Meeting Agenda of the
TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMISSION
October 12, 2017
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.

1. Call Meeting to Order

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

3. Approval of Minutes*
   September 14, 2017
   Action Requested: Approve/Disapprove/Modify

4. Safety Performance Measures – Charles Meyer or Alisa Babler* (For Discussion)

5. Bustang/Outrider Service – CDOT Transit Invited

6. Southwest Chief Update - Randy Grauberger, WSP and Commissioner Pace
   (Informational)

7. CDOT Region 2 Updates (Informational Updates)

8. Avondale Drainage Project - Dan Dahlke* (Informational)

9. US 50 West Project - Dan Dahlke* (Informational)

10. Proposed Changes to Safe Route to Schools Program*

11. Staff Reports/Updates (Informational Updates)
   1. Public Participation Plan - Approved
   2. Update of Areawide Bike Map

12. Items from TAC Members or scheduling of future agenda items

13. Adjourn at or before 10:30 am
Meeting Agenda of the
TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMISSION
September 14, 2017
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.

1. **Call Meeting to Order**
   Chairman: John Adams
   Time of Call: 8:31 a.m.
   MPO Members Present: John Adams, Bart Mikitowicz, Hannah Haunert
   TAC Members Present: Alf Randall, Don Bruestle, Joan Armstrong, Ian Turner,
   Shawn Winters, Dan Dahlke, Brad Curtis
   CAC Members Present: Kristen Castor
   Others Present:

2. **Introductions and Public Comments (non-agenda items only)**
   There were no comments made.

3. **Approval of Minutes of the regular meeting held on August 10, 2017.*
   Craig is supposed to be Brad, it will be changed in the minutes.
   Joe Garcia had a concern about the timeframe for the construction of the southern portion of I-25.
   Motion to Approve: Don Bruestle
   Second: Alf Randall
   Unanimous

4. **CTIP/STIP Administration Modifications Agenda Item(s)**
   CDOT Region 2 requests for PACOG MPO/TPR TIP amendment(s)
   Motion to Approve: Don Bruestle
   Second: Alf Randall
   Unanimous
   Project Name: US50 Permanent Water Quality Pond Between Purcell and Pueblo Blvd.
   STIP Number: SPB7004
   Project Location and Description: US 50 Between Purcell and Pueblo Blvd.
   Fund Source(s):
   Federal Program Funds: $ 122,331
   State Matching Funds: $ 25,430
   Local Matching Funds: $ -0-
TOTAL PROJECT FUND AMENDMENT: $ 147,761
This request is to add more water quality funding to the right-of-way and design phases of the project in FY 2018. $25,000 will go into the right-of-way phase and $122,761 will be added to the design phase.

Don Bruestle asked where this was. Dan Dahlke said right by Purcell and Hwy 50 and right by the Water Treatment Plant.

5. Bike/Ped Trails and Grade Separation Over US50 - Pueblo West/CDOT
Action Requested: Discussion
Brad Curtis said that they are looking into an overpass and how to move forward to have it analyzed. Dan Dahlke asked his team up in the Denver to figure out the best option. Brad said that the cheapest would be a switchback. An underpass, the cattleguard (west of Purcell), and a median has been looked at. Alf Randall asked where the money would come from. Brad said that they are just looking if this is feasible. Bart Mikitowicz said that the Sierra Vista Trail is going under US50. Dan said Hwy 50 will go over the pedestrian trail at McClulloch and Purcell. Don Bruestle asked if this would eliminate the traffic signal. Dan said that the on/off ramps will be controlled. Joan Armstrong asked if both intersections would be done at the same time. Dan said they wouldn’t be, Purcell would be first then McClulloch. John Adams said that CDOT is looking into this and will have a public hearing to go over all the options.

