

Colorado Tolling Enterprise

2005 Annual Report

Prepared For:
The Senate Transportation Committee
and
The Transportation and Energy Committee
of the House of Representatives



February 15, 2006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	ENTERPRISE OVERVIEW	1
2.0	FISCAL YEAR 2005 ACTIVITIES	2
2.1	Colorado Tolling Enterprise Board Membership.....	2
2.2	Colorado Tolling Enterprise Staff.....	3
2.3	Meeting Date and Adopted Resolutions	3
3.0	FINANCIAL STATUS	5
3.1	Expenses	5
4.0	AD HOC COMMITTEE ON TOLLING	6
5.0	TOLL PROJECTS	14
5.1	Potential Toll Corridors.....	15
5.2	I-25 HOT Lanes.....	15
6.0	TOLL RATES AND INTEROPERABILITY	17
6.1	Toll Rates.....	17
6.2	Interoperability.....	17
7.0	RECOMMENDED STATUTORY CHANGES	18

1.0 ENTERPRISE OVERVIEW

The Colorado Tolling Enterprise (CTE) was established as a government-owned nonprofit business operating within, and as a division of the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT). The Colorado Tolling Enterprise was authorized by House Bill 02-1310 and created by the Transportation Commission, Department of Transportation, State of Colorado, pursuant to Section 43-4-803(1), C.R.S., by a resolution adopted on August 15, 2002. As reported in the first Annual Report dated January 15, 2003, initial activities included the election of officers, adoption of articles of organization and bylaws, and the adoption of Mission and Vision Statements.

MISSION STATEMENT: *To Enhance Mobility in Colorado by Increasing Capacity Through the Creative Development of a Statewide System of Toll Facilities.*

VISION STATEMENT: *To Enhance the Quality of Life and the Environment of the Citizens of Colorado by Creating a Tolling System to Further Move People and Goods.*

The Board of the Colorado Tolling Enterprise requested a loan of \$1 million from the Colorado Transportation Commission to fund start-up costs in connection with the formation and operation of the Colorado Tolling Enterprise, and for conducting a Statewide Tolling System Traffic and Revenue Feasibility Analysis. The Transportation Commission approved the loan request and an Interagency Agreement between the Colorado Department of Transportation and the Colorado Tolling Enterprise was signed on March 20, 2003. The loan is not required to be repaid until such time as the Colorado Tolling Enterprise issues revenue bonds for a toll project and can repay the loan.

The Colorado Tolling Enterprise can finance and build toll facilities anywhere within the State of Colorado, in any corridor as long as it is identified as the preferred alternative in the necessary environmental study. This flexibility allows the Enterprise to build toll facilities where they are most needed and can be financed and operated efficiently. House Bill 05-1148 further clarified the relationship of toll projects to regional transportation planning processes and stated under what conditions, revenues from toll facilities could be used toward a system.

2.0 FISCAL YEAR 2005 ACTIVITIES

2.1 COLORADO TOLLING ENTERPRISE BOARD MEMBERSHIP

On October 16, 2004, annual elections were held for the Colorado Tolling Enterprise Board of Directors. The State Transportation Commissioners serve a dual role as the CTE Board but officers are not the same. Director Joe Jehn was elected Chairman with Director Joe Blake as Vice Chairman. Jennifer Webster remained as Secretary to the Board and Peggy Catlin continued as the Acting Executive Director. Additional Board members for FY 05 included:

