



**COLORADO**  
Department of  
Transportation

**Statewide Transportation Advisory Committee (STAC)**  
**May 20, 2016**  
**9:00 AM – 12:00 PM**  
**CDOT HQ Auditorium, 4201 E. Arkansas Ave., Denver, CO**  
**Agenda**

- 9:00-9:05**     **Welcome and Introductions** – Vince Rogalski, STAC Chair
- 9:05-9:10**     **Approval of April Meeting Minutes** – Vince Rogalski
- 9:10-9:20**     **Transportation Commission Report (Informational Update)** – Vince Rogalski
- Summary report of the most recent Transportation Commission meeting.
- 9:20-9:30**     **Chief Engineer Update (Informational Update)** – Joshua Laipply, CDOT Chief Engineer
- 9:30-9:50**     **TPR Reports (Informational Update)** – STAC Representatives
- Brief update from STAC members on activities in their TPRs.
- 9:50-10:10**   **Federal and State Legislative Report (Informational Update)** – Herman Stockinger & Andy Karsian, CDOT Office of Policy and Government Relations (OPGR)
- Update on recent federal and state legislative activity.
- 10:10-10:20**   **Discretionary Grants Update** – Debra Perkins-Smith, CDOT Division of Transportation Development (DTD)
- Update on recent discretionary grant applications.
- 10:20-10:30**   **Break**
- 10:30-10:50**   **CMAQ Alt Fuels Colorado Program Update (Informational Update)** – Steve McCannon, Regional Air Quality Council (RAQC), & Wes Maurer, Colorado Energy Office (CEO)
- Update on status of Alt Fuels Colorado Program.
- 10:50-11:05**   **STAC Retreat and the Role of STAC (Informational Update and Discussion)** – Vince Rogalski
- Discussion of STAC Retreat and the role of STAC.
- 11:05-11:15**   **Safe Routes to School (Informational Update)** – Leslie Feuerborn, DTD
- Update on Safe Routes to School program and FY 16 project awards.
- 11:15-11:30**   **Development Program (Informational Update and Discussion)** – Jeff Sudmeier, DTD
- Update on next steps in Development Program process to identify priorities for major investments based on the transportation planning process and Regional Transportation Plans.
- 11:30-11:40**   **SWP Lessons Learned (Informational Update and Discussion)** – Michelle Scheurman, DTD
- Update on SWP Lessons Learned and discussion on next steps.
- 11:40-11:55**   **Statewide Travel Model Overview and Coordination (Informational Update and Discussion)** – Michelle Scheurman & Erik Sabina, DTD
- Overview and discussion of CDOT's Statewide Travel Model and potential applications for planning.
- 11:55-12:00**   **Other Business**- Vince Rogalski
- 12:00**         **Adjourn**

**Future Agenda Topics**

- **Bike/Ped Update** – Update on current bicycle and pedestrian activities and initiatives
- **Critical Urban/Rural Freight Corridors** – Update/discussion on designation of freight corridors
- **Stakeholder/Public Outreach** – Update/discussion on additional stakeholder and public outreach activities

STAC Conference Call Information: 1-877-820-7831 321805#

STAC Website: <http://www.coloradodot.info/programs/statewide-planning/stac.html>

**Draft STAC Meeting Minutes  
April 29, 2016**

**Location:** CDOT Headquarters Auditorium

**Date/Time:** April 29<sup>th</sup>, 9:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.

**Chairman:** Vince Rogalski, STAC Chair

**Attendance:**

In Person: Vince Rogalski (GV), Chuck Grobe (NW), Elise Jones (DRCOG), Terry Blackmore (NFR MPO), Norm Steen (PPACG), Andy Pico (PPACG), Craig Casper (PPACG), Sean Conway (NFRMPO), Jim Baldwin (SE), Todd Hollenbeck (GVMPO), Peter Baier (GVMPO), Gary Beedy (EA), Walt Boulden (SC), Scott Hobson (PACOG).

