Suggestions for Potential Federal Infrastructure Bill Project Selection Criteria

Black Text: Retained INFRA Criteria
Red Text: Suggested additions or deletions

1) **Support for National or Regional Economic Vitality**
   - Supporting Economic Vitality includes projects that:
     - Achieve a significant reduction in traffic fatalities and serious injuries on the surface transportation system;
     - Improve interactions between roadway users, reducing the likelihood of derailments or high consequence events;
     - Eliminate bottlenecks in the freight supply chain;
     - Ensure or restore the good condition of infrastructure that supports commerce and economic growth;
     - Sustain or advance national or regional economic development in areas of need, including projects that provide or improve connections to the Nation's transportation network to support the movement of freight and people; and
     - Reduce barriers separating workers from employment centers, including projects that are primarily oriented toward reducing traffic congestion and corridor projects that reduce transportation network gaps to connect peripheral regions to urban centers or job opportunities.
   - ~~USDOT will evaluate this selection criterion by relying on quantitative, data-supported analysis, including an assessment of the applicant supplied BCA.~~

2) **Leveraging of Federal Funding**
   - To maximize the impact of federal awards, USDOT is seeking to leverage federal funding with non-federal contributions.
     - Projects which propose a 20 percent federal share will be more competitive than an otherwise identical application proposing a 50 percent federal share.
     - Project will receive additional credit/points in the scoring criteria for work completed in the previous five year period on the project corridor, including:
       - Local Match and Overmatch
       - Partnerships
       - Planning and Engineering, Design, ROW Acquisitions, and Construction
       - Local Communities' contributions (apart from Local Match/Overmatch)
       - Studies and Plans (PEL, EIS, etc.) completed
       - Records of Decision (RODs)
     - USDOT will consider three additional pieces of information in assessing this criterion:
       - The Applicant's available resources or other broader fiscal constraints. ~~(This may apply to applicants from rural OR less wealthy areas.)~~
       - If the applicant is a regular recipient of federal funding, the non-federal share of their overall transportation program.
       - The applicant's plan for future operation and maintenance costs associated with the project's life-cycle.

Suggestions for Potential Federal Infrastructure Bill Project Selection Criteria

3) Potential for Innovation

- USDOT ~~is seeking to~~ encourages innovation in three areas:
  - Environmental review and permitting (New Approach)
  - Use of experimental project delivery authorities (SEP-14/15)[1]
  - Safety and technology
  - Connecting the project to other types of infrastructure, including, but not limited to:
    - Airports/Air Cargo
    - Bridges
    - Broadband/Fiber Optics
    - Freight (Chain-up Stations, truck climbing lanes, truck rest areas)
    - Marine Transportation (Coastal, Lake, and River)
    - Pipelines
    - Railroad (including grade-separation and passenger rail)
    - Roadway
    - Water/Sewer/Storm water
- These will be assessed to the extent they are applicable to the project

4) Performance and Accountability

- USDOT seeks projects that allow it to condition funding on specific, measurable, outcomes, including, but not limited to:
  - Reaching project delivery milestones in a timely manner
  - Making specific State or local policy changes that advance desirable transportation outcomes
  - Achieving specific transportation performance objectives that support economic vitality or improve safety
- ~~USDOT does not intend to impose these conditions on unwilling or interested INFRA recipients~~

5) Additional Considerations

- Geographic Diversity
  - At least 25 percent of federal funds must be awarded to projects located in rural areas. A project is considered in a rural area if the majority of the project is located in a rural area.
    - A rural area is defined as an area outside of an Urbanized Area, as designated by the U.S. Census Bureau, or an Urbanized Area with a population less than 200,000.
    - An urban area is defined as an Urbanized Area, as designated by the U.S. Census Bureau, with a population of 200,000 or more.
- Project Readiness
  - Technical Feasibility
  - Project Schedule
  - Required Approvals
  - Project Risks and Mitigation Strategies

[1] **Special Experimental Project Number 14 (SEP-14)** - which encourages the testing of innovative contracting approaches to assess their effects on project costs, duration, and quality.