JOE BLAKE*	District 1 <i>(Denver County)</i>
JOE JEHN*	District 2 <i>(Jefferson County)</i>
GREG MCKNIGHT	District 3 <i>(Arapahoe and Douglas Counties)</i>
BILL SWENSON	District 4 <i>(Boulder and Adams Counties)</i>
BILL KAUFMAN	District 5 <i>(Larimer, Morgan, and Weld Counties)</i>
TOM WALSH	District 6 <i>(Clear Creek, Gilpin, Grand, Jackson, Moffat, Routt, and Rio Blanco Counties)</i>
DOUG ADEN	District 7 <i>(Chaffee, Delta, Eagle, Garfield, Gunnison, Lake, Mesa, Montrose, Ouray, Pitkin, and Summit Counties)</i>
STEVE PARKER	District 8 <i>(Alamosa, Archuleta, Conejos, Costilla, Dolores, Hindsdale, La Plata, Mineral, Montezuma, Rio Grande, San Miguel, and San Juan Counties)</i>
TERRY SCHOOLER	District 9 <i>(El Paso, Fremont, Park, and Teller Counties)</i>
GEORGE TEMPEL	District 10 <i>(Baca, Bent, Crowley, Custer, Huerfano, Kiowa, Las Animas, Otero, Prowers, and Pueblo Counties)</i>
KIMBRA KILLIN	District 11 <i>(Cheyenne, Elbert, Kit Carson, Lincoln, Logan, Phillips, Sedgwick, Washington, and Yuma Counties)</i>
PEGGY CATLIN	Colorado Tolling Enterprise Acting Executive Director
JENNIFER WEBSTER	Colorado Tolling Enterprise Secretary

*Note Chair and Vice-Chair of the Board of Directors

2.2 COLORADO TOLLING ENTERPRISE STAFF

The Colorado Tolling Enterprise staff consists of Acting Director Peggy Catlin, with Harry Morrow providing legal support from the Office of the Attorney General. Additional support staff is provided from CDOT with time billed to the Colorado Tolling Enterprise cost center. Work is outsourced to consultants and vendors with expertise in issues related to tolling, including, but not limited to, planners, engineers, financial, and legal support. All expenditures are tracked independently from CDOT expenses to maintain a clear separation of the two organizations.

2.3 MEETING DATES AND ADOPTED RESOLUTIONS

The 2005 fiscal year for the Colorado Tolling Enterprise operated from July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2005. During this 12-month period, the Tolling Enterprise Board of Directors met nine times, (a minimum of eight meetings are required annually), and adopted and/or approved the following Resolutions.

FY 2005 Meeting Dates

- | | |
|----------------------|---------------------|
| 1. July 15, 2004 | 6. January 20, 2005 |
| 2. August 26, 2004 | 7. March 17, 2005 |
| 4. October 21, 2004 | 8. April 21, 2005 |
| 5. December 15, 2004 | 9. May 19, 2005 |

Resolution No.	Resolution Description	Date Adopted
CTE-26	Board approved meeting minutes of June 17, 2004	July 15, 2004
CTE-27	Board approved meeting minutes of July 14 & 15, 2004	August 26, 2004
CTE-28	Approve the Business Rule pertaining to Emergency Services, Customer Services & Violation Processing	August 26, 2004
CTE-29	Board approved meeting minutes of August 26, 2004	October 21, 2004
CTE-30	Board approved meeting minutes of October 21, 2004	December 15, 2004
CTE-31	Board approved meeting minutes of December 15, 2004	January 20, 2005
CTE-32	Board approved meeting minutes of January 20, 2005	March 17, 2005
CTE-33	Board approved meeting minutes of March 17, 2005	April 21, 2005
CTE-34	Board approved meeting minutes of April 21, 2005	May 19, 2005
CTE-35	Approve Setting a DBE Goal of 10% General Engineering Consultant Request for Proposal	May 19, 2005

The primary activities of the CTE for FY 2005 consisted of:

- Development of processes and policy for regional transportation plan amendments
- I-25 HOT lanes implementation
- Coordination with candidate corridors through the environmental processes

These activities are detailed further in Sections 4 and 5.

3.0 FINANCIAL STATUS

No incoming revenue is being generated by the Colorado Tolling Enterprise and none is anticipated until a toll project is constructed and tolls are collected. The Enterprise is financing its startup costs through a loan from the Colorado Transportation Commission for \$1 million. This loan primarily funded a Traffic and Revenue Feasibility Study and the development of a draft business plan.

