding major projects within their jurisdiction  
DTR completes scoring and prepares list of recommended projects; final scores and recommendations submitted to DTR Director | 02/15/2020 |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| Award Discussion & Approval | DTR develops list of recommended projects and consults with CASTA regarding the proposed selections  
DTR Director approves awards  
DTR issues Award Letters for selected projects  
Subrecipients review and accept or decline awards  
DTR creates awards in COTRAMS; DTR and Regions work with subrecipients to draft statements of work | Mid-February 2020  
Early March 2020 |
| Budgeting and Programming | TIP / STIP policy amendments  
CDOT Business Offices creates project budgets  
Scope of work drafting, negotiations with local agencies initiated by DTR, Regions | Mar-Apr 2020 |
| Subaward Agreements | DTR and Regions finalize subaward agreements/IGAs. | May-Sept 2020 |
PART 13 Additional Guidance for Settlement Program

What are the Settlement Funds?
An automobile manufacturer has agreed to settle allegations that it violated the federal Clean Air Act by selling vehicles that emit more air pollution than the Clean Air Act allows, and by falsifying federal emission tests to hide the excess pollution. Because the affected vehicles exceed emission limits for a pollutant that harms public health and forms ozone or smog, the manufacturer has agreed to place funds in a national trust fund, referred to hereinafter as the Trust funds, that can be used for a variety of purchases intended to mitigate those harmful pollutants.

States have been awarded Trust funds. CDOT DTR expects to receive, over a period of about five years, approximately $30 million (roughly 43% of the State’s total funds). In the first year of the Settlement Program, eligibility for CNG and propane were included, however in February 2019 Governor Polis issued Executive Order B 2019-002 directing the state agencies managing the Trust funds to direct all remaining dollars to zero-emission vehicle replacements (i.e. electric, hydrogen, or CNG fueled by Renewable Natural Gas) rather than other alternative-fuel types. In Colorado, for improved efficiency, funding will flow through existing programs. DTR will use Trust funds for replacement of diesel-fuel buses with alternative-fuel buses in its Settlement Transit Bus Replacement Program (Settlement Program). Funds will be awarded statewide without any geographic targets or quotas, though CDOT will attempt to achieve some equitable geographic distribution.

What kinds of projects are eligible?

Settlement Program funds are intended for the direct replacement of passenger transit vehicles that are diesel fueled and Class 4 or higher (over 14,000 pounds). The funds can be used for the purchase of alt-fuel rolling stock. Settlement Program funds cannot be used for the replacement of existing alt-fuel rolling stock, since that would not produce an air quality improvement, and cannot be used to purchase hybrid vehicles, though alt-fuel vehicles may be awarded to replace existing hybrid diesel vehicles.

CDOT will use Settlement Program funds only for the incremental cost of an alt-fuel vehicle. That is, for example, for the purchase of a 40-foot coach, Settlement Program funds can only be used for the cost exceeding the normal cost of a diesel-fueled 40-foot coach (the equivalent vehicle). However, applicants for Settlement Program funds can request federal or state funds in their CCCP application to cover the cost equivalent of a diesel-fueled vehicle—though CDOT is not guaranteeing the award of such funds.

In the current round of the Settlement Program, only electric battery, hydrogen fuel cell, and CNG buses fueled by renewable natural gas (RNG) are eligible to replace a diesel-fueled bus. The applicant must provide proof that the CNG bus requested will be fueled using RNG. This
verification may take the form of an RNG purchasing agreement or some other mutually-determined documentation considered acceptable by CDOT DTR.

Other eligibility criteria include:

- Only engine model year 2009 or older, Class 4-8 diesel, or hybrid diesel transit vehicles may be replaced.
- Public, private, for-profit, and nonprofit fleets are eligible so long as they meet all applicable eligibility requirements.
- Following acceptance of the replacement alt-fuel vehicle, the vehicle identified for replacement must be scrapped (i.e., the vehicle’s frame rails must be cut completely in half and a 3-inch hole must be cut in the engine block) for each new alt-fuel vehicle receiving Settlement funding. CDOT must be given the opportunity to witness the scrapping procedure or given other acceptable evidence of such.
- Vehicles identified for replacement must be drivable and must have been registered, insured, and operated in Colorado for the previous two years (to ensure that the program achieves real emission reductions and to prevent abuse). CDOT may request evidence of the vehicle’s maintenance records as proof of this.
- The Settlement Program is limited to new vehicle replacements and cannot be used to fund engine repowers of used vehicles or for non-OEM conversion kits. Conversions by manufacturers
- If Settlement Program funds are awarded for a new electric bus, charging equipment associated with that bus(es) may also receive Settlement funds, in an amount not to exceed $100,000, with no local match required. The funds can be used for the charging equipment as well as reasonable costs associated with installing that equipment, such as underground utility work, building modifications to accommodate the equipment, etc.
- Settlement funds cannot fund CNG- or hydrogen-fueling infrastructure.

How will CDOT DTR award the Settlement funds?
DTR will use a combination of existing funds and Settlement Program funds to incentivize the purchase of alt-fuel rolling stock. DTR will fund 110% of the incremental cost of new alt-fuel rolling stock and may also fund 80% of the cost of an equivalent diesel-fueled vehicle with CDOT-administered federal or state funds. By providing 110% of the incremental cost, CDOT is essentially reducing the local match amount that would have been required for the equivalent diesel-fueled vehicle award. However, as pointed out above, CDOT cannot guarantee that it will award both Settlement and the equivalent diesel-fueled vehicle funding. See the tables below for examples.