6. CDOT Region 2 Updates (Informational Updates)
Dan Dahlke said that Hwy 45 Pueblo Blvd will move back into their own lane but will be down to one lane. It should be done by Thanksgiving. The design phase for Hwy 50 W (WB)out to Purcell is still in process. Girders will be placed in Ilex. Don Bruestle asked if the bridge west of Purcell is going to be replaced. Dan said that will be the onramp. Work has started for James St in Avondale. Joan Armstrong asked what was happening there. Dan said they will put a 48” pipe to alleviate water flow. She asked if it was on the northside of Hwy 50. Dan said yes.

Don Bruestle asked about their new headquarters. Dan Dahlke said that it will be ready in March of 2018.

7. Pueblo Memorial Airport Activities -Ian Turner, Director of Aviation, Pueblo Memorial Airport (Informational)
Ian Turner said that in July, they received $3.8m grant for the rehabilitation for the south runway. Skywest Airline will return to Pueblo in December. There will two flights available. Don Bruestle asked if the airline will travel to other places than Denver. Ian said not right now but maybe in the future.

8. Volkswagen Settlement (Informational)*
Volkswagen must give $68m to CO. It is controlled by Colorado Health. There is Public Hearing on September 28. There is a lot of vehicle upgrades. More information can be found in the packet.

9. Staff Reports/Updates (Informational Updates)
Public Participation Plan
The Plan has a few more weeks for the 45 day public comment. No significant comments had been made. It will go to PACOG for final approval.
**Update of Bike Map**
Bart Mikitowicz has been working with Kyle Good in IT for the current and future bike map.
The Database will have:
1. Project ID
2. Condition
3. Status
4. Type
5. TAP Value
6. Grant Money
7. Complete
8. Sponsor
9. Years Funded

**2018-2019 – Unified Planning Work Program**
The Unified Planning Work Program has been submitted to CDOT and starts Oct 1.

10. **Items from TAC Members or scheduling of future agenda items**
   - FAST ACT – Performance Measures (CDOT Presentation about Safety)

11. **Adjournment**
    Chairman John Adams adjourned the meeting at 9:40 a.m.
FHWA Safety Performance Measures

Setting Targets for Colorado & PACOG

October 2017
• FHWA Final Rule effective April 14, 2016 (Final Rule FHWA-2013-0020);
  • Codified in 23 CFR 490

• States Establish Targets for 5 Safety measures

• 5 Measures - 3 identical for FHWA and NHTSA
  • Fatalities
  • Fatality Rate
  • Serious Injuries
  • Serious Injury Rate
  • Non-motorized Fatalities & Serious Injuries
Requirements

- Definitions
  - VMT, serious injury defined
  - 5 year averages
  - Target - 2014-18 five year average
  - Baseline - 2012-16 five year average

- Year Following - Compare actual to target, then to baseline;
- Must meet or show significant progress compared to baseline in 4 out of 5
Roles & Responsibilities

- DOT role - CFR 490.209
  - CDOT establishes targets, identical to SHSO
  - “performance outcomes” expected for the calendar year for all public roadways
  - Report to HSIP by August 31
  - May report additional targets - urbanized, non-urbanized, etc.
  - Evaluate progress and report to HSIP

- CDOT/State Consequences - full use of HSIP obligation authority, HSIP improvement plan
Roles & Responsibilities

- MPO Role - CFR 490.209
- Establish performance targets
  - February 27, 2018
  - Report to CDOT
  - Establish targets:
    - Adopt/Contribute toward the State DOT target OR
    - Commit to MPO specific target
  - Report VMT used for the MPO
- Applicable to all public roadways
- Coordinated with the DOT, 23 CFR 450
- MPO Consequences
Safety Performance Measures
The Safety Performance Management Measures regulation supports the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) and requires State Departments of Transportation (DOTs) and Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) to set HSIP targets for 5 safety performance measures. This document highlights the requirements specific to MPOs and provides a comparison of MPO and State DOT responsibilities.