The Transportation Commission approved a subsequent loan to the CTE to fund construction activities and procurement of toll collection equipment and software and other technologies (such as dynamic message signs), for the conversion of approximately 6 miles of I-25 High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes to High Occupancy Toll (HOT) lanes. This loan was for \$6 million and will be repaid to the Transportation Commission through tolls charged to Single Occupant Vehicles that choose to use that facility. The original loan for start-up costs applies to statewide activities and will be repaid to the Commission upon completion of other toll corridors.

3.1 EXPENSES

The Colorado Tolling Enterprise expended \$72,861.14 during fiscal year 2005. However, there had been charges mistakenly attributed in the previous fiscal year to the CTE that were credited back, resulting in a net expenditure of \$59,281.53. These expenses are broken down as follows:

➤ Support Staff	\$ 8,959.82
➤ Consultants	\$ 56,183.22
➤ Advertising and Reproduction Costs	\$ 2,259.71
➤ Travel Expenses	\$ 2,560.39
➤ Membership Dues*	\$ 2,898.00
➤ Credit from Prior Year's Error	<u>\$(13,579.61)</u>

Total Expended in FY 05: \$ 59,281.53

** Membership dues are for associations that staff and CTE Board members may utilize as a source to research best practices in tolling. FY05 dues were paid to the International Bridge Tunnel and Turnpike Association (IBTTA). The other Public Highway Authorities in Colorado, E-470 and Northwest Parkway are also members of this organization.*

4.0 AD HOC COMMITTEE ON TOLLING

The legislation authorizing CTE requires that:

“A toll highway financed, constructed, operated, or maintained pursuant to this part 8 shall conform to and be an approved part of the applicable regional transportation plan and the statewide transportation plan developed pursuant to section 43-1-1103.”

HB05-1148 clarified that

“The Board shall develop a plan for the construction of a toll highway that addresses the operation of the toll highway, the technology to be utilized, the project feasibility, the project financing, and any other federally required information. Each toll highway plan in a toll highway system shall be separately approved by each metropolitan planning organization or regional planning commission that is located in whole or in part within the toll highway system.”

Tolling is a new concept for Colorado and there are many issues requiring discussion and resolution prior to implementation. This includes the development of policies and processes that guide decision making. The CTE recognizes the need for a well coordinated decision-making process and an integrated regional and statewide transportation system. Existing state transportation planning processes are sound, and rather than creating a whole new process, the CTE Board invited potentially affected planning partners to participate in this Ad Hoc Committee on Tolling (The Committee) to provide guidance to the CTE and as appropriate to CDOT/TC.

The CTE requested participation from planning partners whose area includes potential tolling facilities as identified through an initial round of technical and financial screening studies. The invited membership consisted of 22 board and/or executive staff members from potentially affected regional planning agencies as listed below:

- Denver Regional Council of Governments Board (DRCOG)
 - Lorraine Anderson – Councilmember, City of Arvada
 - Bob Broom – Councilmember, City of Aurora
 - Rene Bullock – Councilmember, Commerce City
 - Happy Haynes – Council Liaison, City and Council of Denver
 - Bill Macy – Councilmember, City of Idaho Springs
 - Bob Nelson – Mayor Pro Tem, City of Golden
 - Jack O’Boyle – Mayor, City of Lone Tree
 - Karen Stuart – Mayor, City and County of Broomfield
 - Will Toor – County Commissioner, Boulder County

- Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments Board (PPACG)
 - Jerry Heimlicher – Councilmember, City of Colorado Springs
 - Wayne Williams – County Commissioner, El Paso County

