



Colorado Forest Highway Long Range Transportation Plan

A transportation policy plan to advance the
Forest Highway Program in Colorado into the future

2010-2030

January 2010

Prepared by:



Prepared in partnership
with:



Long Range Transportation Plan for the Forest Highway Program in Colorado

2010-2030

A transportation policy plan to advance the Forest Highway
Program in Colorado into the future

Prepared in partnership with:



Prepared by:



Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction 1

1.1 What Are Forest Highways?..... 1

1.2 How Are Forest Highways Defined? 1

1.3 Why Are Forest Highways Important?.....3

1.4 What Is the Colorado Forest Highway Program?.....3

1.5 What Are the Vision, Mission, and Goals for the Forest Highway Program in Colorado? 3

1.6 Why Do We Need Long Range Transportation Planning?.....5

1.7 What Is the Colorado Forest Highway Long Range Transportation Plan?.....6

1.8 What Is Included in This Plan?.....6

Chapter 2: Agency and Planning Coordination 8

2.1 USFS National Forest Plans 8

2.2 Colorado Department of Transportation’s 2035 Plan9

2.3 Consistency with Other Plans 10

2.4 Other Factors that Influence Forest Highway Planning..... 10

2.4.1 Inflation of Construction Costs 10

2.4.2 Multi-Modal Considerations..... 10

2.4.3 Economic Development Opportunities 12

2.5 Public Involvement 13

Chapter 3: Existing Conditions and Trends 14

3.1 Facility Inventory and Conditions 14

3.2 National Forest Trends in Colorado 21

Chapter 4: Funding and Investment Strategies 25

4.1 Recent Forest Highway Investments..... 25

4.2 Funding Assumptions..... 26

4.3 Funding Needs for Stated Goals 27

4.4 Gap Analysis 28

4.5 Additional Funding/Partnering Opportunities..... 29

Chapter 5: Project Selection Process 32

5.1 Forest Highway Call Process 32

5.1.1 Call for Projects 33

5.1.2 Project Selection 34

5.1.3 Programming..... 36

5.2 Unconstrained Program of Projects 36

Chapter 6: Recommendations for Future Plan Activities..... 37

List of Figures

Figure 1 Colorado Forest Highway Network 2

Figure 2 Roadway Condition..... 14

Figure 3 Colorado Forest Highway Condition 15

Figure 4 Bridge Structure Sufficiency Rating 16

Figure 5 Forest Highway Bridge Condition 17

Figure 6 Colorado Forest Highway Traffic Data..... 19

Figure 7 Colorado Scenic Byways 20

Figure 8 Colorado Population Change by County 22

Figure 9 National Forest Visitation (2002 versus 2006)..... 23

Figure 10 2006 Recreational Visits 24

Figure 11 Project Call and Selection Process..... 33



List of Tables

Table 1 LRTP Goals and Related CFR Criteria 5
Table 2 Colorado Forest Highway Project History 26
Table 3 Anticipated Funding Scenarios through the Horizon Year (2030)..... 27
Table 4 Estimated Funding Required to Improve the Colorado Forest Highway Road Network 28
Table 5 Estimated Funding Required to Improve Colorado Forest Highway Bridges..... 28
Table 6 Anticipated Funding Gap through Planning Horizon Year (2030)..... 29
Table 7 Forest Highway Program Transportation Goals and Selection Criteria
Used for Project Ranking 35
Table 8 Long Range Transportation Plan Action Items 37

Appendices

- Appendix A – Tri-Agency Roles
- Appendix B – Forest Highway Background
- Appendix C – Forest Highway Legal Guidance
- Appendix D – Partner Agency Mission and Goals
- Appendix E – Forest Plan Functions
- Appendix F – Shared Forest Highways
- Appendix G – Forest Highway Project Selection Process
- Appendix H – 7-Year Program of Funded Forest Highway Projects



Abbreviations and Acronyms

ATS	Alternative Transportation System
CDOT	Colorado Department of Transportation
CFLHD	FHWA, Central Federal Lands Highway Division
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
FH	Forest Highway
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
LRTP	Long Range Transportation Plan
MPO	Metropolitan Planning Organization
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act of 1969
NFS	National Forest System (including National Grasslands administered by the Forest Service)
OVN	Over Night
RTP	Regional Transportation Plan
SAFETEA-LU	Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users
SB	Senate Bill
STIP	Statewide Transportation Improvement Program
TEA-21	Transportation Efficiency Act for the 21 st Century
TIP	Transportation Improvement Program
TMP	Travel Management Plan
U.S.	United States
USFS	U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service

Chapter 1: Introduction

This 20-year long range transportation plan (LRTP) describes the Forest Highway (FH) Program for the State of Colorado and identifies the long range goals for the program. One purpose of this document is to help transportation planners, transportation professionals, forest professionals, community representatives, and citizens who have an interest in improving FHs understand the FH Program, thereby helping them understand the types of projects eligible for program funding as well as how to participate in the planning and decision-making processes.

