

NORTH FRONT RANGE TRANSPORTATION & AIR QUALITY PLANNING COUNCIL
MEETING AGENDA REVISED
 May 7, 2020

Call-in Number: +1 (224) 501-3412
 Access Code: 582-463-661
<https://www.gotomeet.me/NFRMPO/may-2020-planning-council-meeting>
 For assistance during the meeting, please contact Alex Gordon-agordon@nfrmpo.org or 970.289.8279

Pledge of Allegiance

Public Comment- 2 Minutes each (accepted on items not on the Agenda) Anyone in the audience will be given time to speak to items on the Consent Agenda. Please ask for that item to be removed from the Consent Agenda. Items pulled will be heard at the beginning of the regular agenda. Members of the public will be given an opportunity to speak to all other items prior to Council action being taken.)

- 1) Acceptance of Meeting Agenda
- 2) Approval of Minutes-Lead Planning Agency for Air Quality/MPO- April 2, 2020 (Pg. 7)

Lead Planning Agency for Air Quality Agenda

COUNCIL REPORTS:

- | | | |
|--|-----------|------------------|
| 3) Air Pollution Control Division (APCD) | (Written) | <u>Est. Time</u> |
| 4) Regional Air Quality Council (RAQC) | (Written) | |

Metropolitan Planning Organization Agenda

REPORTS:

- | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|------------------|
| 5) Report of the Chair- | Dave Clark-Council Chair- City of Loveland | <u>Est. Time</u> |
| • New Members/Community Positions | | (5 min.) 6:05 |
| • Finance & HR Committees | | |
| 6) Executive Director Report | Suzette Mallette- MPO Executive Director | (5 min.) 6:10 |
| • 2020 Conflict of Interest | | |
| 7) Finance (Pg. 11) | (Written)/Don McLeod- Committee Chair | (5 min.) 6:15 |
| 8) TAC (Pg. 12) | (Written) | |
| 9) Mobility | (Written) | |
| 10) Q1 TIP Modifications (Pg. 13) | (Written) | |

ACTION ITEMS:

- | | | |
|--|---|------------------|
| 11) Resolution Corrections: | Becky Karasko- Transportation Planning Director | <u>Est. Time</u> |
| a) Multimodal Options (MMOF) Fund -Call for Projects-Revised Resolution 2020-12 (Pg. 33) | | (5 min) 6:20 |
| b) March TIP Amendment-Revised Resolution 2020- 13 (Pg. 35) | | |
| 12) FY2019 & FY2020 STBG Additional Funding Allocations Resolution 2020-14 (Pg. 37) | Medora Bornhoft- Transportation Planner II | (5 min.) 6:25 |
| 13) FY2019 Audited Financials (Pg. 42) | Lisa Gagliardi- Accounting Manager | (20 min.) 6:30 |
| | Wayne Herr- CPA, CGMA, Partner, McGee, Hearne & Paiz, LLP | |

PRESENTATIONS:

- | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|------------------|
| 14) Transportation Recovery Workgroup & CDOT Budget | Shoshana Lew- CDOT Executive Director | <u>Est. Time</u> |
| | | (25 min.) 6:55 |

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

- | | | |
|---|---|------------------|
| 15) FY2020-2021 UPWP and FY2021 Budget (Pg. 90) | Suzette Mallette & Lisa Gagliardi | <u>Est. Time</u> |
| 16) NFRMPO Boundary Focus Group | Jamie Grim- CDOT Local Government Liaison | (10 min.) 7:05 |
| | | (5 min) 7:15 |
| | | 7:20 |

COUNCIL REPORTS:

- | | | |
|----------------------------|--|--|
| Transportation Commission | Kathleen Bracke | |
| CDOT R4 Update | Heather Paddock- CDOT R4 Transportation Director | |
| I-25 Coalition | Dave Clark | |
| US 34 Coalition | Troy Mellon- Coalition Chair, Town of Johnstown | |
| STAC | (Written) | |
| Host Council Member Report | Mark Clark- City of Evans- Mayor Pro Tem | |

