



# TRANSPORTATION NEWSLETTER

**DATE: OCTOBER 2020**

**Vince Rogalski, Chairman**

**Gunnison Valley TPR**

**[vrogal@montrose.net](mailto:vrogal@montrose.net)**

## FISCAL YEAR 2019-20 REVENUE RECONCILIATION

At the close of each fiscal year, the Division of Accounting and Finance (DAF) compares forecasted revenues from the prior fiscal year to actual revenues and presents them to the Transportation Commission (TC) for review.

CDOT had estimated revenues for the FY 2019-20 budget of \$2.15 billion (including enterprises) and \$2.02 billion excluding enterprises. CDOT alone received actual revenues, including additional federal obligation authority (FY 2019-20 redistribution), in the amount of \$2.15 billion, a surplus of \$128.6 million. Although there was a \$33.7 million shortfall in HUTF revenue, other revenues offset that loss. The surplus is primarily due to an additional premium of \$59.8 million received through the second issuance of Senate Bill (SB) 17-267 Certificates of Participation (COPs) and \$77.0 million additional flexible federal funds received in August through the annual FHWA Redistribution process.

- CDOT Miscellaneous revenues were \$22.5 million higher than forecasted, in large part due to property sales and higher than anticipated interest earnings.
- Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) revenue was \$16.7 million lower than forecasted as a result of lower than anticipated federal obligation limitation provided through the final FY 2019-20 Appropriations Act.
- Federal Transit Administration (FTA) revenue was \$11.6 million higher than forecasted as a result of Section 5311 & 5340 Rural Areas grants. The Section 5311 grant received \$16.9M of CARES Act funding.
- Certificates of Participation (COP) revenue was \$71.5 million higher than forecasted due to a favorable interest rate environment resulting in \$59.8 million in additional premium under the second issuance of SB 17-267 COPs, and \$11.7 million in interest earnings associated with COP proceeds.
- FHWA Redistribution - CDOT is eligible to receive an increase in federal obligation authority through the annual Federal Redistribution process in August of each year. The amount available to states varies each year and as such is not included in forecasts of revenue. CDOT received notice in late August of federal FY 2019-20 redistribution totaling \$77.0

TO: Colorado Transportation Commission  
FROM: Rebecca White, Director, Division of Transportation Development (DTD)  
Marissa Gaughan - Acting Manager, Multimodal Planning Branch  
DATE: October 14, 2020

## **RE: Regional Priority Program (RPP) Program Distribution Formula Approval**

**Purpose:** The purpose of this memorandum is to provide the Transportation Commission (TC) background on the RPP formula to help inform a final decision on Program Distribution for the 2045 planning cycle.

**Action:** TC approval of a formula for RPP Program Distribution

**Background:** One of the most important actions the TC takes is determining how specific funding programs are distributed around the state (i.e. how much does each CDOT Region get to spend on formula programs like FASTER Safety and RPP). This is known as the Program Distribution process and is a required step in building long-term budgets and planning documents. In particular, Colorado's five MPOs rely on Program Distribution to build their Long Range Transportation Plans.

Program Distribution includes the following six programs: Surface Transportation - Metro (STP-Metro), Transportation Alternative Program (TAP), Metro Planning Program (Metro-PL), Congestion Mitigation Air Quality Program (CMAQ), RPP and FASTER Safety. The Commission is asked to formally adopt formulas for these programs every four years during the statewide planning process. The STAC also is asked to provide their input to TC on these formulas.

To date, the Transportation Commission has approved formulas for five programs. RPP is the final program needing approval. RPP is a flexible funding program for Regional priority projects. This program receives approximately \$50 million annually.

### **Details:**

RPP formula options are included in the table below. The STAC approved Option B in a 12-3 vote. In February 2020 the TC formally considered the STAC recommendation but a vote to approve Option B did not pass. This allowed the current formula ("Prior Formula-Current") to temporarily remain in place. However, now that the Commission has adopted the 2045 statewide plan, and several MPOs are in the process of finalizing their long-term plans, CDOT staff is requesting that the Commission take final action in choosing an RPP formula for the 2045 planning window.