There are three basic funding scenarios, as outlined below that could occur with this mix of federal/state and Settlement Program funds:
A. An applicant requests and receives both Settlement Program funding for the alt-fuel vehicle(s) and federal or state funding for the equivalent “base” vehicle amounts.

B. An applicant requests and receives Settlement Program funding for the alt-fuel vehicle(s) but does not receive federal or state funding for the equivalent “base” vehicle(s) requested—or which may not have been requested in the first place.

C. An applicant requests both Settlement Program funding for the alt-fuel vehicle(s) and federal or state funding for the equivalent “base” vehicle amounts but is only awarded federal or state funding for the equivalent “base” vehicle amount. In such a case, the applicant can either decline the award, proceed with purchasing a diesel-fueled vehicle, or use other funding to pay for the incremental cost of an alt-fuel vehicle.

It will be important for applicants to respond to questions in the application regarding how they would proceed if some of these scenarios were to result.

The two tables below illustrate the first two scenarios and calculations showing the potential amount of awarded Settlement Program funds and the resulting local share for RNG and electric battery vehicles. In each scenario, the equivalent 40-foot diesel-fueled bus is estimated to cost $500,000, an RNG-fueled bus is estimated to cost $600,000, an electric battery bus is estimated to cost $800,000, and the electric battery bus charging equipment is estimated to cost $80,000.

For any questions regarding Settlement Program please contact Michael King at (303)-757-9997 or michael.king@state.co.us.
### Table A: Settlement Program Funding Examples with State or Federal Award

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RNG Bus</th>
<th>Electric Bus and Charging Equipment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Alt Fuel vehicle cost</strong></td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electric charging cost</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equivalent vehicle cost</strong></td>
<td>Estimated diesel-fueled 40-ft bus cost of $500,000</td>
<td>Estimated diesel-fueled 40-ft bus cost of $500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal/State award for “base” equivalent vehicle</strong></td>
<td>$500,000 times 80% Federal/State share = $400,000</td>
<td>$500,000 times 80% Federal/State share = $400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settlement award</strong></td>
<td>Incremental bus cost ($600,000 minus $500,000) times 110% = $110,000</td>
<td>Incremental bus cost ($800,000 minus $500,000) times 110% = $330,000, plus 100% of $80,000 charging cost = $410,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total CDOT awards</strong></td>
<td>Federal/State award $400,000 plus Settlement award $110,000 = $510,000</td>
<td>Federal/State award $400,000 plus Settlement award $410,000 = $920,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant local share</strong></td>
<td>Alt Fuel vehicle cost $600,000 minus Total Awards $510,000 = $90,000</td>
<td>Alt Fuel vehicle cost $800,000 minus charging cost $80,000 minus Total Awards $810,000 = $70,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Federal/State award = $400,000
### Table B: Settlement Program Funding Examples without State or Federal Award

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CNG Bus Funding</th>
<th>Electric Bus and Charging Equipment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alt Fuel vehicle cost</strong></td>
<td>$600,000 RNG bus cost</td>
<td>$800,000 electric bus cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electric charging cost</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Electric charging equipment $80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equivalent vehicle cost</strong></td>
<td>Estimated diesel- fueled 40-ft bus cost of $500,000</td>
<td>Estimated diesel- fueled 40-ft bus cost of $500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal/Statute award</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settlement award</strong></td>
<td>Incremental bus cost ($600,000 minus $500,000) times 110% = $110,000</td>
<td>Incremental bus cost ($800,000 minus $500,000) times 110% = $330,000, plus 100% of $80,000 charging cost = $410,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant local share</strong></td>
<td>Alt Fuel vehicle cost $600,000 minus Total Awards $110,000</td>
<td>Alt Fuel vehicle cost $800,000 plus charging cost $80,000 minus Total Awards $410,000 = $470,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation Criteria**

As with other replacement vehicle requests, age, mileage, and condition will be key factors in evaluating applications. However, another important part of the review of applications will be the applicant’s demonstrated capacity to implement and operate alt-fuel vehicles within their fleet, particularly if it is for an electric bus. For example, applicants will be asked to describe their long-term alt-fuel vehicle plan and timeline for implementation, their agency’s operational considerations, plans for power delivery, the agency’s related financial plan, and other pertinent planning activities. It will be important for those who propose to use electric vehicles for the first time to address the issue of demand charges, electricity costs, the potential for necessary facility upgrades, and other factors not related to the rolling stock itself in order to demonstrate a full understanding of the broader transition needed for successful implementation.
West Pueblo Connector – Downtown Connection

PEL Study DRAFT

Introduction and Purpose and Need

What is a PEL study?
A Planning and Environmental Linkages (PEL) Study considers environmental and community issues early in the planning process before formal environmental clearance begins. Formal environmental clearance is regulated under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1970. Future environmental studies can use the data collected and analyzed for the PEL Study as funding for specific improvements becomes available. Projects will be chosen that have independent utility, logical termini, and do not restrict consideration of alternatives for other reasonably foreseeable transportation improvements. Compliance with NEPA will be required if there is federal funding included or federal permitting approval required for any follow-up projects.