How do MPOs establish HSIP targets?
Coordination is the key for all stakeholders in setting HSIP targets. Stakeholders should work together to share data, review strategies and understand outcomes. MPOs must work with the State DOT. MPOs should also coordinate with the State Highway Safety Office, transit operators, local governments, the FHWA Division Office, National Highway Transportation Safety Administration (NHTSA) Regional Office, law enforcement and emergency medical services agencies, and others. By working together, considering and integrating the plans and programs of various safety stakeholders, MPOs will be better able to understand impacts to safety performance to establish appropriate HSIP targets. Coordination should start with the Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP). More information on the SHSP is available at http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/hsip/shsp/.

MPOs establish HSIP targets by either:
1. agreeing to plan and program projects so that they contribute toward the accomplishment of the State DOT HSIP target or
2. committing to a quantifiable HSIP target for the metropolitan planning area.

To provide MPOs with flexibility, MPOs may support all the State HSIP targets, establish their own specific numeric HSIP targets for all of the performance measures, or any combination. MPOs may support the State HSIP target for one or more individual performance measures and establish specific numeric targets for the other performance measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HSIP Safety Targets Established by MPOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of fatalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rate of fatalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Number of serious injuries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Rate of serious injuries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Number of non-motorized fatalities and non-motorized serious injuries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If an MPO agrees to support a State HSIP target, the MPO would:
- Work with the State and safety stakeholders to address areas of concern for fatalities or serious injuries within the metropolitan planning area
- Coordinate with the State and include the safety performance measures and HSIP targets for all public roads in the metropolitan area in the MTP (Metropolitan Transportation Plan)
- Integrate into the metropolitan transportation planning process, the safety goals, objectives, performance measures and targets described in other State safety transportation plans and processes such as applicable portions of the HSIP, including the SHSP
- Include a description in the TIP (Transportation Improvement Program) of the anticipated effect of the TIP toward achieving HSIP targets in the MTP, linking investment priorities in the TIP to those safety targets

If an MPO establishes its own HSIP target, the MPO would:
- Establish HSIP targets for all public roads in the metropolitan planning area in coordination with the State
- Estimate vehicles miles traveled (VMT) for all public roads within the metropolitan planning area for rate targets
- Include safety (HSIP) performance measures and HSIP targets in the MTP
- Integrate into the metropolitan transportation planning process, the safety goals, objectives, performance measures and targets described in other State safety transportation plans and processes such as applicable portions of the HSIP, including the SHSP
- Include a description in the TIP of the anticipated effect of the TIP toward achieving HSIP targets in the MTP, linking investment priorities in the TIP to those safety targets
Volumes for HSIP Rate Targets: MPOs that establish fatality rate or serious injury rate HSIP targets must report the VMT estimate used for such targets, and the methodology used to develop the estimate, to the State DOT. For more information on volumes for HSIP rate targets, see [http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/planning/processes/tools/technical_guidance/index.cfm](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/planning/processes/tools/technical_guidance/index.cfm).

Roads addressed by MPO HSIP Targets: HSIP targets cover all public roadways within the metropolitan planning area boundary regardless of ownership or functional classification, just as State HSIP targets cover all public roads in the State.

How do MPOs with multi-State boundaries establish HSIP targets?
MPOs with multi-State boundaries must coordinate with all States involved. If an MPO with multi-State boundaries chooses to support a State HSIP target, it must do so for each State. For example, an MPO that extends into two States would agree to plan and program projects to contribute to two separate sets of HSIP targets (one for each State). If a multi-State MPO decides to establish its own HSIP target, the MPO would establish the target for the entire metropolitan planning area.

When do MPOs need to establish these targets?
States establish HSIP targets and report them for the upcoming calendar year in their HSIP annual report that is due August 31 each year. MPOs must establish HSIP targets within 180 days of the State establishing and reporting its HSIP targets. Since FHWA deems the HSIP reports submitted on August 31, MPOs must establish HSIP targets no later than February 27 of each year.