MEETING WRAP UP: 7:25

Next Month's Agenda Topic Suggestions

NEXT MPO COUNCIL MEETING: June 4, 2020- Town of Windsor



MPO Planning Council

City of Loveland

Dave Clark, Councilmember- Chair

Alternate- Steve Olson, Councilmember

Town of Severance

Donald McLeod, Mayor- Vice Chair

Alternate- Frank Baszler, Trustee

Larimer County

Tom Donnelly, Commissioner - Past Chair

Alternate- Steve Johnson- Commissioner

Town of Berthoud

William Karspeck, Mayor

Alternate-Jeff Hindman, Mayor Pro Tem

Town of Eaton

Lanie Isbell, Mayor Pro Tem

Alternate- Glenn Ledall, Trustee

City of Evans

Mark Clark, Mayor Pro Tem

Alternate- Brian Rudy, Mayor

City of Fort Collins

Kristin Stephens, Mayor Pro Tem

Alternate- Wade Troxell, Mayor

Town of Garden City

Fil Archuleta, Mayor

Alternate-Alex Lopez, Councilmember

City of Greeley

Brett Payton, Councilmember

Alternate-John Gates, Mayor

Town of Johnstown

Troy Mellon, Councilmember

Town of LaSalle

Paula Cochran, Trustee

Alternate-

Town of Milliken

Elizabeth Austin, Mayor

Town of Timnath

Lisa Laake, Trustee

Weld County

Kevin Ross, Commissioner

Alternate- Steve Moreno, Commissioner

Town of Windsor

Paul Rennemeyer, Mayor

Alternate- Ken Bennett, Mayor Pro Tem

CDPHE- Air Pollution Control Division

Dena Wojtach, Manager, Planning & Policy Program

Colorado Transportation Commission

Kathleen Bracke, Commissioner

Alternate- Heather Paddock, Acting Region 4 Director



COLORADO

Department of Transportation

Senate Bill 267

Regional Equity and Scenario Planning

May 7, 2020



Budget Impacts - Discussion To Date

- **April 16:** Initial discussion of expected budget impacts
- **April 21:** Follow-up on budget, SB267 and recommended assumptions around “worst-case”
- **May 7:** Scenarios on SB-267 funding availability, equity analysis, and project screening/evaluation approach
- **May 21:** Staff recommendations for additional projects to move forward under second tranche of SB267
- **June:** Further analysis of potential project “add-backs” pending additional funding



Decisions/Discussions To Date

- Agreed that Commission and staff remain committed to “Your Transportation Plan” and to the funded 4-year list being the priority list, even if phasing and funding level assumptions are different such that it might take longer to execute. 10-year list remains the more aspirational goal and means that CDOT has a robust pipeline of projects that are ready to execute.
- Agreed to “plan for the worst, and work towards the best” -- programming to a baseline level that accounts for assumed 2nd tranche COP issuance but \$250 million of other budget cuts as low-end scenario.
- Agreed to certain conditions around second tranche investments:
 - Honor all awarded projects (including rural pavement).
 - Proceed with all “limbo” (notice to proceed not yet issued) projects upon clarification of SB 267 2nd tranche timing in May.
 - Honor projects that received Federal grant/partnership funding.
 - Examine options to reduce SB267 funding draw for large, multiple year projects.
- Today’s briefing focuses on achieving regional equity assuming these conditions and a low-end funding scenario.



Analysis Assumptions (Second Year of SB-267)

- Assume a target of \$530M-\$550M in highway funding and an additional \$64M in transit dollars.
- “Subtract” current SB Year 2 commitments, which include (per 4/21 TC concurrence):
 - Projects/corridors already under construction
 - Fully awarded projects and those awaiting Notice to Proceed
 - Projects with federal grant/partnership funding
- Consider multiple I-25 North Segment 7 and 8 funding targets.
- Add in \$17M in FY20 Supplemental Highway Infrastructure committed to Region 1 Urban Arterial Multimodal Safety Improvements Project (subject to 5/21 TC approval)
- Focus on region equity as criteria for programming recommendations
- Limit consideration of “eligible” projects to those ready to go to advertisement by the spring of 2021 (e.g. start construction within about 18 months)



Worst Case Scenario: How do we arrive at a planning range ?