What is the study location?
The study area for the West Pueblo Connector – Downtown Connection was defined during the project kickoff meeting. It was generally defined with Wildhorse Creek as the western boundary; 19th Street as the northern boundary; the railroad tracks to 15th Street to Hood Avenue to Francisco Street to 11th Street to Conley Street to 10th Street to West Street to 8th Street as the eastern boundary; and 8th Street to the railroad yards back to Wildhorse Creek as the southern boundary. The study area is depicted in Figure 1. Figure 2 shows the greater West Pueblo Connector Corridor.
Who will use the corridor?
The following groups would be the primary users of the West Pueblo Connector – Downtown Connector:

- Commuters from northwest Pueblo to and from downtown
- Commuters looking to avoid congestion along Pueblo Boulevard (SH 45), Thatcher Avenue (SH 96) and US 50
- Pedestrians, bicyclists and transit riders

What are the current conditions in the corridor?
Current conditions in the corridor do not exist because the corridor does not actually exist yet. The only current connections to Pueblo Boulevard from downtown include SH 96 (4th Street, Lincoln Street and Thatcher Avenue) and 18th Street by Tuxedo Boulevard to 24th Street or Lambert Avenue to 11th Street. There is no connection between downtown and the West Side/Pueblo Boulevard between SH 96 and
18th Street. The purpose of this project is to determine the best location for an additional connection that can provide a more direct route between Pueblo Boulevard and downtown.

Cross Sections
There is no single route that currently exists. SH 96 currently provides two through lanes in each direction, but no other roadways that provide an indirect connection to Pueblo Boulevard from downtown provide more than one through lane in each direction. 17th Street provides two through lanes in each direction, but only along the frontage of the Colorado Mental Health Institute (CMHI) campus. 18th Street, Lambert Avenue, 11th Street and Tuxedo Boulevard all only provide one through lane of traffic in each direction. 24th Street only has a short segment providing two through lanes in each direction between Perry Avenue and Sunburst Court.

Intersection configurations and levels of service
Since there is no existing corridor or route, intersections throughout the study area were analyzed for how they are currently operating. The operations of these intersections were reviewed in a draft traffic report dated August 31, 2016.

Traffic count data was provided by the City of Pueblo and was a combination of counts the City already had on-hand and new counts conducted for this project. A summary of the existing roadway traffic counts is shown below in Figure 3.
In built-up areas, traffic operations are determined based on how intersections operate rather than on how roadway segments operate. Therefore, traffic operations analysis was conducted on several study area intersections.

Level of service (LOS) is a measure of effectiveness that explains how a roadway or intersection will operate and is measured in terms of the amount of traffic volume compared to the theoretical capacity of the roadway or intersection (v/c ratio) and can also be measured in seconds of delay on average experienced by users of the roadway or intersection. LOS only relates to traffic flow and congestion. LOS varies from LOS A, which is essentially free-flow conditions to LOS F, stop and go conditions. LOS A – LOS D are considered acceptable LOS. LOS E and LOS F are considered unacceptable and need to be mitigated so that LOS A – LOS D can be achieved. LOS is further depicted in Figure 4.
The project team identified six (6) intersections in the project study area to study in detail. These six intersections are:

- 18th Street/Lambert Avenue
- 18th Street/Tuxedo Boulevard
- 17th Street/Francisco Street
- 11th Street/Lambert Avenue
- 8th Street/Blake Street
- 8th Street/West Street
AM and PM peak hour turning movement counts were collected at the six intersections and Midday peak hour turning movement counts were collected at three intersections (18th Street/Lambert Avenue, 18th Street/Tuxedo Boulevard, and 8th Street/West Street). Synchro micro-simulation software was used to determine how each intersection will operate. Figure 5 shows the existing turning movement counts for each of the six intersections in the AM, PM, and Midday (as applicable) peak hours.

18th Street/Lambert Avenue
The 18th Street/Lambert Avenue Intersection is a 4-legged intersection with north, south and west legs of the intersection stop-controlled and the east leg with no control. 18th Street has one travel lane in each direction and a center turn lane. Lambert Avenue has one travel lane in each direction. The Highway Capacity Manual can either analyze side-street stop-controlled intersections or all-way stop controlled intersections. Since this intersection does not meet either category with three of the four legs having stop control, the Intersection Capacity Utilization (ICU) LOS was used to determine whether this intersection has an acceptable level of service. ICU LOS is a capacity-based method of determining an intersection’s capacity and is ideal for planning, roadway design, and traffic impact studies. Although the HCM LOS is a delay-based method for determining intersection capacity, the ICU method is designed such that it is compatible with the HCM method and an acceptable ICU LOS will correspond to an acceptable HCM LOS.

This intersection operates at ICU LOS A during the AM, PM, and Midday peak hours.

18th Street/Tuxedo Boulevard
The 18th Street/Tuxedo Boulevard intersection is a T-intersection where the north leg of the intersection tees into 18th Street. As a side-street stop-controlled intersection, the level of service (LOS) for the intersection is determined by the lowest performing stop-controlled intersection leg (north leg). This intersection is the northern terminus for the Downtown Corridor of the West Pueblo Connector and all alternatives will start at this intersection. It is assumed that Tuxedo Boulevard will be extended across 18th Street to intersect with Cheyenne Avenue to form the West Pueblo Connector unless the selected alternative uses the existing 18th Street bridge over the railroad tracks.

The intersection operates at LOS C during the AM peak hour; LOS B during the PM peak hour; and LOS B during the Midday peak hour.
17th Street/Francisco Street
The 17th Street/Francisco Street intersection is a four-legged intersection with the north and south legs (Francisco Street) stop-controlled. Both Francisco Street and 17th Street have one travel lane in each direction through this intersection. The intersection LOS is determined by the lowest performing Francisco Street approach.

The intersection operates at LOS C during both the AM and PM peak hours. No Midday traffic volumes were collected at this intersection.