On the Phone: Kevin Hall (SW), Stephanie Gonzales (SE).

<b>Agenda Items/ Presenters/Affiliations</b>	<b>Presentation Highlights</b>	<b>Actions</b>
Introductions & March Minutes / Vince Rogalski (STAC Chair)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of March STAC Minutes.</li> </ul> <p><b>STAC Comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Norm Steen</u>: On page 7 of the March STAC Minutes it indicates that HB 1304 requires a yearly transportation conversation with the public. However, it only requires a one-time conversation.</li> </ul>	Minutes approved.
STIP Update / Jamie Collins (CDOT Office of Financial Management & Budget)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Roughly 35 members of the public came to speak on the draft STIP at the last TC meeting. Most were commenting on the Central 70 project.</li> <li>• We will consolidate all comments and our responses in our final STIP document and submit it to the TC for their approval in May.</li> </ul>	No action taken.
Transportation Commission Report / Vince Rogalski (STAC Chair)	<p><b>Presentation</b> <i>High Performance Transportation Enterprise</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HPTE is discussing a number of different projects from the past, present, and future.</li> </ul>	No action taken.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The members talked about the US 36 post-project assessment, and so far the results are very positive.</li> <li>• Bidding on Central 70 is still in progress with 4 potential teams in the running. As mentioned before, many of the comments from the public were on this topic, both for and against, and the conversation was very orderly.</li> <li>• A winning bidder has been selected for the C-470 project and we anticipate construction to start in mid to late summer.</li> </ul> <p><i>Transportation Commission</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Risk and resiliency is a topic of increasing discussion – how do we deal with road closures like those on I-70 and their impacts on other parts of the state?</li> <li>• Commissioner Berry led an open house with businesses participating in the Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Program with very fruitful conversation between CDOT and those business leaders in a small group, workshop setting.</li> </ul> <p><b>STAC Comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Norm Steen</u>: Was there any discussion of how STAC and the TC will work together in the future in light of the recent legislation strengthening STAC’s advisory role?</li> <li>• <u>Vince Rogalski</u>: I am attending the TC meetings on behalf of the STAC and we will continue to work on that in the future. One idea is convene a retreat for us to discuss our new relationship. That’s in the planning stage.</li> <li>• <u>Sean Conway</u>: Are we waiting for the TC to come to us with a proposed arrangement? If so, I think that the Legislature was very clear in its intent to have the STAC work more closely with the TC – all STAC members, rather than just the chair.</li> <li>• <u>Debra Perkins-Smith</u>: We think it would be opportune to host that STAC retreat, meet with TC and figure out together what it means for us going forward. This would be the beginning of the discussion, not the entire coordination. Right now we’re looking for good dates – any thoughts from the group on that?</li> <li>• <u>Herman Stockinger</u>: In a few weeks when the legislative session ends we’re going to meet with TC to summarize all of the transportation bills that were</li> </ul>	
--	--	--

	<p>passed, so in another month we can have that prepared and then come back with a plan that is much more detailed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Sean Conway</u>: That’s fair, thanks.</li> </ul>	
<p>Chief Engineer Update / Joshua Laipply (CDOT Chief Engineer)</p>	<p><b>Presentation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There has been a lot of discussion of Central 70 and specifically what DRCOG and City and County of Denver are contributing to the project.</li> <li>• This handout lays out all the numbers, including “soft costs”, ROW costs, etc. Between the two it totals around \$82 million.</li> <li>• The back side of the document shows some information on Bridge Enterprise and why it makes sense to use it on this project. Initially there were 128 bridges listed in the FASTER legislation that needed to be addressed, and this is the only one yet to be tackled.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Of the 128 bridges, 121 were completed using BE funds and the remainder were funded via other sources.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• It also constitutes roughly 50% of all the current “poor” bridge deck area in the state, so it will make a significant impact there as well.</li> </ul> <p><b>STAC Comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Terri Blackmore</u>: We should recognize the fact that this is the last FASTER bridge to be addressed. If you could add it to this sheet that would help us when we talk with our Board next week.</li> <li>• <u>Joshua Laipply</u>: We can get that to you ASAP.</li> <li>• <u>Andy Pico</u>: I’m not disputing the math but when you spend half of your estimated revenues for the next 20 years on a single project, even if you’ve already completed 121 others it’s still worrisome. What other projects aren’t getting done as a result of this? Also, what percentage of this project is really a storm water viaduct and why isn’t there any storm water funding going into it? Shouldn’t local agencies be contributing to the local storm water aspect of this project? It doesn’t make sense to me that no money from the statewide storm water enterprise is going to this project. What percentage, if any, of the local contribution is coming from that statewide fund?</li> <li>• <u>Joshua Laipply</u>: Yes, I understand your concerns. But we have an obligation from the state and federal government to reduce our poor deck</li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>