- Under the worst case funding scenario there is \$726.4M of available funding through sources such as SB 1, SB 262, SB 267 (Year 2), Transportation Commission Program Reserve (TCPR), SB 267 interest, and Supplemental Highway Infrastructure.
- However, we also have to assume potential reductions totaling \$198M through the loss of 3 years of General Fund transfers and additional debt service payments.
- This leaves a remaining net amount of \$528.4M to be programmed.
- Amount to program may increase based on premium under the second issuance.

Staff recommends using a Senate Bill Year 2 Planning Range of \$530-\$550M.

Sources	\$
FY 20 SB 1	\$105M
FY 20 SB 262	\$60M
FY 20 SB 267	\$450M
FY 20 TCPR	\$80M
SB 267 Interest	\$14.4M
FY 20 Supplemental Highway Infrastructure	\$17M
Total	\$726.4M
Reductions	\$
Loss of 3 Years of GF Transfer	(\$150M)
Additional Debt Service	(\$48M)
Total	(\$198M)
Net	\$528.4M



Original List of Projects Planned for SB 267 Year 2

Region	Project Type	Project Description	Year 2 SB Allocation
1	Capital	I-25 South Gap Package 3	\$ 26,000,000
1	Capital	I-70 Peak Period Shoulder Lanes (PPSL)- Year Two 267 Commitment	\$ 35,000,000
1	Capital	I-25 Valley Highway Phases 3 & 4	\$ 60,000,000
1	Capital	Urban Arterial Safety Improvements (Urban Arterial Safety Improvements)	\$ 25,000,000
2	CY20 Rural Paving	SH 116 - US 287 to Kansas Border	\$ 12,536,685
2	CY20 Rural Paving	SH 69A Westcliffe to Fremont County	\$ 6,969,836
2	CY20 Rural Paving	US 50 Texas Creek East	\$ 9,793,479
2	Capital	US 50 and Purcell Drive Interchange	\$ 37,000,000
2	Capital	I-25 and SH 94 Safety and Mobility Improvements	\$ 34,000,000
2	Capital	US 287 Bridge Preventative Maintenance Phases 1 & 2	\$ 5,000,000
2	Capital	US 287 (APark Street South) - Lamar Downtown Concrete Paving	\$ 18,000,000
2	Capital	SH 21 and Research Parkway Interchange	\$ 44,000,000
2	Capital	I-25 Colorado Springs Ramp Metering Phase 2	\$ 6,000,000
2	Capital	M-22-AY Bridge Repair on CO 109 over US 50B in La Junta	\$ 3,000,000
2	Capital	US 285/CO 9 Intersection Improvement with Bridge Widening	\$ 7,000,000
2	Capital	Bridge Preventative Maintenance: CO 12, CO 194, and 25 C	\$ 2,500,000
2	Capital	Bridge Preventative Maintenance on I-25, CO 16 & CO 24 in Colorado Springs (4 bridges)	\$ 5,500,000