- North Front Range Transportation and Air Quality Planning Council Board (NFR)
 - Glenn Gibson – County Commissioner, Larimer County
 - Kurt Kastein – Councilmember, City of Fort Collins
- Upper Front Range Regional Planning Council
 - Mike Geile – County Commissioner, Weld County
- Intermountain Regional Planning Council
 - Mick Ireland – Pitkin County Commissioner
- Denver Regional Transit District (RTD) Board
 - Bill McMullen – Board Member, RTD District E
- Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
 - David Nicol – Colorado Division Administrator
- Colorado Toll Enterprise Board (CTE)
 - Terry Schooler – Board Member
 - Joseph Jehn – Board Member
 - Joseph Blake – Board Member
 - Douglas Aden – Board Member
- CTE Acting Executive Director
 - Peggy Catlin

The Committee was created to advise the TC and the CTE Board regarding “policy and process on toll road planning and implementation”. It convened on January 25, 2005 and met 9 times.

The Committee agreed to operate on a consensus basis and recognized there may be a need to allow for minority reports should a committee member so desire. No committee members have submitted minority reports.

Following a series of informational and background presentations on tolling and the statutory basis and structure of transportation planning in Colorado, the Committee structured their work by considering when in the decision-making process specific issues and concerns should be addressed.

In this effort, the Committee identified 56 questions/issues in seven categories related to major steps in the decision-making process from policy to implementation. The Committee then discussed and developed consensus recommendations on the following areas:

- Toll-Related Decision Processes
- Roles and Responsibilities in Toll-Related Decision-making
- Toll System Regional Transportation Plan Amendment Analysis Framework
- Identification of Key Policy Issues and Recommended Policy Positions.

One key difference between a toll revenue-funded project and the traditional tax supported transportation project is the important role of the private sector in the decision to fund a proposed project. Most toll projects will involve funding by the private financial markets and/or other contributions by the private sector. It is therefore necessary for any proposal that includes toll revenue-based financing to be acceptable to the financial markets, and perhaps the private sector for implementation and operation.

Key roles and responsibilities of the partner agencies in the toll decision-making process that included the private sector was discussed.

The Committee also identified the critical topics that should be addressed in any proposed amendment to a regional transportation plan that includes a tolling system or facility

The Committee noted that a proposal to amend the regional plan would need to meet the federal and state requirements regarding fiscal constraint by developing a planning level "Financing/Revenue Plan" based on the toll system defined in the proposed amendment. The plan should include a planning level financial analysis that addresses how revenues and costs of toll facilities relate to system implementation timing and corridor phasing, revenue and cost sharing among corridors, as well as system financing assumptions, consistent with the criteria identified. The Committee recognized that such a financial analysis would be based on the information and detail available at a planning level (much as was required for FasTracks).

The Committee also recognized that if a RTP amendment submittal adequately addresses the topics as identified in the Framework Matrix at a planning level the Regional Planning Commission/MPO Boards will have sufficient information from which to take action on a proposed amendment.

The Committee identified a number of key policy questions or issues that they felt would need to be addressed and resolved before they felt a Regional Planning Council/MPO Board would be willing to take action on a proposed amendment to include a tolling system or facility in a regional transportation plan.

Policy Issue 1: CDOT resource allocation

- a. Any tolling decision by CTE should not reduce the allocation of TC funding to the region in which the facility or system lies.
- b. Tolling revenue should not be considered when calculating the proportion of state or federal highway funds received by a transportation planning region or CDOT region.
- c. Toll facilities should not be included in the state highway inventory used for resource allocation purposes

Policy Issue 2: Definition of a toll system

- a. An integrated toll system should be defined as a network of toll facilities and toll corridor improvements identified in the adopted regional transportation plan.
- b. Revenue sharing may occur among facilities within an integrated toll system.
- c. Revenue sharing between toll facilities on an integrated toll system must be within the same TPR/MPO or, when the system crosses TPR/MPO boundaries, with the mutual agreement from the adjoining TPR/MPOs.
- d. CTE is encouraged to undertake a public education campaign before proposing an amendment to include specific toll facility or system in a regional plan.