Where do MPOs report targets?
While States report their HSIP targets to FHWA in their annual HSIP report, MPOs do not report their HSIP targets directly to FHWA. Rather, the State(s) and MPO mutually agree on the manner in which the MPO reports the targets to its respective DOT(s). MPOs must include baseline safety performance, HSIP targets and progress toward achieving HSIP targets in the system performance report in the MTP.

Whether an MPO agrees to support a State HSIP target or establishes its own HSIP target the MPO would include in the MTP a systems performance report evaluating the condition and performance of the transportation system with respect to the safety performance targets described in the MTP including progress achieved by the MPO in achieving safety performance targets

Assessment of Significant Progress
While FHWA will determine whether a State DOT has met or made significant progress toward meeting HSIP targets, it will not directly assess MPO progress toward meeting HSIP targets. However, FHWA will review MPO performance as part of ongoing transportation planning process reviews including the Transportation Management Area certification review and the Federal Planning Finding associated with the approval of the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program.

---

Top 5 Things to Know about MPO HSIP Safety Performance Targets

- All MPOs must set a target for each of the 5 HSIP Safety Performance Measures
- MPOs may adopt and support the State’s HSIP targets, develop their own HSIP targets, or use a combination of both
- MPOs must establish their HSIP targets by February 27 of the calendar year for which they apply
- MPO HSIP targets are reported to the State DOT
- MPO HSIP targets are not annually assessed for significant progress toward meeting targets; State HSIP targets are assessed annually
2017 (and annual) Process

• 2017 (and annually)
  • Analysis, coordination, reporting
  • Coordination between SHSP, HSIP, HSO, MPO
  • June 1 - Report to NHTSA
  • August 31 - establish 2018 Targets

• Feb 27, 2018 - MPO set targets (180 days after DOT)
• Dec 2019 - Data available for PM assessment by FHWA
• Mar 2020 - Notifications sent from FHWA
CDOT’s Statewide Approach

- FHWA Workshop
- Statistical analysis
- Factors Analysis
- Executive Review
- MPOs Review
- FHWA Consultation
Statistical Analysis

- HSO
- Traffic & Safety Engineering
- CDPHE
- Multiple statistical models
Factors Considered

• CDOT considered the following factors:
  • Funding changes
  • Legislative changes
  • Driver/User Behaviors/Choices - impairment, distraction
  • Enforcement
  • Education/Outreach
  • Population growth
  • VMT growth
  • automotive engineering and technologies
  • roadway engineering and technologies
Difficulty in Approach

• Pessimistic
  • Seeing continued increases in fatalities and serious injuries
  • No changes in 4Es, funding, legislation
  • Short term

• Realistic

• Optimistic
  • visionary, intended direction, alignment with TZD, halving fatalities by 2030
  • Longer term vision - short term spikes vs. long term trends/vision
  • More hopeful, proactive, supportive of TZD initiatives
2018 Targets

- Finalized Statewide Targets
  - Co-established by SHSO, CDOT
  - Reviewed by Executive Director, Deputy, Division Directors
  - Reviewed by MPOs, Regions
  - 2014-2018 5 year averages

- Fatalities - 610
- Fatality Rate - 1.2
- Serious Injuries - 3350
- Serious Injury Rate - 6.79
- Non-motorized Users Fatalities & Serious Injuries - 586
How Can We Assist?

• Data
  • MPO specific data on FTP site (see handout for directions)
  • Excel spreadsheet with CDOT calculations available
  • CDOT data is not geocoded
  • MPO crash data is provided based on county level location, working to MPO boundaries

• Discussion/Philosophy

• Federal contacts

• Contact information:
  • Alisa Babler, 303-757-9967
    • Alisa.Babler@state.co.us
  • Charles Meyer, 303-757-9879
    • Charles.e.Meyer@state.co.us
Next Steps

- February 27, 2018 Deadline
- MPO Decision
  - Support Statewide Targets, or
  - Establish MPO-specific targets
- Document and Copy CDOT with Decision
NOTE:
EXISTING RIGHT-OF-WAY AND EASEMENTS SHOWN ARE APPROXIMATE.
I. PURPOSE

A. The purpose of these Rules is to prescribe procedures for application and disbursement of federal or state moneys to political subdivisions of the State, for projects to improve safety for pedestrians and bicyclists in School Areas, as authorized by § 43-1-1601 et seq., C.R.S.