Original List of Projects Planned for SB 267 Year 2

Region	Project Type	Project Description	Year 2 SB Allocation
3	CY20 Rural Paving	SH 92 Crawford East	\$ 7,402,461
3	CY20 Rural Paving	SH 64 Meeker West	\$ 5,996,237
3	CY20 Rural Paving	SH 34 Grand Lake	\$ 10,223,800
3	Capital	SH9 Iron Springs to Main St.	\$ 6,000,000
3	Capital	US 50 Windy Point/Blue Creek Canyon	\$ 18,500,000
3	Capital	US 50 Grand Junction to Delta Repairs	\$ 15,000,000
3	Capital	SH 13 Garfield County MP 11.3 to 16.2	\$ 16,500,000
3	Capital	SH13 Fortification Creek	\$ 10,800,000
3	Capital	US 550 Montrose to Ouray County Line Safety Improvements	\$ 6,000,000
3	Capital	US 6 Fruita to Palisade Safety Improvements	\$ 36,000,000
3	Capital	US 50 Passing Lanes Blue Mesa	\$ 6,000,000
3	Capital	SH 92 Rogers Mesa to Hotchkiss	\$ 8,000,000
4	CY20 Rural Paving	US 6 Merino to Atwood	\$ 5,373,809
4	CY20 Rural Paving	CO 59 Seibert to Cope	\$ 17,806,713
4	Capital	I-25 North: Segment 5 & 6: BUILD Grant Funding Commitment Express Lanes on permanent EIS alignment (CO 56 to CO 402)	\$ 115,770,000
5	Capital	US 550/160 Connection (Interchange Completion)	\$ 7,900,000
5	CY20 Rural Paving	CO 141 & 145 Slickrock & Redvale Resurfacing	\$ 10,000,000
5	CY20 Rural Paving	CO 17 MP 84.5 to 118.5 Shoulders and Resurfacing	\$ 17,000,000
5	Capital	US 160 McCabe Creek Major Structure Replacement	\$ 6,000,000



Current Commitments for SB267 Year 2

- While \$550M is the starting point, the next step is to reduce this amount by year 2 “commitments”.
 - There were originally 35 number of projects anticipated for delivery as part of the SB 267 Year 2 Tranche by the end of the calendar year.
 - These current SB Year 2 commitments fall into one of five categories.
 1. Projects/corridors already under construction: \$184,670,000
 2. Other Awarded Projects: \$61,510,686
 3. Projects waiting Notice to Proceed: \$78,596,097
 4. Projects with federal grant funding/partnerships: \$69,500,000
 5. Preconstruction: \$25M
- Total: \$425.3M**
- By deducting \$425.3M of current commitments from the \$550M planning range, there is roughly \$124.7M remaining to be programmed. Importantly, this amount does not include out-year commitments to complete I-25 segments 7 & 8.



Current Commitments for SB267 Year 2 I-25 Segments 7&8 Not Included \$17M Federal Funding for Urban Arterials Included

Region	Project Type	Project Description	Year 2+ SB Allocation		
1	Capital	I-25 South Gap Package 3	\$ 26,000,000	█	Commitments to projects/corridors already under construction
1	Capital	I-70 Peak Period Shoulder Lanes (PPSL) - Year Two 267 Commitment	\$ 35,000,000		
4	Capital	I-25 North: Segment 5 & 6:	\$ 115,770,000		
5	Capital	US 550/160 Connection (Interchange Completion)	\$ 7,900,000		
2	CY20 Rural Paving	SH 116 - US 287 to Kansas Border	\$ 12,536,685	█	Other awarded projects
2	CY20 Rural Paving	US 50 Texas Creek East	\$ 9,793,479		
3	Capital	SH9 Iron Springs to Main St.	\$ 6,000,000		
4	CY20 Rural Paving	US 6 Merino to Atwood	\$ 5,373,809		
4	CY20 Rural Paving	CO 59 Seibert to Cope	\$ 17,806,713		
5	CY20 Rural Paving	CO 141 & 145 Slickrock & Redvale Resurfacing	\$ 10,000,000	█	Projects awaiting Notice to Proceed
2	CY20 Rural Paving	SH 69A Westcliffe to Fremont County	\$ 6,969,836		
2	Capital	US 50 and Purcell Drive Interchange	\$ 37,000,000		
3	CY20 Rural Paving	SH 92 Crawford East	\$ 7,402,461		
3	CY20 Rural Paving	SH 34 Grand Lake	\$ 10,223,800		
5	CY20 Rural Paving	CO 17 MP 84.5 to 118.5 Shoulders and Resurfacing	\$ 17,000,000		
1	Capital	Urban Arterial Multimodal Safety Improvements	\$ 17,000,000	█	Projects with federal grant funding or partnerships
2	Capital	I-25 and SH 94 Safety and Mobility	\$ 34,000,000		
3	Capital	US 50 Windy Point/Blue Creek Canyon	\$ 18,500,000		
SW	Capital	Preconstruction	\$ 25,000,000	█	Preconstruction
Total			\$ 425,273,020		



What Options Do We Have to Complete I-25?