Policy Issue 3: Integration of other modes into the toll system

- a. It is appropriate to acknowledge and pursue ways to integrate tolling and other modes. The decision on whether/how to integrate alternative modes into a toll system/corridor should be a cooperative CDOT/CTE-TPR/MPO decision based on Regional Transportation Plan, National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and financing decisions by bond markets.
- b. All assumptions will be refined through the regional plan/NEPA/market feasibility analyses. There are two opportunities for integration of alternative modes one - at initial project financing (item c below), and two - if the toll facility generates revenue above that needed for operations and maintenance (item d below).

- c. Initial project financing may include “toll corridor related improvements” (defined in d. below) as part of the project scope as determined on a corridor specific basis and associated financial feasibility analysis.
- Capital construction, financing and related obligations, maintenance, operations, replacement and responsibilities to bond holder should be the highest priority for toll revenues.
 - Public transit buses may use toll facilities free of charge
 - The decision on whether, or at what rate, High Occupancy Vehicles should be tolled is a corridor specific decision made cooperatively between CDOT/CTE and the TPR/MPO.
 - Right of way needs/costs should be considered for all modes as part of the tolling analysis, regardless of whether or not alternative modes become part of the initial toll financing

Implementation of “toll corridor-related improvements” with toll revenue should be considered as part of any decision to reduce toll rates after bond and ongoing maintenance, operation and replacement obligations are satisfied.

- d. “Toll corridor-related improvements” should be defined as improvements beyond those necessary to implement the basic scope for a toll facility, including, but not limited to:
- Alternative mode improvements such as public transit, bicycle, and pedestrian
 - Roadway improvements not included in the basic project scope
 - Open Space acquisition
 - Utilities

Policy Issue 4: Funding of long term operations, maintenance and replacement costs

Toll Revenues should be used for the planning, design, financing, administration, construction, operations, maintenance, and reconstruction of the toll facilities.

Policy Issue 5: Leveraging tolling and federal/state dollars/Effect of tolling on project selection

- a. Tolling and other modal improvements should not be viewed as competing, but as key components of an integrated transportation system necessary to provide a full range of travel choices to the public.
- b. Shared funding sources to implement an integrated transportation system can result in additional funding for the entire transportation system.

- c. Use of toll credits as a soft match for federal funding for any transportation purpose allowed under Title 23 of the Code of Federal Regulations may leverage funds for the region.
- d. Toll revenue may be used as a local match to leverage additional federal transportation funding consistent with CTE/TC and MPO/TPR objectives.
- e. Federal, state and local funds may be used to leverage toll financing, consistent with any state and federal restrictions. The eligibility of a tolling facility for federal transportation funds will be determined with FTA or FHWA on a corridor or system basis based on the characteristics of the specific proposal and financial plan.
- f. Toll revenue may be used to repay a TPR/MPO that programs federal/state/local funds to finance a toll facility/system (subject to TABOR limitations), recognizing that priorities for the use of federal and state transportation funds are set through the cooperative state and regional transportation planning and programming process.
- g. Use of federal/state/local funds to leverage financing, and the use of toll revenue to repay such funds, must be documented in a memorandum of understanding (MOU) between the CTE, CDOT, and the regional planning commission/MPO. The MOU should include reasonable assurances that any repayment of funds by CTE to CDOT should be allocated by the TC to the region and/or program from which the funds originated.
- h. The highest priorities for toll revenues are capital construction, financing and related obligations, maintenance, operations, replacement and other named responsibilities to bond holders.
- i. The relationship between tolling and transit ridership, as well as a demographic analysis of toll facility users, will be evaluated as part of the request to include a toll system in the regional transportation plan, as well as in the NEPA analysis. This information will aid decision-makers in their actions regarding tolling and financing.
- j. CTE recognizes that TPR/MPOs have the responsibility to propose projects that match the long-range vision for transportation within the region. Conversely the TPR/MPO and sponsoring agency have the responsibility to solicit formal comments from CTE on proposed projects, including, but not limited to, parallel access controlled freeways, that may compete with current and proposed toll facilities, or otherwise affect the

ability of CTE to meet its obligations. The CTE has the responsibility to respond to requests for comment from a TPR/MPO in a timely fashion.