B. The Department promulgated these Rules in order to carry out the purposes of § 43-1-1601 et seq., concerning the “Safe Routes to School” program. The Rules were adopted for the following reasons: (1) to comply with § 43-1-1604 C.R.S.; (2) to establish the procedures to review and award grants; (3) to define essential terms; (3) to determine additional criteria and procedures under which the program will be managed.

II. STATEMENT OF BASIS AND SPECIFIC STATUTORY AUTHORITY

A. Statement of Basis

Sections 43-1-1601 et seq. C.R.S. was enacted in June 2004. Section 43-1-1604 C.R.S. directs the Department to promulgate Rules for the implementation of a grant based program awarding federal funds to political subdivisions of Colorado to improve safety for pedestrians and bicyclists in School Areas.

During September 2004, the Department formed a committee to review the statutory directive. The objective of the committee was to provide opportunity for input from stakeholders while developing the Rules, allow stakeholders to review and comment on the proposed Rules language, and develop understanding and consensus among stakeholders. Comments and concerns from the taskforce were considered in developing the Rules.

Stakeholders represented on the rulemaking committee included Bicycle Colorado, Colorado Dept. of Public Health and Environment, Colorado Dept. of Transportation Traffic Safety Office, Colorado Dept. of Transportation Bicycle/Pedestrian coordinator, and Colorado Dept. of Transportation policy staff.

The Department promulgated the Rules in May 2005. The Department initiated the rulemaking process to amend the existing Rules in June 2007. The first amendment was needed to revise the contact person to be in compliance with job duties and responsibilities within the Department of Transportation, and Section 1404 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy of Users Act of 2005. The second amendment was necessary to attain continuity of services and leadership on the Advisory Committee.

The Department amended the Rules in 2012 as part of a Department-wide initiative to update Rules where warranted, eliminate unnecessary language and lessen restrictions on local government when possible. This initiative was in keeping with the Governor’s Executive Order D2011-005 and Executive Order 2012-002.
The Department amended the Rules in 2014 as a result of HB14-1301. This bill made state general funds available for FY15 for the Safe Routes to Schools Program, and specified that all of the grants awarded using the funds resulting from HB14-1301 must be for non-infrastructure projects. The bill also provided that if the Safe Routes to Schools Program received federal dollars in FY15, general funds appropriated for the program will be reduced by the amount of the federal moneys received. Finally, the bill eliminated the need to distribute projects by geographic distribution of the student population. Instead, the bill required that the Department consider schools having greater than fifty percent of the students eligible for free or reduced-priced lunch as one of the criteria for awarding grants.

The Department amended the Rules in 2017 as a result of changes enacted in HB14-1301 which were only in effect for one year. The state general funds available in FY15 for Safe Routes to Schools are no longer available for the grant program. All other aspects of the Safe Routes to School Program required by the bill remain in effect.

**B. Specific Statutory Authority**

These Rules are promulgated by the Department pursuant to the specific statutory authority of §§43-1-110 (2) and 43-1-1604 C.R.S. and conform to the requirements of PL 112-141 ("Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century" or "MAP-21") PL 114-94 ("Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act" or "FAST Act") signed into law on December 4, 2015, 23 U.S.C. 101 (29)(B); 23 U.S.C. 213(b)(3) and 23 U.S.C. 403 and its implementing regulations; "SAFETEA-LU" 23 U.S.C. 402, and its implementing regulations; "National Goals and Performance Management Measures" 23 U.S.C. § 150; the National School Lunch Act, 42 U.S.C. § 1751 et seq. and its implementing regulations, 7 CFR 245. Pursuant to § 24-4-105(11), C.R.S., the Department may entertain petitions for declaratory orders.