Special Experimental Project Number 15 (SEP-15) - which encourages innovation in a number of areas to foster public-private partnerships (PPPs), private investment, and more efficient project development processes and practices, in the areas of contracting, finance, planning, environmental clearance, and right-of-way acquisition.

Legislative Outline for Rebuilding Infrastructure in America
(Selected Provisions, from AMPO)

$100 BILLION INFRASTRUCTURE INCENTIVES PROGRAM - Encourage increased state, local, and private investment in infrastructure through incentive grants. Project sponsors selected for award would execute an agreement with express progress milestones. Federal incentive funds would be conditioned upon achieving the milestones within identified time frames.

Purposes of this program - attract significant new, non-Federal revenue streams dedicated to infrastructure investments; create significant leverage of Federal infrastructure investments; assure long-term performance of investments; modernize infrastructure project delivery practices; increase economic growth; spur the development and use of new and infrastructure technology to improve cost and improve performance; and ensure grant recipients are accountable for achieving specific, measurable milestones.

The funds would be divided in specific amounts to be administered by the United States Department of Transportation (DOT), United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

Each lead Federal agency would solicit applications as soon as practicable.

Eligible projects - surface transportation and airports, passenger rail, ports and waterways, flood control, water supply, hydropower, water resources, drinking water facilities, wastewater facilities, storm-water facilities, and Brownfield and Superfund sites.

Project evaluation criteria:

- Dollar value of the project or program (weighted at 10 percent);
- Evidence supporting how the applicant will secure and commit new, non-Federal revenue to create sustainable, long-term funding for infrastructure investments (weighted at 50 percent);
- Evidence supporting how the applicant will secure and commit new, non-Federal revenue for operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation (weighted at 20 percent);
- Updates to procurement policies and project delivery approaches to improve efficiency in project delivery and operations (weighted at 10 percent);
- Plans to incorporate new and evolving technologies (weighted at 5 percent); and
- Evidence supporting how the project will spur economic and social returns on investment (weighted at 5 percent).

Each lead Federal agency would calculate each application score by multiplying the weighted score from the evaluation criteria by the percentage of non-Federal revenues (out of total revenues) that would be used to fund the project or program of projects. The program would include a look-back period (up to 3 years) to receive credit for actions that occurred prior to the enactment of the Incentives Program that align with the desired outcomes of the program (i.e. raising the state gas tax).

$50 BILLION RURAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM - The program will provide significant investment in rural infrastructure to address long-unmet needs. This investment is needed to spur prosperous rural economies, facilitate freight movement, improve access to reliable and affordable transportation options, and enhance health and safety for residents and businesses. Under this program, States would be incentivized to partner with local and private investments for completion and operation of rural infrastructure projects.

Eligible projects - Transportation: roads, bridges, public transit, rail, airports, and maritime and inland waterway ports. Broadband (and other high-speed data and communication conduits). Water and

Waste: drinking water, wastewater, storm-water, land revitalization, and Brownfields. Power and Electric: governmental generation, transmission and distribution facilities. Water Resources: flood risk management, water supply, and waterways.

80 percent of the funds under the Rural Infrastructure Program would be provided to the Governor of each State via formula ("rural formula," calculated based on rural lane miles and rural population adjusted to reflect policy objectives) distribution. The Governors, in consultation with a designated Federal agency and State directors of rural development, would have discretion to choose individual investments to respond to the unique rural needs of their States. Each state would receive at least a minimum of funds with a cap on the maximum amount.

20 percent of the funds under the Rural Infrastructure Program would be reserved for rural performance grants that fall within eligible asset classes and meet specified criteria.

Funds made available to States under this program would be distributed as block grants to be used for infrastructure projects in rural areas with populations of less than 50,000.

A portion of the Rural Infrastructure Program funds would be set aside for Tribal infrastructure and territorial infrastructure, with the remainder available for States.