	<p>area and this project accounts for 50% of that, so it's a big impact. I can also look into the drainage issue and get you more information on that.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Debra Perkins-Smith</u>: One of the decisions that was made by the TC was to set aside 50% of the Bridge Enterprise funding to continue on other bridge projects rather than putting all of it into the Central 70 project and conclude it more quickly. So because of that decision we are able to continue funding other state priorities along with the Central 70 viaduct over the coming years.</li> <li>• <u>Sean Conway</u>: I want to thank Josh and Herman for keeping us in the loop on this, there are a lot of moving parts and factors to consider here and we appreciate you working with us.</li> </ul>	
<p>TPR Reports / TPR Representatives</p>	<p><b>Presentation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>NFRMPO</u>: The MPO submitted a FASTLANE grant app for North I-25 between SH 402 and SH 14 for \$137.6 million, and local match from regional communities came to \$24.5 million, in some of these small towns it works out to nearly \$400 per capita, indicating a clear commitment by these communities to partnering with CDOT, every governmental entity along the route contributed; the MPO also supported the plan to dedicate its FY19 and FY20 RPP funds (roughly \$2.2 million) for the US 34 PEL study and hopefully we will be able to release the RFP on that very soon; the MPO installed 2 permanent bike/ped counters along the Poudre River trail and purchased 3 counters that will be shared by communities along the trail and are able to count both bikes and cars simultaneously.</li> <li>• <u>Southeast TPR</u>: Holly overpass will be finished by end of June; Lamar Reliever Route working on ROW issues currently, utilities and paving to start sometime next year; concrete repair on US 287 starting June 1<sup>st</sup> with 24-hour lane closures to come; culvert replacements on SH 266 have been completed.</li> <li>• <u>PPACG</u>: Our TIP is out for comment; HB 1304 legislation has passed the House and assigned to Senate's State Veterans and Military Affairs committee; requires 15 meetings throughout the state inviting all elected officials to be invited, and significant outreach efforts including television, radio, social media, etc. CCI has opposed the bill and I think it's a bad idea, but CDOT has spoken in favor of it. This will affect all of us, and my big question is how we would use this input from the public in terms of adjusting</li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>

the statewide or regional plans accordingly. I would love to hear others' thoughts on this topic.