**The following is the last portion of the Resolution Approved by the Transportation Commission on October 15, 2020 VOTE was 6 to 4.**

**Commissioners: Dissenting**

**Commissioner: Sidney Zink**

**Commissioner: Kathy Hall**

**Commissioner: Gary Beedy**

**Commissioner: Barbara Vasquez**

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Commission approves the following FY 2020 - 2045 Program Distribution allocation methodology for the Regional Priority Program (RPP) for use in developing the 2020-2045 Statewide Transportation Plan, Regional Transportation Plans, and to guide development of the FY 2021 - 2024 STIP.  
 1) Regional Priority Program: Based on 50% Population/35% On-System Lane Miles/ 15% On-System Truck Vehicle Miles Traveled.

FURTHER BE IT RESOLVED, that the Commission will periodically review the fund allocations directed by Commission decision to ensure the effective use of funds and reserves the option to alter the allocation of those funds.

Example - FY 20 RPP									
Recipient	Option A		Option B		Prior Formula (Current)		Historic Formula		
	25 VMT/ 25 Pop/ 35 LM/ 15 TVMT		25 VMT/20 Pop/40 LM/15 TVMT		50 Pop/35 LM/15 TVMT		45 VMT/40 LM/15 TVMT		
	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	
Region 1	35.0%	\$ 16,913,125	33.2%	\$ 16,055,855	36.3%	\$ 17,576,947	32.1%	\$ 15,524,797	
DRCOG	32.9%	\$ 15,910,313	31.0%	\$ 15,005,676	34.8%	\$ 16,825,563	29.5%	\$ 14,273,476	
Region	2.1%	\$ 1,002,811	2.2%	\$ 1,050,179	1.6%	\$ 751,384	2.6%	\$ 1,251,321	
Region 2	18.8%	\$ 9,102,028	19.0%	\$ 9,185,025	19.5%	\$ 9,441,497	18.4%	\$ 8,913,450	
PPACG	6.9%	\$ 3,317,396	6.4%	\$ 3,084,890	8.1%	\$ 3,906,221	5.4%	\$ 2,613,829	
PACOG	2.0%	\$ 975,806	2.0%	\$ 945,631	2.2%	\$ 1,042,236	1.8%	\$ 892,487	
Region	9.9%	\$ 4,808,827	10.7%	\$ 5,154,505	9.3%	\$ 4,493,041	11.2%	\$ 5,407,134	
Region 3	14.9%	\$ 7,193,815	15.5%	\$ 7,508,565	13.7%	\$ 6,650,000	16.4%	\$ 7,943,617	
GVMPO	1.4%	\$ 685,790	1.4%	\$ 653,672	1.7%	\$ 825,970	1.1%	\$ 541,528	
Region	13.5%	\$ 6,508,024	14.2%	\$ 6,854,893	12.0%	\$ 5,824,030	15.3%	\$ 7,402,089	
Region 4	23.7%	\$ 11,463,919	24.1%	\$ 11,678,077	23.3%	\$ 11,278,596	24.4%	\$ 11,826,336	
DRCOG	4.7%	\$ 2,251,819	4.5%	\$ 2,168,902	4.8%	\$ 2,325,454	4.4%	\$ 2,109,994	
NFRMPO	5.5%	\$ 2,661,963	5.2%	\$ 2,518,378	6.3%	\$ 3,030,994	4.6%	\$ 2,223,153	
Region	13.5%	\$ 6,550,137	14.5%	\$ 6,990,798	12.2%	\$ 5,922,148	15.5%	\$ 7,493,189	
Region 5	7.7%	\$ 3,702,114	8.2%	\$ 3,947,477	7.1%	\$ 3,427,960	8.6%	\$ 4,166,800	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>\$ 48,375,000</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>\$ 48,375,000</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>\$ 48,375,000</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>\$ 48,375,000</b>	
<b>DRCOG TOTAL</b>	<b>37.5%</b>	<b>\$ 18,162,133</b>	<b>35.5%</b>	<b>\$ 17,174,578</b>	<b>39.6%</b>	<b>\$ 19,151,017</b>	<b>33.9%</b>	<b>\$ 16,383,470</b>	
<b>GVMPO TOTAL</b>	<b>1.4%</b>	<b>\$ 685,790</b>	<b>1.4%</b>	<b>\$ 653,672</b>	<b>1.7%</b>	<b>\$ 825,970</b>	<b>1.1%</b>	<b>\$ 541,528</b>	
<b>NFRMPO TOTAL</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	<b>\$ 2,661,963</b>	<b>5.2%</b>	<b>\$ 2,518,378</b>	<b>6.3%</b>	<b>\$ 3,030,994</b>	<b>4.6%</b>	<b>\$ 2,223,153</b>	
<b>PPACG TOTAL</b>	<b>6.9%</b>	<b>\$ 3,317,396</b>	<b>6.4%</b>	<b>\$ 3,084,890</b>	<b>8.1%</b>	<b>\$ 3,906,221</b>	<b>5.4%</b>	<b>\$ 2,613,829</b>	
<b>PACOG TOTAL</b>	<b>2.0%</b>	<b>\$ 975,806</b>	<b>2.0%</b>	<b>\$ 945,631</b>	<b>2.2%</b>	<b>\$ 1,042,236</b>	<b>1.8%</b>	<b>\$ 892,487</b>	