$20 BILLION TRANSFORMATIVE PROJECTS PROGRAM - A program to advance transformative projects. The purposes of the Transformative Projects Program would include — significantly improving performance from the perspective of availability, safety, reliability, frequency, and service speed; substantially reducing user costs for services; introducing new types of services; and improving services based on other related metrics. They would be ambitious, exploratory, and ground-breaking project ideas that have significantly more risk than standard infrastructure projects, but offer a much larger reward profile.

Infrastructure sectors covered by this program could include, but would not be limited to, the transportation, clean water, drinking water, energy, commercial space, and broadband sectors.

The Department of Commerce (DoC) would serve as the Chair for the purposes of program administration and could request other relevant Federal agency employees to serve on a temporary assignment to assist in the administration of this program. Given the multidisciplinary nature of the Transformative Projects Program, interagency evaluation panels comprised of individuals from the applicable Federal agencies would review and evaluate all applications.

Funding under this program would be available under three tracks:

1. Up to 30 percent of eligible costs under the demonstration track;
2. Up to 50 percent of eligible costs under the project planning track; and
3. Up to 80 percent of eligible costs under the capital construction track.

As a condition of receiving any financial assistance for a construction project under the capital construction track, an applicant would be required to include in its partnership agreement a value share agreement with the Federal Government.

Applicants selected for award would enter into a partnership agreement with the Federal Government, which would specify the terms and conditions of the award, major milestones, and other key metrics to assess performance.

Recipients would be required to publish performance information upon achieving milestones and upon project completion. Regular audits would be performed by the lead Federal agency.

$20 BILLION INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING PROGRAMS – The purpose of this program is to advance major, complex infrastructure projects by increasing the capacity of existing Federal credit programs to fund investments and by broadening the use of Private Activity Bonds (PABs). $14 Billion would be made available for the expansion of existing credit programs like TIFIA and RRIF (rail). The plan recommends that TIFIA eligibility be expanded to airport and port infrastructure. The proposal would also expand eligibility under WIFIA (water) and RRIF and create flexibility and broaden eligibility to facilitate the use of Private Activity Bonds (PABs).

ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENT-TRANSPORTATION

- Provide States flexibility to toll on Interstates and reinvest toll revenues in infrastructure.
- Reconciles the grandfathered restrictions on use of highway toll revenues with current law.
- Provide States Flexibility to Commercialize Interstate Rest Areas.
- Amend titles 23 and 49 to provide targeted flexibility pertaining to the application of Federal requirements where the project funding is primarily non-Federal and the Federal share is minimal would increase investments in infrastructure and reduce project delays and costs.
- Authorize Federal Land Management Agencies to Use Contracting Methods Available to States.
- Amend the law to raise the threshold for major projects from $500 million to $1 billion would remove unnecessary oversight requirements from smaller, less complex projects that are routinely managed by FHWA and State DOTs.
- Amend the law to allow utility relocation to take place prior to NEPA completion would streamline the building process, reduce overall construction time, and lower costs.
- Authorize Repayment of Federal Investment to Eliminate Perpetual Application of Federal Requirements
- Amend the law to include value capture financing as a prerequisite for Section 5309 Capital Investment (Discretionary) Grants, excluding Small Starts projects, would increase resources available for transit capital projects and decrease dependence on Federal grant programs for continued development.
- Apply FAST Act Streamlining Provisions to Rail Projects and Shorten the Statute of Limitations.

INFRASTRUCTURE PERMITTING IMPROVEMENT – This program includes provisions to protect the environment while at the same time delivering projects in a less costly and more time efficient manner.

- Establishing a “One Agency, One Decision” Environmental Review Structure - Protect the Environment through a structure that establishes firm deadlines to complete environmental reviews and permits.
    - Establish a firm deadline of 21 months for lead agencies to complete their environmental reviews through the issuance of a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) or Record of Decision (ROD), as appropriate.
    - Establish a firm deadline of 3 months after the lead agency’s issuance of a FONSI or ROD for Federal agencies to make decisions with respect to the necessary permits.
- Require a Single Environmental Review Document and a Single Record of Decision Coordinated by the Lead Agency.
- Require CEQ to revise its regulations to streamline NEPA which would reduce the time and costs associated with the NEPA process and would increase efficiency, predictability, and transparency in environmental reviews.
- Eliminate EPA’s additional review and assessment of EISs would remove duplication and make the environmental review process more efficient.
- Authorize any Federal agency to use a CE that has been established by another Federal agency and identify documented CEs that can be moved to an agency’s undocumented CE list without undergoing the CE substantiation and approval process.