- Because I-25 does not need full funding in FY20 and the full funding was never intended to be carried in one year's budget.
- Given this timing, we can look at several funding options (including financing) to help defer costs of the project.
- 5/21 briefing will present additional information on options to complete the project -- including how to manage the risk if the decision is to pursue additional debt (e.g. defining a worst-case for what portion of the project would not get build if the debt did not come through -- this will not be an option that would make sense from a traffic or safety perspective, but it would be technically feasible).
- Next briefing will also identify if there are options to reduce project costs along the margins without undermining the operability of the project, but these will likely be smaller dollars.



What Options Do We Have to Complete I-25?

I-25 North Segments 7&8 Funding Scenarios			
Planning Range	\$550M	\$550M	\$550M
Current SB Year 2 Commitments	\$425.3M	\$425.3M	\$425.3M
I-25 North Segments 7&8 Funding Scenarios	— \$50M	— \$100M	— \$154M
<i>Remaining to Program</i>	<u>= \$74.7M</u>	<u>= \$24.7M</u>	<u>= -\$29.5M</u>

- This analysis looks at three scenarios for how much funding we would carry in the “base package”, assuming that we would look other funding options (including financing) to repay the balance: funding at \$50M, \$100M, and \$154M (full need).
- Immediately funding I-25N Seg 7&8 at the full amount (\$154M) would deplete all remaining year 2 dollars.



Region Equity Analysis: Comparing Original 4-Year Equity Target to Current Commitments + Varying Funding Levels for I-25 Seg 7 & 8

4-Year Equity Target*		Current Equity (I-25 @ \$50M)		Current Equity (I-25 @ \$100M)		Current Equity (I-25 @ \$154M)	
Region	Region %	Region %		Region %		Region %	
1	34.2%	30.2%	↓	28.9%	↓	27.6%	↓
2	19.0%	11.6%	↓	11.2%	↓	10.7%	↓
3	15.1%	9.5%	↓	9.1%	↓	8.7%	↓
4	23.9%	39.5%	↑	42.1%	↑	44.6%	↑
5	7.9%	9.2%	↑	8.8%	↑	8.4%	↑

- The *Current and Historic RPP Midpoint* was the target established by staff to ensure statewide equity, across all four years, in the original distribution of SB funding.
- The three scenarios above (\$50M, \$100M, and \$154M) for varying levels of I-25N Seg 7&8 investment demonstrate that equity is impacted.
- Based on this analysis, CDOT staff recommends that remaining SB-267 second tranche funds (beyond current commitments) be programmed to Regions 1, 2, and 3 as they are currently below original equity whereas Regions 4 and 5 are above.

*Allocates-25 South Gap project according to total mileage located in Region 1 (2 miles) and Region 2 (8 miles)



Updated Region Equity for Highway Projects

- If I-25N Seg 7&8 is allocated an additional \$50M, this leaves \$74.7M in remaining dollars to program. If those funds are divided among Regions 1, 2 and 3 according to equity formulas, Region 1 would receive an additional \$20.6M, Region 2 would receive \$30.6M and Region 3 \$23.5M.
- If I-25 is allocated an additional \$100M, this leaves \$24.7 in remaining dollars to program. The same analysis provides Region 1 with \$5.8M, Region 2 with \$10.7M and Region 3 with \$8.2M.
- The table (right) recalculates equity based on those funding distributions.

Updated Region Equity Distribution			
Region	4-Year Equity Target	Updated Equity (I-25 @ \$50M)	Updated Equity (I-25 @ \$100M)
1	34.2%	30.0%	28.8%
2	19.0%	13.4%	11.8%
3	15.1%	10.8%	9.6%
4	23.9%	37.1%	41.2%
5	7.9%	8.6%	8.6%

Based on current funding assumptions, it is not possible to restore the regional equity distribution to the original target levels.