- k. The CTE has the responsibility to provide guidance that the TPR/MPOs should use to determine what could constitute a competing project.

Policy Issue 6: Assumptions Used By Market in the Financial Feasibility/Market Analysis

- a. The TPR/MPOs recognize that CTE has the responsibility to propose tolling projects that are financially attractive to the markets and consistent with agreements and commitments made through the RTP, NEPA and financing agreements.
- b. If the financial markets do not support a proposal by CTE, the planning partners commit to re-evaluate the project scope and feasibility to determine if the project can be modified to be financially viable. If modified the necessary changes will be processed as appropriate through the RTP, NEPA document and financial agreements.

Conclusion - Next Steps

The Committee recommendations were provided to the TC and CTE Board in this report with the comments from the STAC, for their review and consideration, according to the following process.

- **Presentation to State Transportation Advisory Committee (STAC):** This Committee report was provided to the STAC for review so that the TC and the CTE can consider the STAC comments when evaluating the recommendations of The Committee. The STAC, which consists of representatives from each of the fifteen regional transportation planning commissions, has the statutory responsibility to advise the CDOT on planning related issues.
- **TC/CTE Workshops:** The TC and the CTE considered these recommendations, STAC comments, and provided an opportunity for public comment in a workshop setting at their August and October 2005 meetings.
- **MPO/TPR Discussion:** Each affected MPO/TPR discussed with its board and/or advisory committees the recommendations included in this report through its individual decision making procedures.
- **Action by TC/CTE:** Based on public comment and comments from the MPO/TPR's, the TC/CTE will consider taking action on the applicable proposed policies and procedures recommended in this report.

- **Action by MPO/TPR:** Based on public comment and comments from the TC/CTE, the MPO/TPR Boards will consider taking action on the applicable proposed policies and procedures recommended in the report.

5.0 TOLL PROJECTS

Tolling is being considered to add *new capacity* (new highways or additional lanes) that cannot otherwise be funded under current and projected transportation funding scenarios. Tolling of existing lanes is *not* being considered and is *not* allowed under law. (The only exception to this is the I-25 HOV/HOT lanes conversion project north of downtown Denver.)

There are no “free roads”. Most roads are supported by motorists who pay gasoline taxes – whether they drive on a specific road or not! Toll roads are supported by those that choose to use them as limited or no gas tax revenue is required to build or maintain them. Those that use a toll road pay for it.

Studies indicate that toll roads are used by all socio-economic groups. The majority of users are not expected to use a toll/road lane for every trip. In Colorado, motorists will also have the choice to use the adjacent or nearby non-toll alternatives as well.

Tolling is about choice—it only presents an alternative. It allows people to choose whether or not to use a toll road based on how bad traffic is and what they feel their time is worth.

One of the greatest benefits of a toll lane/road is that it offers a predictable travel time compared to a non-toll alternative. Toll lane prices can vary by level of congestion to ensure that traffic always flows freely, unlike an unpredictable average highway lane. A toll lane is a reliable, non-congested alternative to adding a “free” lane that will likely become congested later on. Having a predictable toll alternative is important to businesses and emergency responders, and may be important to many individuals as well.

Think of tolling like you would mail service. You can use the US Postal Service and pay a fee to mail your package with the knowledge it will arrive in a few days. However, if you absolutely need for your package to get there quickly or by a certain date, you may opt to use FedEx and pay a little bit more for that service but have a guarantee that it will get there when you need it to.