- Allow design-build contractors to conduct final design activities before NEPA is complete.
- Enhance integration of transportation planning and NEPA by removing an unneeded concurrence point for using transportation planning documents and decisions in NEPA.
- Amend the law to provide broader authority for Federal agencies to accept funds from non-Federal entities to support review of permit applications and other environmental documents would provide additional resources to streamline project delivery and would help defray the costs of the environmental review.
- Clarify that Metropolitan Planning Organizations need only conform to the most recent National Ambient Air Quality Standard – to eliminate confusion and reduce legal challenges.
- Allow transportation conformity to apply one year after EPA approves or finds the emissions budgets adequate (versus one year after non-attainment designation) for conformity purposes would eliminate confusion and give MPOs certainty in meeting Federal requirements.
- Eliminate duplicative reviews of historic property impacts for transportation projects.
- Provide States with authority to assume some, or all, of FHWA's responsibilities for approval of right-of-way acquisitions.

JUDICIAL REFORM – Limit injunctive relief to exceptional circumstances would allow for environmental concerns to be addressed without unduly delaying needed infrastructure projects.

Establish a uniform statute of limitations of 150 days for decisions and permits on infrastructure projects would reduce uncertainty and prevent substantial delays in project delivery, while still affording

Infrastructure Listening Session
With Congressman Jared Polis
February 21, 2018

Attending

In Person
Kathy Gilliland (Colorado Transportation Commissioner, District 5)
Kathleen Bracke (City of Boulder, Transportation Division/GO Boulder Manager)
Gerry Horak (Fort Collins Mayor Pro Tem)
Ryan Dusil (NFRMPO)
Phil Greenwald (Longmont)
Thomas Bradley (CSU Energy Institute)
Jeremy Young (Fire Chief-Frederick Firestone)
Mara Brosy-Wiwchar
Kim Redd

By Phone
Audrey DeBarros (Commuting Solutions)
Sean Conway (Weld Co. Commissioner)
Blaine Miller-McFeeley
Nissa Erickson
Danielle Green
Tom Clancy

Congressman Polis gave an overview of President Trump's proposed infrastructure plan and then asked the attendees to tell him their thoughts and concerns.

Concerns regarding how monies would come from the federal government to the states were discussed. Keeping the current structure of money flowing from the federal government through the Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO's) is desirable because it allows local input into the planning process and how/where the money will be spent. It also allows for local control. An example was given of $87M being raised locally as part of the funding for I-25, with part of the money coming from a TIGER grant applied for through the MPO, and the majority of funding coming from CDOT. Would like to see the MPO structure stay in place.

There was also support for the streamlining of the permitting process and that it is very important. An example was given of how this was done with Highway 15.

Several very specific examples of concerns with President Trump's proposed Infrastructure Plan document were given. Regarding the Infrastructure Incentives Program, on page 3, Part B, Applicability, it does not mention broadband and it should be included. On page 4, Part D, Applications and Evaluation Criteria, the wording about the "dollar value of the project or program of projects (weighted at 10%)" is very unclear about what this means, and Part E, Incentive Grant Awards, states, "An incentive grant could not exceed 20% of new revenue" (what this means is also very unclear). On page 5, Part D, Application and Evaluation, regarding the Incentives Program and receiving credit for new (non-federal)

revenue generation, there is a table that states they will look back at what local revenue generation has been regarding projects in the past and use this as a multiplier in determining the project sponsor's new revenue application score. In the table, it states that they will give 100% credit for projects after February 2018 but were very unclear about what percent would be used as the "New Revenue Credit Score Multiplier" for previous years. It was recommended that 100% credit be given for all past non-federal contributions and revenue generation over the past 3-5 years. Also on page 5, the last sentence of the first bullet under the table states, "The amount of funds dedicated to the look-back would not exceed 5 percent of the total amount for the Incentives Program," and this was also seen as a very unclear statement. The evaluation criteria are a good start but the expectation that funding for all projects will be 80% non-federal monies and 20% federal monies is not realistic, especially for highways and roads. Private money is not realistically available, especially at 80%, for the cost of expanding highways. Broadband may be able to be privately funded at an 80:20 ratio in larger towns but is also not realistic for rural areas.