**1.00 DEFINITIONS**

1.01 “Advisory Committee” means the committee appointed by the Executive Director as established in § 43-1-1601(4) C.R.S. and Section 2.00 of these Rules.

1.02 “Applicant” means a political subdivision of the State of Colorado that applies for an award under these Rules.

1.03 “Commission” means the Colorado Department of Transportation Commission established pursuant to § 43-1-106 C.R.S.

1.04 “Department” means the Colorado Department of Transportation established pursuant to § 43-1-101 C.R.S.

1.05 “Executive Director” means the Executive Director of the Colorado Department of Transportation pursuant to § 43-1-103 C.R.S.

1.06 “Free or Reduced-Priced Lunch” means a lunch served to a child from a household eligible for such benefits as provided by 7 CFR 245, and the National School Lunch Act, 42 U.S.C. § 1751 et seq.

1.07 “MPO” means a Metropolitan Planning Organization located in urban areas with a population over 50,000. An MPO is a federally-designated entity established by agreement between the Governor and the units of local government responsible for transportation planning processes.

1.08 “Non-System Road or Trail” means a road or trail that is not part of the State highway system.

1.09 “On-System Road or Trail” means a road that is part of the State highway system.

1.10 “Rural Area” for purposes of these Rules means an area outside an MPO boundary.
“School Areas” means the area within a two mile radius of a school.

“STAC” means Statewide Transportation Advisory Committee as created in § 43-1-1104, C.R.S.

“STIP” means the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program that is the federally required, four-year program of planned transportation projects. The STIP is developed in coordination with planning partners throughout the state through the Project Priority Programming Process. The STIP incorporates the Transportation Improvement Programs (TIPs) from each MPO.

“TIP” means the Transportation Improvement Programs (TIPs) that identify all current federally funded transportation projects to be completed in a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) region over a four-year period.

“TPR” means a Transportation Planning Region. TPRs are geographically designated areas of the state with similar transportation needs and commonalities, pursuant to the provisions of § 43-1-1102 and 1103 C.R.S.

2.00 ADVISORY COMMITTEE

2.01 The Executive Director shall appoint an Advisory Committee in conformance with § 43-1-1601(4) C.R.S.

2.02 In addition, the Advisory Committee shall include representatives of the STAC, who shall serve a two year term. The STAC shall choose their designees, with the approval of the Executive Director. STAC representatives to the Advisory Committee shall consist of:

2.02.1 Two STAC representatives of Metropolitan Planning Organizations or their designee;

2.02.2 Two STAC representatives of rural Transportation Planning Regions or their designee.

3.00 APPLICATION INFORMATION

3.01 The Department will notify city and county governments, schools, and school districts of the potential availability of Safe Routes to School funds, requirements for requesting an application package, and the deadline to submit an application to the Department for Safe Routes to School funds.

3.02 The application package, to be developed and periodically updated by the Advisory Committee, will contain instructions and guidelines for completion of the application, as determined by the Advisory Committee and the Department. Instructions and guidelines may not be in conflict with § 43-1-1601 et seq., C.R.S.

4.00 THRESHOLD CRITERIA FOR APPLICANT ELIGIBILITY

4.01 The purpose of this section is to describe the threshold criteria the Department and Advisory Committee will use to determine if an Applicant will be eligible for funding. An Applicant must comply with all threshold criteria.

4.01.1 Applicants must be political subdivisions of the state.

4.01.2 A political subdivision of the state that receives money under this Part 16 of Article 1 of Title 43, may not use such moneys as a substitute for funds currently being used to support similar activities.
4.01.3 In order for a political subdivision of the state to be eligible for the funds, the political subdivision must show that it has established an agreement with the school in the area where the project will occur. Such agreement of the improvement project must be documented and signed by an official of the school.