11th Street/Lambert Avenue
The 11th Street/Lambert Avenue intersection is a tee-intersection that forms the southern terminus of Lambert Avenue. 11th Street is an east/west local road on the southern edge of the West Side neighborhood that may potentially extend over the railroad tracks to form the West Pueblo Connector. A separate project is constructing a new bridge for 11th Street over Wild Horse Creek. Both 11th Street and Lambert Avenue provide one lane in each direction through this intersection and Lambert Avenue is stop-controlled.

The intersection operates at LOS A during the both AM and PM peak hours.

8th Street/Blake Street
The 8th Street/Blake Street intersection is a three-legged intersection with the north leg (Blake Street) stop controlled and the east and west legs (8th Street) not controlled. The alignment of 8th Street bends to the southwest as it passes through the Blake Street intersection from the east. 8th Street has two travel lanes in each direction and Blake Street has one lane in each direction. There are two railroad spurs crossing 8th Street immediately west of the Blake Street intersection. Both of these spurs serve the Pueblo Cheiftain printing plant. There are no flashing light signals or gates at the railroad crossing. There are also no advanced signs or pavement markings at the railroad crossing, just cross-buck sign at the crossing on each side of the tracks.

The intersection operates at LOS B during both the AM and PM peak hours.

8th Street/West Street
The 8th Street/West Street intersection is a 4-legged intersection with the north and south legs of the intersection stop controlled. The stop signs also have red flashing beacons to emphasize the stop condition. West Street has one travel lane in each direction and 8th Street has two travel lanes in each direction.

The intersection operates at LOS B during the AM and PM peak hours and LOS C during the Midday peak hour.

All of the intersections studied for the West Pueblo Connector – Downtown Corridor Analysis currently operate at an acceptable level of service

Transit
The study area for the West Pueblo Connector – Downtown Corridor Analysis is currently served by Pueblo Transit Route 3 – Irving Place. This route can be seen in Figure 6.
This route operates with 10 departures during weekday mornings between 6:30 AM to 2:00 PM. During weekday afternoons, there are 6 departures from the downtown transit station between 2:30 PM and 6:00 PM. The route operates with 1-hour headways on Saturdays between 8:30 AM and 6:00 PM. There is no Sunday service.

Ridership on Route 3 has been increasing each year. Ridership for route 3 had 63,789 boardings in 2013; 71,736 boardings in 2014; and 72,829 boardings in 2015 – a 12 percent increase in ridership over the three years.
Crash History

Matrix received intersection crash data from the City of Pueblo for the following five intersections:

1. 18th Street/Lambert Avenue
2. 18th Street/Tuxedo Boulevard
3. 18th Street/Hooper Avenue
4. 17th Street/Francisco Street
5. 8th Street/West Street

The data was collected for the calendar years 2012, 2013 and 2014.

18th Street/Lambert Avenue

The 18th Street/Lambert Avenue intersection has seven recorded crashes during the three-year period. None of the seven crashes involved injuries or fatalities. Four of the seven accidents (57%) were from failure to stop or yield the right-of-way, two were left turn related (29%) and one was a fixed object crash (14%). This intersection has the only stop-control along 18th Street between Spaulding Avenue and Hooper Avenue. Installing a STOP AHEAD advance warning sign and pavement markings for eastbound 18th Street traffic in advance of the intersection could reinforce the stop-controlled conditions. There are also no other stop-controlled intersections along Lambert Avenue in either direction from the 18th Street intersection. STOP AHEAD advance warning signs and pavement markings could also help reinforce the stop-controlled conditions along Lambert Avenue.

18th Street/Tuxedo Boulevard

The 18th Street/Lambert Avenue intersection has three recorded crashes during the three-year period. None of the accidents involved injuries or fatalities. Two of the crashes involved a single vehicle striking a fixed object (67%) and the other accident involved left-turning vehicles (33%). No mitigation measures are recommended.

18th Street/Hooper Avenue

The signalized intersection of 18th Street/Hooper Avenue has eight recorded crashes during the three-year period, one of which caused a fatality involving a motorcycle. Five of the crashes were rear-end crashes (63%); two crashes involved U-turns (25%) including the fatality, and; one crash involved red light running (12%). Rear-end accidents are common at traffic signal-controlled intersections. There is good visibility of the traffic signal indications from all four approaches and all the indications are 12-inch, so there is nothing that can be done to increase the traffic signal visibility.

17th Street/Francisco Street

The 17th Street/Francisco Street intersection has seven recorded crashes during the three-year period. However, three of the crashes were vehicles hitting a fixed object such as a parked car. One of the crashes involved the tailgate of a truck malfunctioning and the trucks load being spilled onto the roadway which was hit by another vehicle. One crash involved vehicles side swiping each other in opposite directions. However, the vehicle that did not maintain its lane left the scene, so it cannot be determined if alcohol or drugs were involved. Francisco Street is approximately 44-feet wide in this area with only one-lane of travel in each direction. There should not be any roadway design issues with vehicles missing parked cars or each other traveling in opposite directions. The three remaining crashes in the three-year period involved a failure to yield, a rear-end crash and a left turn crash. There is
adequate sight distance at the intersection from all directions and no mitigation measures appear necessary.

8th Street/West Street
The intersection of 8th Street/West Street has eight recorded crashes in the three-year period. All these crashes involved vehicles on stop-controlled West Street failing to yield the right-of-way to vehicles traveling along 8th Street. 8th Street is one of the few roadways in this area that has two-lanes of traffic in each direction which adds to the judgement required from drivers stopped at West Street. The buildings on the northwest and southwest corners can hinder sight-distance requiring drivers to stop and slowly move forward until sight-distance is available. The vegetation on the northeast corner also inhibits sight-distance for motorists stopped on the north leg of the intersection.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities
The roadways in the project study area do not have bicycle lanes or shared lane markings. The following study area roadways are designated as on-street bike routes:

- 18th Street
- 11th Street
- 17th Street
- Tuxedo Boulevard
- Blake Street
- 8th Street

The only off-street multi-use path in the study area is the trail along Wildhorse Creek, which begins at the Arkansas River Trail and travels along the west side of the creek to 18th Street.