## Front Range Passenger Rail Study Update - Randy Grauberger, Project Director, Southwest Chief & Front Range Passenger Rail Commission

- a) STAC was presented an update on the Front Range Passenger Rail Study which examined potential rail alignments from Pueblo to Ft. Collins;
- b) Reviewed components of the study and planning outreach, including agency coordination, environmental, engineering, operations (travel modeling), stakeholder engagement, and legislative proposals for creation of authority or district(s);

- c) Three alternative rail routes are considered and evaluated, all of which are technically feasible and whose segments can be mixed and matched to find the best combined components and minimize impacts;
- d) Future steps include comparative analysis of alternatives; NEPA scoping package, which includes public involvement, existing conditions, coordination, and decisions on rail technology used, station locations, phasing of segments and service characteristics
- e) Travel Demand Modeling, using the most advanced modeling techniques available, shows significant demand for rail transit on all alignments, with projected ridership falling approximately in the middle of the list of the most successful passenger rail routes in the US.
- f) Future TDM will consider TOD development around stations, scenarios with fewer trains, different sets of stations, and lower fares;
- g) Special events ridership also modeled, as are GHG reduction projections.
- h) Amtrak's Network Modernization Program puts Colorado's Front Range Rail as its number one priority with potential for \$2.1 Billion federal investment.

## **STAC comments:**

- STAC members expressed concern for the misconception that rail would eliminate congestion and take away the need to invest in the roadways; Members acknowledged that future solutions to transportation cannot succeed without investment in all modes.
- STAC members feel the controversy and resistance to rail is because of the high cost; people want to ride it, but won't likely want to pay for its implementation; Some members feel it should be paid for mostly by riders/users and not by public subsidy.
- South Central portion of the state is expected to be very against the alternatives proposed, which would route the Southwest Chief from La Junta to Pueblo, eliminating a direct route from Pueblo to Trinidad.

## **STAC Bylaws Revision - John Liosatos, Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments:**

### **STAC discussion:**

- a) STAC members debated at length whether to amend the Bylaws to put in place two, 2-year term limits for officers;
- b) Proponents argued that it would be valuable for other STAC members to have experience in the Chair/vice-chair position to build and expand the breadth of knowledge among its members;
- c) Opponents felt it unnecessary to force the STAC to elect new Chair/Vice-chair and would prefer to have that as a choice.
- d) A motion to draft term limits into the Bylaws ultimately failed 6 to 7;
- e) Amended Bylaws would be drafted to require meeting materials be delivered one week prior to meetings with the ability of the STAC to approve emergency items on the agenda;
- f) Draft Bylaws will be considered for adoption in November and Officer elections to follow.

**Transportation TPR Meeting**  
**NEXT MEETING NOTICE TPR meeting December 3, 2020**  
**Region 10 at 10am to Noon**  
**Possible**  
**Video Conference Only**