This plan also describes the process for coordinated planning and decision making among the partner agencies involved in the FH Program. The plan is a product of the Tri-Agency partnership, which consists of representatives from the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT); the United States (U.S.) Department of Agriculture, Forest Service (USFS), Rocky Mountain Region (Region 2); and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Central Federal Lands Highway Division (CFLHD). Each agency has specific roles and responsibilities as part of the planning and implementation of FH projects (see Appendix A). This long range plan is intended to help the Tri-Agency make investment decisions for planning, safety management, preservation, and construction on FHs in Colorado. Because funds are limited, it is essential to assess needs, set priorities, and efficiently manage and leverage funds from a variety of sources to meet future transportation needs.

1.1 What Are Forest Highways?

Established by the passage of the Federal Highway Act of 1921, specific roadways providing access to and through national forests across the U.S. were designated as FHs due to the benefits they provide to the national forest, states, and local communities. Approximately 1,473 miles of roadway in Colorado are designated as FHs, as shown in Figure 1. For more information on how FHs were designated, please see Appendix B, Forest Highway Program Background. FHs are diverse, ranging from isolated county roads in rural areas to state roads that receive intense use from nearby metropolitan areas. FHs are intended to provide safe and adequate transportation for national forest visitors, recreationists, resource users, and others. FHs also assist rural and community economic development, and promote tourism and travel.

1.2 How Are Forest Highways Defined?

The term "Forest Highway" refers to a road under the jurisdiction of, and maintained by, a public authority and open to public travel. A public authority other than FHWA, such as CDOT, USFS, or a local government, typically has jurisdiction of a FH. A FH may be comprised of several segments, each managed by a different authority. FH maintenance and improvement projects can also receive funding from several sources. In general, FHs must be in or adjacent to the National Forest System (NFS) land; be necessary for access to protect, administer, use, and develop national forest resources; open to public travel; and provide a connection to other transportation systems (such as public roads).



The list of designated FHs is not fixed. Routes can be added or removed at any time while maintaining a net zero approach; that is, a net zero increase in the number of miles of FHs. The CFLHD Division Engineer, with concurrence from the USFS and CDOT designates FH routes. Figure 1 shows currently designated FHs in Colorado. Further information regarding FH eligibility and designation is provided in Appendix B.

1.3 Why Are Forest Highways Important?

Accessing our NFS lands is part of our heritage, our culture, and our economy. The FH Program addresses the needs for safe and adequate transportation access to and within NFS lands for tourism, recreation, resource use, and other uses. Other transportation programs do not specifically address those needs. FHs aid rural and community economic development and promote tourism and travel. FHs are particularly important in Colorado because private, state, and national forests dominate the landscape, especially in the central and western half of the state. Meanwhile, Colorado's population has increased, placing more people closer to NFS and other federal lands. In addition, urban and suburban development outside of federal lands is placing greater pressure on existing transportation infrastructure and resources.

1.4 What Is the Colorado Forest Highway Program?

Because FHs provide access to a multitude of economic, cultural, and environmental resources for state residents and visitors, we need to understand the existing and long-term demands on the roadway system to meet current and future needs. The FH Program was developed to address those needs by providing funding for improvements to FHs. Through the federal tax on gasoline, the FH Program provides approximately \$11.9 million of federal transportation funding to Colorado each year.



*Poudre River Canyon
Photo by Barry Lilly*

The FH Program in Colorado is, by law, a partnership of CDOT, USFS, and CFLHD (the Tri-Agency). Roles of the Tri-Agency are defined in Appendix A.

1.5 What Are the Vision, Mission, and Goals for the Forest Highway Program in Colorado?

The vision, mission, goals, and objectives presented in this document are intended to guide the process for evaluating and selecting projects for the FH Program in Colorado. Through a cooperative effort, the Tri-Agency partners developed these foundational statements specifically for this LRTP, using the requirements set forth in 23 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) §660, Subpart A – Forest Highways (see Appendix C). Once complete, they were distributed to counties and forest supervisor headquarters in an effort to solicit their comments. Based on input received during the comment period, the vision, mission, goals, and objectives were revised and finalized. These guiding principles shape the development, conclusions, and recommendations

of this LRTP. Nevertheless, each state and federal partner has specific vision, mission, and goals that are of unique interest to that particular agency. The individual statements of the three partnering agencies are provided in Appendix D.

Vision

The vision of the FH Program in Colorado is to advance the FH network in an efficient manner that facilitates responsible care for the land, while providing an enhanced user experience to and within the National Forests.

Mission

The mission of the FH Program in Colorado is to work in partnership with CFLHD, CDOT, USFS, and local communities to improve the FHs within the state.

Goals and Objectives

Goals of the FH Program in Colorado represent four categories including access and mobility, system performance, funding and economic development, and natural resource protection. Each goal includes distinct objectives that serve to further the sentiment expressed by the goal. The goals and objectives are listed with a description of the purpose of each objective.

Access and Mobility: Provide sustainable access to and within the national forests for use and enjoyment of the land and its resources.