Sidewalks exist on both sides of most study area roadways where development exists. However, where empty lots exist, there are often gaps in the sidewalk. There is no sidewalk along the west side of Francisco Street between 15th Street and 11th Street.

What is the Purpose and Need
Corridor needs
The needs for this project are to:

- Improve safety response times;
- Increase the mobility between downtown and northwest Pueblo neighborhoods;
- Alleviate congestion on Pueblo Boulevard (SH45), Thatcher Avenue (SH96) and US 50 caused by travelers forced out of direction as they try to move to/from downtown;
- Accommodate multimodal connectivity (including transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities);
- Maintain reasonable access to future growth.

Currently, hundreds of peak hour trips between the northwest Pueblo neighborhoods and downtown must make substantial out of direction travel to make the connection.

There are only two points of vehicular access to the lower west side area, from West 18th Street via Atlanta Avenue on the north, and by West 11th Street via a narrow vehicular and railroad bridge to the
southwest. Emergency response times would be significantly improved from both Fire Station 1 and Fire Station 3 if a connection across the railroad tracks were available.

This area sits near the middle of a 2-mile gap between designated connection points for bicyclists (18th Street to the north and Union Ave to the south) from northwest Pueblo neighborhoods to access downtown.

The transit system currently provides neighborhood service via the Irving Place route which also travels out of direction, adding unnecessary travel time to transit users trying to travel to and from downtown.

The 2040 travel model includes a doubling of anticipated trips between the northwest Pueblo neighborhoods and downtown -- or destinations further east. This connection is necessary to provide reasonable transportation options to those future residents and businesses.

Other project goals include the desire to develop additional transportation infrastructure and connectivity to:

1. Promote preservation of urban residential land use areas where appropriately buffered from existing and future industrial uses currently allowed under existing zoning.
2. Develop, redevelop and expand light industry mixed land use areas to enhance the industrial tax base and promote jobs for Pueblo area residents.
3. Reclaim, enhance and promote the open spaces and riparian areas along Wildhorse Creek for the enjoyment of the public and habitat for wildlife.

Study purposes
The purpose of this project is to provide a new alignment for a multi-modal facility to connect the neighborhoods in northwest Pueblo to downtown with a crossing of the railroad yards. The connection would eliminate significant out of direction travel for all travelers between the two areas and be particularly beneficial for emergency service response times. In addition, this connection is a crucial component of the larger West Pueblo Connector which will enhance regional connectivity for northwest Pueblo neighborhoods, relieve congestion on Pueblo Boulevard (SH 45), Thatcher Avenue (SH96) and US 50, provide multimodal facilities, and support locally adopted plans.

Alternatives Considered and Evaluated
How were alternatives developed and evaluated?
The study team developed alternatives based on their knowledge of the area and looked at how the alternatives would meet the purpose and needs identified for the project. Alternatives were scored against the purpose and need statement and were presented to the public in an open house format. This project will use two levels of screening. Level 1 screening comprises of testing the alternatives on how they meet the purpose and need statement. Remaining alternatives will be carried forward to Level 2 screening which will include other factors such as number of properties impacted, number of environmental impacts and traffic operations. All alternatives had a northwestern terminus at the intersection of 18th Street and Tuxedo Boulevard and a southeastern terminus at the intersection of 8th Street and Blake Street.

What is the No Action Alternative?
The No Action Alternative is existing conditions. Existing conditions between the 18th Street/Tuxedo Boulevard intersection and the 8th Street/Blake Street intersection requires a circuitous route across the railroad tracks along the 18th Street bridge, travel along Hood Avenue for a short distance and then a
turn onto 17th Street. 17th Street would have to be traveled to Blake Street and then Blake Street used to access 8th Street. All these roadways provide only 1 lane in each direction except for a short segment of 17th Street along the frontage of the CMHI. 17th Street provides access to residential properties between the CMHI property and Blake Street. Blake Street does not provide direct access to any residential properties but does provide access to alleys that travel behind the residential properties. 8th Street provides two lanes in each direction.

Level 1 Screening
Level 1 screening involved an environmental scan for fatal flaws as well as screening against the project’s purposes and needs.

Environmental Scan
An environmental scan for the project’s study area was prepared by All Phase Environmental Consultants, Inc. in May 2016. Environmental resources that were evaluated within the study area included:

- Environmental Justice
- Water Resources
- Hazardous Materials
- Floodplains
- Wetlands
- Threatened, Endangered and Special Status Species (TES Species)
- Cultural, Historical and Archaeological Resources
- Paleontological Resources
- Air Quality
- Soils

A separate Environmental Scan Report is available, but the results of the environmental scan will be summarized here.

*Environmental Justice* – The study area is primarily located within zip code 81003 in the City of Pueblo. 2010 US Census data for the Pueblo 81003 zip code indicates that 49.8% of the population is Hispanic, 44.1% of the population is white alone, and 6.1% is some other race. The median income for a household in 2013 was $28,273. An estimate in the 2010-2014 American Community Survey shows 26.3% of all people live below the poverty level. Both the percentage of the population that is minority as well as the percentage of people living below the poverty level are above the county-wide average.

*Water Resources* – Wildhorse Creek is a riverine that flows along the western border of the Study Area. The area of the creek from West 18th Street south to West 11th Street is Wildhorse Creek Park. The headwaters are north of Pueblo and it flows into the Arkansas River just south of the Study Area.