**STAC Comments**

- Sean Conway: Can Herman explain why CDOT spoke in favor of this?
- Herman Stockinger: We're already planning to go out and have this type of conversation over as a follow up to the SWP. We think it's good to have this type of discussion but I think that the bill will face a tougher road in the House than the Senate. We're going to go for input regardless of whether this bill passes or not, and if it does we can incorporate this material into the existing effort. Another thing to consider is that if this law passes *and* there is a transportation ballot initiative in November, we would be required to do this outreach to the public talking about transportation funding and priorities. There is also a concern that if we're going out and asking whether people want to pay more for transportation at the same time that there's a ballot initiative supporting that same concept, where is the line for lobbying versus public outreach?
- Debra Perkins-Smith: One of the things that we're going to be doing is more of the Telephone Town Halls that were very popular during the SWP process. Another is that we want the SWP to be a living document, not something that sits on the shelf. So we're doing a series of events called "Together We Go" that update people on what's changed since the SWP was adopted (such as the FAST Act, updated SB 228 list, etc.) We want to verify that we still are reflecting the public's priorities given these changes. The third piece is that the Public Information Office is working to bring greater transportation knowledge and awareness to the public more generally, so that can also align with this effort if it passes. Overall we want to fit this bill, if it passes, into the existing process rather than creating something brand new.
- Andy Pico: My concern is that CDOT has already been doing this type of outreach, and now our support for the bill implies that we weren't or that we weren't doing it well enough. I think CDOT should stand up to this rather than going along with it.
- Herman Stockinger: Understood, your critique is noted and appreciated.

**Presentation**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>PACOG</u>: Received notification of Safe Routes to School (SRTS) grants awarded to the area; coordinating with the railroad on some minor ROW issues on the ILEX project; 2017-2020 TIP is out for public comment.</li> <li>• <u>GVMPO</u>: Horizon Drive FASTER project going well so far, a main exit from I-70 to downtown Grand Junction including several new roundabouts, is moving forward; other grant opportunities are being explored; 2017-2021 TIP is out for public review; conducting a route operations and schedule analysis for Grand Valley Transit.</li> <li>• <u>Eastern</u>: TPR meeting is next Monday so not much to report; several summer projects are gearing up; pleased that FHWA released guidance for selection of critical urban and rural freight corridors so they can be incorporated into the Multimodal Freight Plan moving forward.</li> <li>• <u>South Central</u>: Overlay bridge work occurring in the area near Aguilar; Las Animas and Huerfano counties submitting a joint TAP application to do a feasibility study of a bike trail along SH 12.</li> <li>• <u>DRCOG</u>: Held annual awards ceremony during the past week, it was very well-attended, Transportation Commissioner Ed Peterson was recognized and received an award, Jack Hilbert was awarded the J.B. Christianson Award; RTD's new A-line to DIA opening event occurred on April 22, 2016 and has received rave reviews; US 36 Managed Lanes have seen a 45% ridership increase since last August and US 36 is experiencing an increase in travel speeds of approximately 30%.</li> <li>• <u>Northwest</u>: Weather is delaying the start of some of our local projects; SH 9 has its asphalt removed and is a dirt road for about 10 miles; 2-3 miles of widening on SH 13 south of Meeker that will begin next week; bridge over Yampa River south of Craig will have some full-day outages over the course of the summer.</li> <li>• <u>Gunnison Valley</u>: We currently have a number of overlay projects in the Gunnison area; at our last TPR meeting we had a representative from DTR come to discuss the rural regional bus network and where the gaps in the system are, so people in our area are very excited about that.</li> <li>• <u>Southwest</u>: Several grants being applied for in the TPR including FASTLANES, FLAP, and TAP funding. Thanks to Mike King and Mike Timlin for coming down to update us on rural regional bus network and SWP Lessons Learned activities.</li> </ul>	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>South Central</u>: We discussed the rural regional bus network at our last TPR meeting with Mike Timlin and it was very well-received by the group; the SWP Lessons Learned discussion was very productive and it would be helpful in the future to include a project list to assess needs going forward; our TPR wanted to compliment Region 2 on their great communication with the TPR.</li> </ul>	
<p>Freight Advisory Committee Update / Gary Beedy</p>	<p><b>Presentation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The FAC met yesterday and passed a resolution supporting new funding for freight and for CDOT more generally; we also got an update on CDOT freight activities, evaluation of hazmat routes (including the Eisenhower Tunnel); the state's FASTLANE grant applications will be submitted for US 85, US 287 Lamar, US 550, and a Truck Parking Information System; broke into working groups to decide what issues the group wants to address – one of those being identifying Critical Urban and Rural Freight Corridors to meet FAST Act Requirements by December.</li> </ul> <p><b>STAC Comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Jeff Sudmeier</u>: We've been doing monthly reports to the STAC, and in the last two meetings the FAC has moved beyond the foundational stage and into some more tangible projects to report to the group. We will also be bringing more freight-related conversations to the STAC, such as the identification of FAST Act freight corridors.</li> <li>• <u>Joshua Laipply</u>: We've identified those low clearance bridges in our bridge tracking system and may need to adjust the asset management system to reflect that.</li> <li>• <u>Peter Baier</u>: We have received a request from 5 counties in Eastern Utah that would like to sit down and talk with Western Slope counties about freight issues, and I'd like to know what the FAC's role in that should be.</li> <li>• <u>Debra Perkins-Smith</u>: We would be very interested in that opportunity. The staff contact for freight at CDOT is Jason Wallis. He has been working to build partnerships with neighboring states, so if you can bring them to the FAC for an update in the future that would be very beneficial.</li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>
<p>Federal and State Legislative Report /</p>	<p><b>Presentation</b></p>	<p>No action taken.</p>