The majority of users of existing toll lanes in other states do not use the lanes for every trip. It is expected that the majority of users will use toll lanes just some of the time. Those are the times when people really need a congestion-free, reliable trip. Toll lanes provide a choice for a parent who doesn't want to be late to their child's sporting event, or an employee who has an important meeting. The adjacent “free” lanes will always provide another option for those who choose not to use the toll lanes.

Tolling is being considered as *part* of the solution to today's transportation challenges. It is estimated that between now and the year 2030, Colorado needs to invest approximately \$123 billion just to sustain our existing statewide transportation system. That compares to only about \$75 billion in anticipated revenue. That equates to an estimated \$48 billion dollar shortfall – just to maintain the level of service on the highways we have now!

- By the year 2030, the percentage of congested lane miles in Colorado is expected to spike by 161 percent.
- Traveler delay due to congestion in the Denver, Boulder and Colorado Springs areas now costs more than \$1 billion, or \$1,426 per traveler annually.

With this in mind, CDOT has considered a number of potential projects as described below.

5.1 POTENTIAL TOLL CORRIDORS

CDOT has initiated a number of environmental studies that include toll lanes or toll roads as alternatives to be considered. These include:

- US 36
- I-70 East
- C-470
- NW Corridor
- I-70 Mountain
- I-25 North

Other corridors under consideration, but without formal Environmental studies underway include the Colorado Springs Toll Road, I-225, and I-270.

5.2 I-25 HOT LANES

The introduction of High Occupancy Toll (HOT) lanes, a partnership with the Colorado Department of Transportation, the City and County of Denver, and the Regional Transportation District has been approved conceptually by FHWA and FTA. This HOT lanes concept would allow single occupant vehicles to use the High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes for a fee, depending on the time of day. The limits of the project are generally from Denver Union Station, to US36, in the barrier separated Bus/HOV lanes on I-25. Buses and carpools would continue to travel as they do currently, but single occupancy drivers could choose to pay a toll to drive in the lane. The prices will vary, based on peak demand in the corridor, i.e., as congestion increases, the price to travel in those lanes becomes a premium. Solo drivers still have the option of traveling in the general purpose lanes of I-25 for no charge, but now they have a choice if they need a faster, more reliable trip.

The Colorado Tolling Enterprise will operate the facility and is in the process of negotiating with E-470 to provide electronic toll collection services, and technology backup. The concept would be that Colorado drivers who drove E-470, NW Parkway, or the I-25 HOT lanes would only receive one invoice and would only be required to have one transponder.

Buses on the corridor and carpools will continue to have priority, but those solo drivers who choose to pay a toll, will now provide some revenue to offset the operations and maintenance of the facility.

Anticipated opening and monitoring of this facility is June of 2006.

6.0 TOLL RATES AND INTEROPERABILITY

6.1 TOLL RATES

A schedule of toll rates has not yet been established by the Colorado Tolling Enterprise. Toll rates will be determined after toll system traffic and revenue feasibility analysis is completed and the first toll project is advanced. In pursuit of establishing a system of toll facilities and toll rates, the Enterprise is coordinating with other public highway authorities within Colorado, specifically the E-470 Public Highway Authority and the Northwest Parkway Public Highway Authority, on interoperability issues and tolling rate structures.

6.2 INTEROPERABILITY

Interoperability refers to the ability of a toll collection system to use the parts, equipment, and user support services of other systems. Due to the various toll facilities that now exist or will exist in the state, it is essential to the cost effective deployment of numerous Intelligent Transportation System applications that these systems be available to all drivers that may use the toll facilities. One of the goals of the Colorado Tolling Enterprise is to provide for interoperability between the Enterprise projects and other toll facilities within the system

7.0 RECOMMENDED STATUTORY CHANGES

There are provisions in the new Federal SAFETEA-LU bill that provide opportunities for innovative financing with the private sector for highway projects. There may be some opportunity to adjust current state statutes to accommodate this new federal law.