Concerns were stated that switching the ratio from 80:20 (federal monies: local monies) to 20:80 (federal monies: local monies) is not reasonable. Private investors will want revenue from any revenue generating source (tolls, user fees, etc.). P3's have a place but they aren't the answer for everything. Express lanes, for example, provide reliable trips for automobiles and a lane for transit systems (like BRT). Short term, gas taxes may provide some revenue but the increase is only temporary given new fuel efficient vehicles and new fuels (electric and hybrid vehicles). A road usage charge would provide a more realistic, longer term revenue stream. Concerns were expressed that the plan states that if everything runs through one agency it could be a real potential problem if it isn't staffed appropriately to handle the demand. What is needed is to accelerate the process, not bog it down. Loosening the regulations about tolling to allow it on all lanes (not just new lanes) on highways was seen as a positive proposal.

It was stated that making sure multi-modal transportation continues to be a focus of any infrastructure plan is important. The NW metro corridor is a great example of multi-modal (bike, Bus Rapid Transit, express lanes, rail). Attendees stated they would like TIGER grants to continue since these grants have sparked a lot of creativity in the types of projects communities have pursued and received funding for. CMAQ air quality funding has also been a good source for funding multi-modal projects.

More concerns were expressed about the ratio being flipped from 80:20 (fed: local) to 20:80. A 20% local match or even 30% or 40% may be doable, but 80% local funding for transportation projects is a huge problem. There needs to be NEW federal monies/funding for infrastructure, not just shuffling money from one area (TIGER and INFRA grants) to another. TIGER grants need to stay as an option. They are competitive and have been a catalyst for bringing communities to the table. A good example is US 36 and how well the TIGER grant worked to get communities to contribute as well. TIGER grants have helped get new starts and small starts like Bus Rapid Transit. A strong desire was voiced to keep the coalition approach to funding projects and that the grants helped incentivize communities to work together.

While the infrastructure plan states it will lead to new jobs, it could be the opposite. If a state cannot compete with other states for even the 20% of federal funding because they cannot come up with the 80% of state funding for projects, then jobs will go away and highway projects won't get done. It could have a very negative impact on many states and lead to degradation in infrastructure across the country. Cash flow is a huge issue. CDOT does not have a year's worth of funding as a buffer. The current

proposed infrastructure plan is not going to help Colorado or the country improve our overall infrastructure the way it is currently outlined.

The Fire Chief was asked how infrastructure effects emergency responders and the fire department. He said the number one problem for first responders is traffic flow. Last year's metrics show that delays are occurring. The only access points this station has to I-25 to respond to emergencies are either from 119 or 52 which are both several miles away and can also delay response times. He said express lanes on I-25 are helpful for emergency vehicles. The area is growing so rapidly that they currently have 4 fire stations and are planning on needing 3 more stations in the next 10 years.

Another participant stated he is on the Poudre Valley Fire Authority board and the key to planning is anticipating growth areas and locating stations strategically because "you can't move stations in the future". The key to emergency response is to keep traffic moving. You need 3 lanes.

CDOT has seen fatalities increasing due to congestion on I-25. Congestion isn't just occurring during rush hour, it is now congested all of the time. Safety is their #1 concern and the additional express lanes help reduce congestion and increase safety.

There was discussion about "Vision Zero" which aims to eliminate fatal crashes and accidents involving any mode of transportation including cars, bikes, pedestrians, accessing transit, etc. and that this should be added to any infrastructure bill also.