*Hazardous Materials* – An EDR Radius Map report dated February 2, 2016 and Sanborn Maps dated February 3, 2016 were obtained through Environmental Resources Inc. (EDR) for the study area. The locations with reported environmental issues have no violations and any open cases have been closed.

*Floodplains* – The project area west of the railroad tracks lies within either Zone A10 or Zone B (majority).
Wetlands – There is one wetland listed in the approximate planning area according the National Wetland Inventory (NWI) Wetlands Mapper. The map shows an area of Riverine wetland (Wildhorse Creek) along the western border of the planning area. A map illustration of the wetlands with an accompanying legend including descriptions, and the proximity to the proposed action is shown below.
TES Species – According to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Endangered Species Act Species List (IPaC Trust Resource List), the following federally listed species are known to occur in Pueblo County:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birds</td>
<td>Mexican Spotted Owl</td>
<td>Strix occidentalis lucida</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arkansas Darter</td>
<td>Etheostoma cragini</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greenback Cutthroat Trout</td>
<td>Oncorhynchus clarki stomias</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mammals</td>
<td>Black-Footed ferret</td>
<td>Mustela nigripes</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canada Lynx</td>
<td>Lynx Canadensis</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The current planning area is not expected to affect any designated critical habitat for these species. There are none in the vicinity of the project.

Cultural, Historical and Archaeological Resources – A cultural resource inventory of the study area was completed using the tools available from the State Historic Preservation Office’s online resources. A search of the National Historic Places Register (both state and federal) shows there are no cultural sites
of importance within the study area. A map of both the Federal and State Register lists for Pueblo is shown below.

Paleontological Resources – There are no known resources in the Study Area.

Air Quality – The Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE) Air Quality Division was contacted and it was confirmed that Pueblo is in attainment on all areas of concern and no further data was available.

Soils – Per the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Web Soil Survey, there are 3 main soils in the project area; Glenberg-Haverside complex (Gh), Haversid silt loam (Ha) and Heldt silt clay loam (He).

Alternatives considered
There are two main obstacles to finding a route between the 18th Street/Tuxedo Boulevard intersection and the 8th Street/Blake Street intersection. The CMHI campus poses an obstacle to a through route in the northern part of the study area and the railroad switching yards are an obstacle in the south part of the study area. The further south the route traverses, the longer a bridge would have to be to cross the railroad tracks. A total of nine alternatives were developed for the Level 1 screening process within three different families of alternatives. The “A” alternatives all sought to re-use the existing 18th Street bridge over the railroad tracks. The “B” alternatives propose a new crossing adjacent to the CMHI...
campus and the “C” alternatives use the 11th Street alignment as the crossing location over the railroad tracks.

Alignment A-1 – re-uses the existing 18th Street Bridge over the railroad tracks and curves to form a roundabout intersection at the 17th Street/Hood Avenue intersection. This eliminates the dogleg intersections between 18th Street and 17th Street along Hood Avenue. The alignment continues along 17th Street to Francisco Street, forms another roundabout and continues south along Francisco Street before curving southeasterly to the 8th Street/Blake Street intersection. The future D Street connection would intersect the alignment near Francisco Street and 14th Street. A separate 11th Street connection would have to be constructed using Cheyenne Avenue.

Alignment A-2 – Alignment A-2 also re-uses the existing 18th Street Bridge over the railroad tracks. The alignment converts the 18th Street and 17th Street alignments into a continuous alignment and maintains the existing 17th Street/Hood Avenue intersection. Other than removing the roundabout at the 17th Street/Hood Avenue intersection, the alignment is the same as Alignment A-1 with the same future D-Street and 11th Street connections.
Alignment A-3 – constructs a new bridge over the railroad tracks along the 17th Street alignment, but otherwise matches Alignments A-1 and A-2.
Alignment A-4 – matches Alignment A-1 between the 18th Street/Tuxedo Boulevard intersection and the 17th Street/Hood Avenue intersection. The alignment then traverses to the south along the Hood Avenue alignment through the CMHI campus before a sweeping curve to the east exiting the CMHI property in the southeast corner. The alignment then curves to the southeast to intersect the 8th Street/Blake Street intersection. The future D-Street alignment connects from the south along the Martin Street alignment. The 11th Street connection is the same as other A alignments.
Alignment A-5 — re-uses the existing 18th Street bridge for westbound traffic, constructs a new bridge over the railroad tracks along the 17th Street alignment for eastbound traffic and uses a one-way couplet between the 18th Street/Tuxedo Boulevard intersection and 17th Street between Hood Avenue and Francisco Street. The alignment travels along Francisco Street to 14th Street where a roundabout intersection is introduced that also acts as the location where the future D-Street connection intersects. The alignment then bends southeasterly to the 8th Street/Blake Street intersection. The 11th Street connection is the same as all other A alignments.
Alignment B-1 – continues the Tuxedo Boulevard alignment southeasterly from 18th Street before a sweeping curve to the east along the 15th Street alignment. A new bridge is constructed over the railroad tracks along the 15th Street alignment and the alignment traverses the CMHI campus before intersecting Francisco Street and turning southwards along Francisco Street before curving to the southeast to the 8th Street/Blake Street intersection. The future D-Street connection intersects the alignment near 14th Street and the 11th Street connection intersects the alignment from the south just north of 16th Street.
Alignment B-2 – continues the southeasterly alignment of Tuxedo Boulevard towards 12th Street before curving to the east. A new bridge over the railroad will be constructed adjacent to 12th Street and the alignment will traverse along the southern boundary of the CMHI campus. The alignment will then curve southeasterly to the 8th Street/Blake Street intersection. The future D-Street connection will intersect from the south along the Martin Street alignment. The 11th Street alignment will sweep northeasterly from 11th Street to intersect the alignment near the existing 13th Street/Halleck Avenue intersection.
Alignment C-1 – continues the Tuxedo Boulevard alignment southeasterly along the Cheyenne Avenue alignment through the urban renewal area before intersecting with 11th Street on the south. The alignment then turns to the east along 11th Street where a new bridge is constructed over the railroad tracks and across the southern portion of the CMHi campus before emerging along the 14th Street alignment on the east. The alignment then curves southeasterly to the 8th Street/Blake Street intersection. The future D-Street connection intersects from the south along the Martin Street alignment. The 11th Street connection intersects at the 11th Street/Cheyenne Avenue intersection.
Alignment C-2 – is very similar to Alignment C-1. However, immediately east of the 11th Street/Cheyenne Avenue roundabout intersection, Alignment C-2 curves to the south to avoid the CMHI campus. The future D-Street connection intersects from the south along the Martin Street alignment.
Screening criteria
The project team developed screening criteria for Level 1 screening based on the Purpose and Need statement. The intent was to perform a pass/fail analysis of all nine alternatives against the project’s purpose and need statement. The needs identified for the project were:

- Improve safety response times;
- Increase the mobility between downtown and northwest Pueblo neighborhoods;
- Alleviate congestion on Pueblo Boulevard (SH 45), Thatchcr Avenue (SH 96) and US 50 caused by travelers forced out of direction as they try to move to/from downtown;
- Accommodate multimodal connectivity (including transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities);
- Maintain reasonable access to future growth.

All nine alignments were subjectively scored against these five needs with scores of

- Meets the Need
- Does Not Meet the Need
- No change over existing conditions

The level 1 evaluation matrix for the nine alignments is shown below.
### Project Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alignment</th>
<th>Safety Response Times</th>
<th>Increase Mobility</th>
<th>Alleviate Congestion (SH 45, SH 96 and US 50)</th>
<th>Accommodate Multimodal</th>
<th>Access for Future Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-2</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-3</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-4</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-5</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-1</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Multimodal includes bicycles, pedestrians, and transit in addition to personal vehicles.

**Safety Response Times** — the A alignments as well as Alignment B-1 all primarily use existing roadways to connect northwest Pueblo with downtown. Therefore, all these alignments were scored with safety response times that do not change over existing conditions. Alignments B-2, C-1 and C-2 were all scored with improved safety response times because most of these alignments is a new roadway with more direct routes and less intersections.

**Increased Mobility** — like safety response times, the A alignments as well as Alignment B-1 were scored with no change over existing conditions for overall mobility between northwest Pueblo and downtown. Alignments B-2, C-1 and C-2 were all scored as meeting the need by improving the mobility between the northwest neighborhoods and downtown.

**Alleviate Congestion** — all the A alignments will provide similar travel times as existing conditions due to the number of existing roadways and intersections used. Therefore, they are not thought to provide any congestion relief over existing conditions. Both B alignments and both C alignments have enough new roadway and reduction in turning movements and intersections that they would attract travelers off SH 45, SH 96 and US 50.

**Accommodate Multimodal** — all alignments are proposed to have the same roadway cross-section shown below.
The cross-section provides landscape buffer separated sidewalks on both sides and 4-ft wide paved shoulders that can be used by bicyclists. Additionally, transit can be provided along this roadway cross-section. Therefore, all alignments were scored as meeting the need of accommodating multimodal connectivity between northwest Pueblo and downtown.

Access for Future Growth – was evaluated based on the amount of land adjacent to the alignments that can be developed or re-developed. All A alignments traverse existing developed neighborhoods and the CMHI campus and therefore do not offer an opportunity for future growth. Alignments B-1 provides some opportunity to realign roads and properties and redevelop in the northern portion of the Lower West Side Urban Renewal Area. However, the rest of the alignment travels through the CMHI campus and through existing roads and neighborhoods. Therefore, it was rated as having similar access for future growth to existing conditions. Alignments B-2, C-1 and C-2 provide access to the entire urban renewal area and meet the need of providing access for future growth.

Public input
A public open house meeting was held on October 20th, 2016 at the Dolores Huerta Preparatory High School. Exhibits of all nine alternatives were shown as well as the evaluation matrix. Additionally, an overview map of the overall connector was shown.
The project’s purpose and need statement was shown along with the proposed roadway cross-section. Twenty-two comment forms were received. Most comments favored the three alignments that meet the project’s purpose and need statement. However, several comments were made about too many roundabout intersections in the options presented. Additional comments were received from the Pueblo Downtown Association. Four of the seven comments received favored Alignment A-5 with 17th Street and 18th Street as one-way streets.

Level 1 screening results
After reviewing the comments, the project team decided to move forward alignments B-2, C-1 and C-2 as they are the only three that meet all the projects needs as identified by the project’s purpose and need statement.

Level 2 screening
Level 2 screening will be performed on the three alignments (B-2, C-1 and C-2) that are moving forward. The project’s technical advisory group developed a set of screening criteria. Alignment B-2 was altered based on public input to remove roundabouts other than the 18th Street/Tuxedo Boulevard intersection. Alignment B-2 was further refined into Alignments B-2a and B-2b. The only difference between the two B-2 alignments is whether the alignment requires relocation of the existing railroad spur south of the CMHI campus.
Level 2 screening criteria

The refined alignment alternatives that went through level 2 screening are shown below.
Level 2 screening criteria are as follows:

*Number of Properties Impacted* – quantitative count of how many individual properties are impacted by each alternative.