<p>Herman Stockinger (CDOT Office of Policy &amp; Government Relations)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TIGER grants are due today so we'll be submitting our application and hoping for some funding; it looks like TIGER will keep going in the future, earlier this week a congressional committee increased the amount by about \$25 million.</li> <li>• The Hospital Provider Bill is being discussed in the House today and may pass to the Senate soon. There is a companion bill going with it that specifies how that money (if approved) will be spent, and one element is that it protects SB 228 money for CDOT. We are already set to receive a full transfer for FY16 funds this June and a three quarters FY17 transfer next summer. If this bill passes it could lead to larger SB 228 transfers in the following 3 years, up to full funding amount and maybe even some extra from the general fund. Overall this is reflective of a change in how legislature views transportation needs as compared to just a few years ago.</li> <li>• Trans Bond II will be introduced in Senate next week, with a funding source of about 6% of the state sales tax that will be bonded against. It includes protections for our Asset Management program, which CDOT appreciates. A project list is being developed but CDOT hasn't been directly involved in that other than providing our own internal lists.</li> <li>• HB 1273 to allow park and ride enforcement died in committee, but it's likely to come back in some form next year.</li> <li>• HB 1172 to expand CDOT Efficiency &amp; Accountability committee still moving, seems likely to pass.</li> <li>• SB 194 would allow use of future sales tax from large development projects to pay for interchanges or other contributing projects moving along, will keep an eye on it.</li> <li>• SB 123 to eliminate the use of transponders was defeated, and would've had the most impact on CDOT.</li> <li>• HB 1169 to allow Tribes to vote in STAC has passed.</li> </ul> <p><b>STAC Comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Sean Conway</u>: I know that you can't comment on the specifics, but what type of position do you expect that CDOT will take on the potential Trans Bond II bill once it's introduced?</li> </ul>	
---	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Herman Stockinger</u>: Sometimes it is best for CDOT to let these conversations occur without taking a position either way, and I think that might be our approach here. We are happy that the proposal includes language that protects CDOT’s asset management approach.</li> <li>• <u>Debra Perkins-Smith</u>: Since the last STAC there’s been a new funding source that’s become available to fund research with other states on the potential for road usage charges (RUCs). It would only be research at this point but CDOT is planning to apply for that funding and investigate the topic further with other states.</li> <li>• <u>Joshua Laipply</u>: This is a visceral issue, but CDOT’s role is to do our research and present the fullest information possible on all the options so that decision-makers and the public may decide for or against them.</li> </ul>	
<p>Statewide Plan Lessons Learned Workshop</p>	<p><i>see workshop notes</i></p>	<p>No action taken.</p>
<p>Other Business / Vince Rogalski (STAC Chairman)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The next STAC meeting will be May 20<sup>th</sup> – one week earlier than usual due to the Memorial Day holiday.</li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>