Another participant stated they appreciate federal support but if the ratio changes to 80% local and 20% federal monies they will not even go for the federal monies due to the expense and administrative costs associated with federal contracts. Mid-size cities will probably not pursue federal monies unless the ratio changes.

The MPO wants to keep TIGER grants and CMAQ funding and work with coalitions of communities in northern Colorado to jointly fund transportation projects. [Reference point: The FAST Act continued the CMAQ program to provide a flexible funding source to State and local governments for transportation projects and programs to help meet the requirements of the Clean Air Act. Funding has been available to reduce congestion and improve air quality for areas that do not meet the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for ozone, carbon monoxide, or particulate matter (nonattainment areas) and for former nonattainment areas that are now in compliance (maintenance areas).]

It was stated that rural communities will be hit hard by the new 80:20 split; they often cannot even come up with 20% of funding, let along 80%. CDOT has had to provide significant support to rural infrastructure projects.

TIGER grants are very important for building coalitions of communities to tackle wide ranging problems. An example is the train horn noise issue and how several communities came together to write a TIGER grant request this past fall.

INFRA grants have been good for making improvements in freight corridors and have helped everything from moving freight more rapidly on rail to dealing with increased freight traffic in neighborhoods as more and more people order goods online and have the goods delivered to their homes.

It was asked how the people at the meeting today can help. A suggestion was made to possibly send a letter to the administration.

It was stated that transit funding is critical and should be included in any infrastructure plan. The example given was the US 36 comprehensive transit corridor which includes Bus Rapid Transit/Flatiron Flyer, commuter bikeway, bike lanes, express lanes, etc. connecting Boulder and Denver.

Cybersecurity should be considered as part of an infrastructure plan and will be needed at a regional and local level also. There will be regional needs for cyber infrastructure as cars are tracked via intelligent transportation systems (ITS). The ITS data feeds into/talks to transportation operations centers (TOC). All of these systems can be vulnerable as we become dependent on ITS technology and will need cybersecurity systems to protect them. In addition, energy transmission will be an even bigger infrastructure need than energy storage technology.

Students from CSU then showed their EcoCAR3 alternative vehicle to attendees.

I-25 Funding Committee
February 28, 2018
Meeting Minutes

1. Welcome and Introductions – see sign in sheet
    - Gerry Horak
    - David May
    - Becky Karasko
    - Medora Kealy
    - Dan Betts
    - Heather Paddock
    - Kim Redd
    - Sandra Solen
    - Karen Schneiders
    - Jeff Kullman
    - Danielle Smith

2. Work Session Overview and Purpose
    - Becky reviewed ideas that were generated from the early Feb meeting.
    - Becky handed out the AMPO synopsis of the President's bill.
    - Sandra reviewed potential state bill 2018-01. The bill focuses on General Funds side of the equation proposing $300m/yr of transfer to CDOT.
    - Colorado anticipates as much as $1 billion in new revenue, which provides the ability to fund this action.
    - The 'Transportation Coalition' lead by the Denver Metro Chamber and the Colorado Contractors Association submitted 4 possible ballot iniatives:
        - .5 cents
        - .5 cents + $150m general fund
        - .62 cents
        - 1 penny

Gerry led group into a review of the AMPO handout

- Project evaluation criteria
    - Dollar value of the project or program (10%)
    - Evidence supporting how the applicant will secure and commit new, non-federal revenue to create sustainable, long-term funding for infrastructure investments (50%)
    - Evidence supporting how the applicant will secure and commit new, non-federal revenue for operations, maintenance, and rehabilitation (20%)
    - Updates to procurement policies and project delivery approaches to improve efficiency in project delivery and operations (10%)
    - Plans to incorporate new and evolving technologies (5%)
    - Evidence supporting how the project will spur economic and social returns on investment (5%)

- How will progressive states like Utah or Georgia work within the above criteria? Seems likely their representatives would not support this.
- Will Colorado benefit from finding new revenues? What % of "new" money must be included within the 80%?
- Colorado's local agencies cannot sustain the local match
- There is significant concern about the apparent flip of federal share-
    - Prior to now, Federal share was targeting 80% and match of 20% state/local
- NOW- 20% Federal with 80% state/local
- Currently, Colorado sees $450 M in HUTF from Washington DC. Coupled with $300 M from the federal General Fund.
- Per Dan- possibility of using Repatriation funds for Transportation.
- The republicans are seeing transportation as a possibility to "get things done", so there might be movement. GOP wants another "win" before mid-terms.