*Number of Properties with Environmental Issues Impacted* – quantitative count of how many individual properties impacted by each alternative that also have environmental issues identified from the environmental screening process.

*Construction Cost* – cost estimate performed to construct each of the three remaining alternatives

*Traffic Operations* – operational analysis of each alignment alternative in terms of roadway and intersection level-of-service (LOS)

*Ability to Phase Improvements* – qualitative analysis of each alternative to determine how easy it would be to construct in phases since it will likely be too expensive to construct the entire alignment at once

*Utility Impacts* – qualitative analysis of how many utilities will be impacted by each alternative

*Railroad Impacts* – qualitative analysis of how the railroad in the project area will be impacted
Level 2 screening results
Level 2 screening results are shown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alignment</th>
<th>Properties Impacted</th>
<th>Environmental Properties Impacted</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Phasing</th>
<th>Utility Impacts</th>
<th>RR Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B-2a</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$36,756,573.00</td>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-2b</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$38,773,449.00</td>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-1</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$36,263,933.00</td>
<td>Less difficult</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-2</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$40,134,931.00</td>
<td>Less difficult</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Properties Impacted, Environmental Properties Impacted and Construction Cost are all quantitative evaluations based on the number of individual properties impacted by each alternative, the number of impacted properties with identified environmental issues and construction cost is based on a rough order of magnitude construct cost estimate for each alternative. The construction cost for each alternative considers the roadway construction cost, bridge construction cost, property acquisition cost, utility relocation costs, undergrounding of electrical transmission lines, construction mobilization, drainage improvements, owner relocation, erosion control and a 20% contingency. Alignments B-2b and C-2 have the additional cost of relocation the railroad spur line.

Phasing, Utility Impacts and Railroad Impacts are qualitative evaluations. Phasing for the B alignments is considered more difficult than the C alignments because of the alignment through the URA which cuts diagonally through the entire URA. The C alignments run directly north/south through the URA along Cheyenne Avenue and directly east/west along 11th Street allowing this part of construction to be phased more easily. Utility impacts for the B alignments were considered moderate compared to the higher utility impact C alignments due to the length of overhead electric transmission lines that would have to be converted to underground lines. The B alignments impact less than 900-feet of transmission line and the C alignments impact almost 1,400-feet of transmission line. The railroad impacts to alignments B-2b and C-2 are considered high because portions of the UPRR spur line would have to be relocated whereas alignments B-2a and C-1 do not require relocation of the spur line. The impacts of these qualitative criteria are considered in the construction cost estimates as well.

Traffic Operations was eliminated as a screening criterion once travel-demand model results indicated that there is no significant difference between the four alignments in how the surrounding roadway network is impacted. Traffic operational issues that were identified during this analysis includes determining that 18th Street needs to be widened to four lanes between Tuxedo Boulevard and Hood Avenue. This will include a need to widen the 18th Street bridge over the UPRR tracks. Additionally, the proposed roundabout intersection at the northern terminus of the alignment may operate better as a traffic signal-controlled intersection.

Which alternative is preferred and why?
Alternative C-1 is being selected as the preferred alternative. The construction cost is the lowest of the four alignments and does not require relocation of the UPRR spur track. This railroad can be a lengthy process that is not fully considered in the construction costs that makes alignments B-2b and C-2 less attractive. The largest obstacle to alignment C-1 is the impact it has to the CMHI campus. However, the
impacts to the CMHI campus are in the service area of the campus and do not impact correctional facilities. It is anticipated that working with the CMHI will be more expedient than the UPRR.

What is the cost of the Preferred Alternative?
Alternative C-1 is estimated to cost approximately $36.3 million to construct. 94 private properties will be impacted with 8 of those properties having identified environmental issues.

Public and Agency Coordination
What stakeholders were coordinated with during the study?
Stakeholders contacted during this study include the public at large, the UPRR and CMHI.

What agencies were coordinated with during the study?
Agencies included in the study process include Pueblo County, Pueblo West, CMHI and the Urban Renewal Authority, Black Hills Energy and Xcel.

Public participation and feedback
A public open house was conducted in October 2016. The alignment alternatives and level 1 screening analysis was presented, and the public feedback was presented earlier in this document.

A second public process is intended after the Level 2 screening and has not been conducted at the time of this document.

Next Steps
Now that a preferred alignment has been identified that will allow this facility to become a reality.

Adopt preferred Alternative
The Pueblo Area Council of Governments (PACOG) must adopt the identified alignment as the preferred alternative and planning documents and transportation plans will be modified to show the adopted alignment. Once the facility appears in planning documents and transportation plans, the region can begin to find funding to construct the alignment.

Funding for Alternative
There are many sources of funding that can be used to construct this alternative. These include federal, state, regional, local and private.

Federal funds for a project like this can include grants and pooling of multiple federal funding sources such as CMAQ and Metro funds over multiple years from multiple agencies.

State funds can include additional state transportation dollars that will hopefully be available in future years from increased tax revenues. The alignment can be identified as a high priority in the region once it is adopted and identified in transportation plans. The State has a vested interest in the connection getting constructed as it is necessary to maintain acceptable operations along US 50.

Finally, a combination of local and private funds could be made available in the future. A tax increment financing (TIF) mechanism could be established within the Lower West Side Urban Renewal Area to raise revenues for the portion of the connector within the URA boundary. Additionally, the City and/or
County may determine to raise local taxes in the future in the form of a rural transportation authority (RTA) or similar mechanism.