**STAC ADJOURNS**



**COLORADO**  
**Department of Transportation**  
Division of Transportation Development  
Multimodal Planning Branch  
4201 E. Arkansas Ave. Shumate Bldg.  
Denver, CO 80222-3400

DATE: May 4, 2016  
TO: STAC  
FROM: Michelle Scheuerman, Statewide Planning Manager  
Subject: Commission District Telephone Town Halls

### **Background**

Based on the success of the telephone town halls that were conducted when developing the 2040 Statewide Transportation Plan, the Transportation Commission had expressed to staff their desire to conduct additional telephone town halls in an effort to continue to engage the public on key transportation issues. The premise is to have an annual conversation rather than just reaching out every four years when it's time to develop the next Statewide Transportation Plan.

### **Upcoming Telephone Town Halls**

Keeping budget in mind, the approach is to conduct eight telephone town halls representing different areas of the state. The eight telephone town halls generally align with the commission districts, and will be hosted by a Transportation Commissioner. The exception is the Denver metro area, where a single telephone town hall will cover multiple metro area districts and be co-hosted by two metro area Commissioners. It is our hope to conduct all telephone town halls by the end of June but we are leaving early July as an option in order to accommodate Commissioner schedules. We will provide STAC with additional information, including dates and times as telephone town halls are scheduled.

### **TPR Input**

At the May STAC meeting during the TPR Report-out, staff is requesting that you bring your thoughts on what might be one question you might want to have the public weigh-in on or information you might want to ascertain from telephone town hall participants.

### **Next Steps**

Based on your input, staff will consider how to best include your question or thoughts in developing the telephone town hall script. At a future STAC meeting, staff will share results from the eight telephone town halls.

Thank you.

**Safe Routes to School**  
**FY 2016 Projects Recommended for Funding**

**INFRASTRUCTURE - Total Funding Available - \$2M**

Application #	Applicant	Project Title	Total Project Cost (corrected)	Amount of CDOT funding	Funded?	Region	MPO/TPR	Infra or Non-Infra	Total Score	RANK
15	Summit County Government	Summit Cove Elementary School Pedestrian & Bicycle Safety Improvements	\$ 468,050	\$ 350,000	Y	3	TPR	I	90.444	1
6	City of Durango	Needham Elementary Connect II	\$ 506,140	\$ 350,000	Y	5	MPO	I	89.556	2
14	Town of Basalt	SH-82 Basalt Pedestrian Underpass	\$ 330,600	\$ 264,500	Y	3	TPR	I	83.000	3
12	Town of Pagosa Springs	Town of PS North Neighborhood SRTS & Bicycle Safety Improvements	\$ 440,000	\$ 346,500	Y	5	TPR	I	82.222	4
32	City of Boulder	19th Street Sidewalk Improvement	\$ 477,758	\$ 350,000	Y	4	MPO	I	78.889	5
17	Pueblo County Government	North Mesa Elementary Safe Routes & Bicycle Safety Improvements	\$ 250,000	\$ 200,000	Y	2	MPO	I	78.889	6
37	City of Englewood Community Development	Broadway/Mansfield Enhanced Safety Crossing	\$ 260,408	\$ 139,000	partial	1	MPO	I	78.625	7
7	City of Durango	School Area Flasher Speed Limit & Bicycle Safety Improvements	\$ 124,870		N	5	TPR	I	78.222	8
38	City of Englewood Community Development	Broadway/Tufts Enhanced Safety Crossing	\$ 220,628		N	1	MPO	I	78.000	9
33	Town of Frederick	Savannah to Thunder Valley & Bicycle Safety Improvements	\$ 579,606		N	4	MPO	I	77.556	10
30	City of Centennial	Relocate SN for-II MS	\$ 98,500		N	1	MPO	I	75.125	11
24	Pueblo West Metropolitan District	Swallows Charger Academy Sieeblo Connection	\$ 136,990		N	2	MPO	I	74.889	12
8	Poudre School District	Poudre SDS Fix-It Stations	\$ 60,000		N	4	MPO	I	74.000	13
34	Town of Castle Rock	Castle Rock - School & Bicycle Safety Improvements	\$ 101,300		N	1	MPO	I	70.889	14
11	Town of Cheyenne Wells	Cheyenne Wells & Bicycle Safety Improvements	\$ 552,149		N	4	TPR	I	68.222	15
2	City of Cherry Hills Village	Cherry Hills Village School Zone & Bicycle Safety Improvements	\$ 215,217		N	1	MPO	I	64.444	16
29	City of Centennial	S. Liverpool Street Sidewalk Project	\$ 414,706		N	1	MPO	I	60.000	17
21	Thompson R-2J School District	High Plains School K-8 Sideeompson Project	\$ 98,200		N	4	MPO	I	60.000	17
1	Town of Manassa	"Picking Up Manassa" SRTS	\$ 566,135		N	5	TPR	I	55.889	19