- **What criteria would NFRMPO like to see added or considered in Federal Infrastructure Selection criteria:**
    - Reward projects that are ready to go
    - The environmental permitting from the federal side does not account for the State permitting.
    - ROW ready should be a consideration
    - Credit for major Federal facilities
        - Should type of facility be considered? Especially for Interstates which is a federal owned facility, international freight rails, waterways. Etc. Some type of hierarchy of facilities?
        - Could the economic and social returns consider these criteria – with the facility type?
    - Benefit of the system connectivity
        - Connecting intramodal facilities, airports, freight corridors
    - Reduce the 50% criteria for revenue to 20% to allow for new relevant criteria
    - What constitutes as "New" revenue
    - Criteria 1 – new more definition is needed
        - Differentiate urban projects by sizes (very large vs. large vs small etc.)
        - How large is project vs the total budget of an entity such as CDOT.
        - Could be some comparison – cost/benefit per user
        - Per capita contributions
        - Managed Lanes
        - Credit for HOV/Transit choice for uses
        - Resiliency (disaster prevention)
        - Setting up DSRC (dedicated short-range communication) in current roadways
        - Setting up for the future of technology
        - Connected vehicles will move into the managed lanes

        - Broadband collaboration – working with them to be able to get the funding to get the percentage
        - Collaboration/support – financial support within a region. Not just one State agency
- Other topics/discussions:
    - This is the time to give input to these criteria
    - Have the MPOs and each entity send a letter to the local representatives.
    - Dig once – put in the broadband while you will put in the highway systems.
    - Leverage the Administrative Bill to encourage our legislature to move on state contributions

3. Next Steps

Funding Committee, Friday March 2, 2018 at 12:30pm at Mimi's café in Loveland
Full I-25 Coalition next Wednesday, March 7, 2018

I-25 Funding Committee
February 28, 2018
Criteria Additions/Clarifications

- **What criteria would NFRMPO like to see added or considered in Federal Infrastructure Selection criteria:**
  - Criteria 1 – Dollar Value (more definition is needed)
    - Differentiate urban projects by sizes (very large vs. large vs small etc)
    - How large is project vs the total budget of an entity?
    - Could be some comparison – cost/benefit per user
    - Per capita contributions
  - Criteria 2 - Funding
    - Reduce the 50% criteria for revenue to 20% to allow for new relevant criteria
    - What constitutes as "New" revenue?
      - What are the proposed target percentages for new revenue that is 1-3 years old?
    - Reward projects that are ready to go
      - NEPA clearance completed
      - ROW ready
      - Utilities cleared (not said in meeting, but a good add-on)
  - Criteria 3 - Procurement
    - Are innovative procurement paths still innovative?
      - Design/Build
      - CMGC – Construction Manager/General Contractor
      - Progressive Design/Build
  - Criteria 4 - Technologies
    - Managed Lanes
      - Credit for HOV/Transit choice for uses
      - Connected vehicles will move into the managed lanes as theu become prevalent.
    - Setting up DSRC (dedicated short-range communication) in current roadways
      - Setting up for the future of technology
  - Criteria 5 – Economies
    - Consider the economic and social returns consider the facility type and the impact on the social and economic benefits of a project.
  - New Proposed Criteria
    - Credit for major Federal facilities, such as interstates.
    - Benefit of the system connectivity
      - Connecting intramodal facilities, airports, and freight corridors
    - Resiliency (disaster prevention)
    - Broadband collaboration – working with them to be able to get the funding to get the percentage
    - Collaboration/support – financial support within a region. Not just one State agency