4.01.4 An Applicant must submit the application to the Advisory Committee through CDOT’s Safe Routes to School Program Manager.

4.01.5 An Applicant must ensure that all forms, assurances, and resolutions required by the application are signed by the appropriate officer or individual with authority to legally bind the Applicant.

4.01.6 If the project is not located on CDOT right of way, maintenance shall be the responsibility of the Applicant. If the project is located on CDOT right of way, maintenance agreements shall be in place prior to construction.

4.01.7 If required by the program, a local match must be demonstrated.

4.01.8 On-System projects must not conflict with the State and Regional Transportation Plans available on the Department website found at https://www.codot.gov/programs/colorado-transportation-matters/.

4.01.9 Applicant eligibility is contingent upon compliance with all state and federal laws and regulations. Applicants that fail to comply with all applicable federal and state laws, regulations and requirements will not be considered eligible under these Rules. Compliance by an Applicant with all threshold eligibility criteria does not obligate the Commission to award funds, but only allows the Applicant to be evaluated by the Department and Advisory Committee for consideration for available funding based upon the evaluation criteria described in Section 5.00. of the Rules.

5.00 EVALUATION CRITERIA

5.01 The purpose of this section is to describe the basic evaluation criteria used by the Department to determine whether an eligible Applicant will be funded and to assist in determining the level of funding to be awarded. Guidelines, instructions, and details concerning such evaluation criteria shall be described fully in the application package.

5.02 The Advisory Committee shall create a scoring procedure utilizing the criteria described in this section.

5.03 The Department and Advisory Committee will include the following criteria to evaluate eligible Applicants:

5.03.1. The demonstrated need of the Applicant;

5.03.2. The potential of the proposed project to reduce injuries and fatalities among children;

5.03.3. The potential of the proposed project to encourage walking and bicycling to school;

5.03.4. The extent to which the application identifies existing safety hazards;

5.03.5. The extent to which the application identifies existing and potential walking and bicycling routes and the extent to which the proposed project would improve or connect them;
5.03.6. Support for the proposed project from local school-based associations, traffic engineers, elected officials, law enforcement agencies, and school officials;

5.03.7. Consideration for implementation of Safe Routes to Schools in communities with schools having greater than fifty percent of the students eligible for Free or Reduced-Priced Lunch; and

5.03.8. Other criteria allowed or required by applicable federal laws or regulations.

5.04 If the project request is located in an MPO boundary, the application must be certified by the MPO. The certification shall demonstrate that all actions necessary to include the project(s) in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for that MPO will be taken before the application may be approved.

6.00 FUNDING

6.01 The Department shall allocate to the Safe Routes to School Program any funds received from the federal or state government that designates funds for such program.

6.02 Applicants applying for funds through the Safe Routes to School program may also be eligible for other federal funds, but must compete for those funds using the criteria established under that program.

6.03 Costs of the Project exceeding the amount of the grant shall be borne by the Applicant.

6.04 Project funds that have not been encumbered within 2 years will be considered inactive and the remaining unencumbered funds may be revoked and returned to the program.

7.00 INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE

The Rules are intended to be consistent with and not be a replacement for the federal requirements contained in the National School Lunch Act, 42 U.S.C. § 1751 et seq. November 10, 1989, and its implementing regulations, 7 CFR 245, December 13, 2007, which are hereby incorporated into the Rules by this reference, and do not include any later amendments. All referenced laws and regulations shall be available for copying or public inspection during regular business hours from the Office of Policy and Government Relations, Colorado Department of Transportation, 2829 W. Howard Pl., Denver, Colorado 80204. Copies of the referenced United States Code may be obtained from the following address: Office of the Law Revision Counsel, U.S. House of Representatives, H2-308 Ford House Office Building, Washington, DC 20515, or by phone at (202) 226-2411. Copies of the referenced Code of Federal Regulations may be obtained from the following address: U.S. Government Publishing Office, 732 North Capitol Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20401, or by phone at (202) 512-1800.