**Safe Routes to School**  
**FY 2016 Projects Recommended for Funding**

**NON-INFRASTRUCTURE - Total Funding Available - \$500K**

Application #	Applicant	Project Title	Total Project Cost (corrected)	Amount of CDOT Funding	Funded?	Region	MPO/TPR	Infra or Non-Infra	Total Score	RANK
28	Sterling Parks, Library & Rec. Dept	Bringing SRTS to Sterling	\$ 28,969	\$ 23,175	Y	4	TPR	NI	88.222	1
20	City of Arvada	Lawrence ES SRTS Project	\$ 5,500	\$ 4,400	Y	1	MPO	NI	83.667	2
3	City of Fort Collins	Fort Collins Biking & Walking Camps, Clubs & Field Trips	\$ 16,200	\$ 12,960	Y	4	MPO	NI	83.222	3
16	City and County of Denver, Dept of Environmental Health	Denver Safe Routes to School (DSRTS)	\$ 103,200	\$ 86,000	Y	1	MPO	NI	83.000	4
27	Center Consolidated Schools 26JT	Center SRTS Program	\$ 80,499	\$ 64,399	Y	5	TPR	NI	81.778	5
4	City of Golden	City of Golden SRTS Program	\$ 36,700	\$ 29,360	Y	1	MPO	NI	81.444	6
31	Lake County Build a Generation	Lake County BAG SRTS Coalition	\$ 75,500	\$ 60,400	Y	3	TPR	NI	81.111	7
18	Englewood Schools Arapahoe I	Englewood Middle School Biking and Walking Project	\$ 25,459	\$ 20,367	Y	1	MPO	NI	80.889	8
22	Thompson R-2J SD	Walk Safe/Bike Safe Education	\$ 92,786	\$ 46,158	Y	4	MPO	NI	80.750	9
35	School District 27J (Brighton)	SRTS for Brighton Elementary Students	\$ 28,950	\$ 23,160	Y	1	MPO	NI	79.889	10
5	Archuleta SD	Retro Metro Kids	\$ 57,700	\$ 46,160	Y	5	TPR	NI	78.000	11
13	City of Durango	Citywide Educational Campaign	\$ 5,000	\$ 4,000	Y	5	TPR	NI	77.778	12
26	Holyoke School District Re-1J	Bringing SRTS to Holyoke	\$ 20,000	\$ 16,000	Y	4	TPR	NI	77.667	13
36	Mesa County and Grand Valley MPO	Mesa County Five E Safe Routes to School Program	\$ 78,623	\$ 62,898	Y	3	TPR	NI	77.250	14
25	Boulder County Transportation	Boulder County SRTS - Trip Tracker	\$ 98,108		N	4	MPO	NI	76.625	15
23	Cherry Creek SD	SRTS for Cherry Creek Schools	\$ 28,000		N	1	MPO	NI	76.000	16
9	City of Colorado Springs-Parks/ Rec/Cultural Svcs	Safe Routes with Trails	\$ 164,808		N	2	MPO	NI	76.000	17