

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY of the
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)
WORK SESSION: 2045 RTP Fiscally Constrained Plan
June 7, 2019**

DISCUSSION

Operations and Maintenance (O&M) Costs - Greeley and Loveland submitted local estimates for roadway O&M costs. McDaniel stated Larimer County O&M were around \$13,000 per centerline mile. Kemp will send Bornhoft estimates for Fort Collins and Nelson will send estimates for Severance. Baxter clarified the cost estimates for Greeley were from the street maintenance portion of the Keep Greeley Moving sales tax and the Streets and Roads Fund, which just covers operations. Bornhoft stated the average for the region was \$9,000/lane mile for operations and \$14,000/lane mile for maintenance but will update the estimate based on new data from local jurisdictions. The lower estimates for O&M allow the region to complete more projects than previously estimated. The operations definition includes planning, design, and engineering as defined in the Census of Governments, but the group agreed to remove those components from the definition since they are accounted for in the capacity project costs.

Additional Projects – Bornhoft stated current estimates show excess funds of \$125M, but estimates do not include buildout of the off-road non-motorized corridors, non-RSC capacity projects, or intersection projects. Bustang was added back into the transit operations and revenue estimates.

Lane Mile Estimates - Relford asked for clarification about how mileage was calculated for Weld County because she felt the numbers seemed low. Bornhoft will send the methodology to Relford for clarification.

Funding Sources - Several communities revised their local revenue estimates, including Larimer County, Loveland, and Greeley. One type of revision was to smooth out local revenue/general fund transfers that are unusual. Fort Collins and Weld County will review their local estimate for accuracy. Larimer County and Loveland are expecting to pursue sales tax initiatives on the next ballots. Kemp requested Street Oversize Fund be changed to “TCEF”. The funding source “SB267/grants” should be clarified. Many projects were submitted without a funding source identified. Developer contributions (outside of impact fees) were identified as a project funding source, but an estimate of reasonably anticipated contributions has not been developed yet. Reasonably anticipated developer contributions are identified in the Loveland Transportation Plan. Fort Collins has a study of anticipated developer contributions in the northeast which could help establish a regional methodology.

Intersection Improvements – The cost of intersection improvements is not currently included because they were not submitted for the Regional Travel Demand Model (RTDM). TAC members suggested Bornhoft look at local Capital Improvement Programs, local Transportation Plans, and CDOT’s projects and extrapolate estimates into the future.

Growth Management Areas (GMAs) – McDaniel asked if projects within GMAs were submitted and counted twice. Bornhoft stated some projects were submitted twice, but they were only recorded once in the model and the project cost estimate. Kemp and Baxter noted a similar issue may happen with the Mulberry annexation and O Street, respectively, and it is unclear who will be responsible for projects in the GMA.

ACTIONS/NEXT STEPS

Bornhoft will remove “planning and design” from O&M definition, send out CDOT’s GIS shapefiles to show centerline and lane mile data for TAC members to compare to their own estimates, work with Schneiders on CDOT funding sources, and resend the spreadsheet showing projects, funding sources, and whether these projects are constrained for communities to fill in missing information.