However, this analysis does demonstrate where current and potential add back funding could be targeted to restore regional equity. 13



Goals for Triaging SB267 Funding

Goals

1. Stay true to Your Transportation Plan
1. All projects will come from previously approved TC provided execution flexibility given project readiness
1. Advertise projects in timely manner
 - a. Associated with \$530-550M planning range (July 2021)
1. Restore regional equity to extent possible
1. Achieve 25% rural paving



The Next Step: Selecting Projects for Remaining Second Tranche Dollars

Safety	Mobility	Economic Vitality	Asset Management	Strategic Nature	Regional Priority
<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Criteria</i>
<p>Extent to which project addresses safety deficiencies at locations with known safety issues (as indicated by Level of Safety Service (LOSS) 3 or 4), or other known or projected safety issues</p>	<p>Extent to which project addresses a mobility need, including congestion reduction, improved reliability, new or improved connections, eliminations of “gaps” or continuity issues, new or improved multimodal facilities, improves efficiency through technology, or improved access to multimodal facilities</p>	<p>Extent to which a project supports the economic vitality of the state or region, including supporting freight, agricultural, or energy needs, or providing or improving access to recreation, tourism, military, job, or other significant activity centers</p>	<p>Extent to which project addresses asset life, including improving Low Drivability Life pavement or poor rated structures</p>	<p>Strategic nature of project, regional or statewide significance, leverages innovative financing and partnerships, and balances short term needs vs. long term trends.</p>	<p>Priority within the Region, based on planning partner input including priorities expressed in Regional Transportation Plans</p>



Additional Screening Criteria

Jobs and Business Impact	Project Ability to Await Funding	Interdependencies of Work Packages	Timing of Economic Impact of Projects	Concentration and Timing of Major Capital Project Starts
<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Criteria</i>
<p>Projects ability to create jobs, help serve economically disadvantaged groups, ensures inclusion of DBEs and SBEs, and placement on a strategic economic corridor.</p>	<p>Ease v. difficulty of putting projects "on the shelf" to be revived if future resources become available later.</p>	<p>Evaluating which projects include components that are reliant on other elements of project work and thus need to be grouped together for efficiency and strategic project scoping.</p>	<p>Estimates of when expenses would hit the ground in terms of work, activity, and jobs.</p>	<p>This will pertain to how we think about larger projects in terms of sequencing, given that larger, multi-year projects tend to require discrete project financing packages and we may want to time those somewhat differently as we contemplate the next few years.</p>



Keeping our eye on the ball: Your Transportation Plan is as important as ever

- This analysis--based on a “worst case scenario” to avoid overcommitting dollars--is only the first step in the scenario planning we need to do.
 - Includes only about a **third of the original \$1.6 billion capital plan** – largely comprised of projects that are already underway or awarded (e.g. I-25 North, a subset of rural road repaving projects, etc.)
- Thanks to the hard work of CDOT staff and the Transportation Commission, we have a robust, approved, four year capital plan. Each additional dollar made available goes into paying for projects on that approved list.
- In order to continue on the path to deliver our \$1.6 billion project list, the next step is developing **phased “add backs”** that determine specific groups of projects ready to move forward at various funding levels.
- While regional equity will remain important in these discussions so too will be the timing and extent of economic benefits and the relationship to other work packages.



Keeping our eye on the ball: Your Transportation Plan is as important as ever

- Staff will present the Transportation Commission with additional analysis on potential projects to fulfill the remaining \$25M-\$75M at the 5/21 meeting.
- 5/21 meeting also will present a similar level of analysis and scenarios for SB267 transit dollars.
- Add back scenarios will be presented starting in June. Scenarios will include:
 - Tiered funding levels
 - Regional Equity Analysis
 - Project screening that factors in the TC Guiding Principles, as well as the Additional Screening Criteria
- Staff has a developed analytical framework for decision making that combines the TC Guiding Principles with the Additional Screening.