Objective 1: Provide and maintain recreational, commercial, administrative, and other suitable access to NFS lands by funding appropriate improvements for transportation facilities.

Objective 2: Consider mode choice opportunities to improve mobility and access to and through the national forests.

Objective 3: Provide a seamless transportation network connecting the NFS lands with local communities and major highway systems.

System Performance: Ensure a safe and reliable transportation network to and within the national forests.

Objective 1: Identify risks to traveler safety and take measures to reduce them.

Objective 2: Maintain or improve the condition of the transportation facilities.

Objective 3: Reduce long-term maintenance costs.

Funding and Economic Development: Use innovative partnerships to fund FH projects and to support economic development opportunities at the local, regional, and national level.

Objective 1: Create partnerships with other agencies or programs to provide additional funding to extend the benefits of the FH Program.

Objective 2: Support economic development in terms of tourism and use of natural resources.



Natural Resource Protection: Maintain leadership in protecting and enhancing the natural environment.

Objective 1: Use transportation facilities as a tool to improve the health of NFS lands.

Objective 2: Minimize the negative impacts of transportation facilities to natural and cultural resources.

As mentioned previously, the goals are based upon the project selection criteria established in 23 CFR §660; however, the CFR criteria were modified to more clearly state the intent of project selection for the FH Program. Table 1 summarizes the relationship between the FH LRTP goals and the criteria established in 23 CFR §660.

**Table 1
LRTP Goals and Related CFR Criteria**

Related 23 CFR 660 Criteria	LRTP Goal
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development, use, protection, and administration of the NFS and its resources. • Continuity of the transportation network serving the NFS and its dependent communities. • Mobility of the users of the transportation network and the goods and services provided. 	<p>Access and Mobility: Provide sustainable access to and within the national forests for use and enjoyment of the land and its resources.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Result for FHs from the pavement, bridge, and safety management systems. 	<p>System Performance: Ensure a safe and reliable transportation network to and within the national forests.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhancement of economic development at the local, regional, and national level, including tourism and recreational travel. • Improvement of the transportation network for economy of operation and maintenance and the safety of its users. 	<p>Funding and Economic Development: Use innovative partnerships to fund FH projects and to support economic development opportunities at the local, regional, and national level.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protection and enhancement of the rural environment associated with the USFS and its resources. 	<p>Natural Resource Protection: Maintain leadership in protecting and enhancing the natural environment.</p>

1.6 Why Do We Need Long Range Transportation Planning?

FH long range transportation planning is necessary to define the vision and goals for the FH network that will serve the public into the future. Long range planning also provides a mechanism to objectively set priorities for implementing projects while working toward the ultimate vision for the FH network that the Tri-Agency is trying to achieve. To accomplish these tasks, planners and decision makers must consider a complex balance among transportation efficiency, human safety, and environmental stewardship, and they must do so collaboratively to effectively manage and implement the FH Program.

The FH Program requires long range transportation planning; that is, a planning process that is consistent, that involves the partner agencies, that is compatible with other transportation planning processes, and that clearly defines and offers opportunities for public input. The key objective of such a planning process is to develop and maintain a coordinated, “seamless” transportation system for public use, even though various segments of the system are under different jurisdictions.

Coordinated planning will also help ensure that the most critical projects receive funding and are implemented, so that the infrastructure remains in place to access forest resources and Colorado communities.



*Mt. Evans Scenic Byway
Photo courtesy of CDOT*

Some general requirements for coordinated FH planning are set forth in 23 CFR §660, Subpart A – Forest Highways, which is provided in Appendix C of this document.

1.7 What Is the Colorado Forest Highway Long Range Transportation Plan?

The Tri-Agency prepared this LRTP to describe how the FH Program operates and to identify the long range goals for the program over the next 20 years. As funding has become more scarce and demand on the FH transportation system continues to increase, it has become increasingly important for the Tri-Agency to work together to assess needs, set priorities, and implement projects that provide public benefits, while meeting fundamental program goals.

This LRTP describes the process and provides guidance for coordinated planning and decision making among the Tri-Agency. Such coordination is the key to wisely investing Colorado FH funds. This LRTP is intended to help the partners make investment decisions for planning, safety management, preservation, and construction on FHs in Colorado.

While funding for maintenance and capital improvements to FHs can come from many sources, such as cities, counties, and states, this LRTP focuses specifically on the types of projects eligible for funding through the FH Program over the next 20 years. It also provides guidance on how FH projects are selected for the FH Program (see Chapter 5, Project Selection Process).

1.8 What Is Included in This Plan?

This LRTP is presented in six chapters, including this Introduction. An explanation of the contents of each chapter follows.

Chapter 2, Agency and Planning Coordination, describes the long range plans that are particularly related to Colorado’s FHs, including USFS National Forest Plans and CDOT’s 2035 Plan. Chapter 2 also describes other factors and regulations that influence FH planning, and describes the public involvement process for this FH LRTP.

Chapter 3, Existing Conditions and Trends, summarizes the current state of FH transportation infrastructure in terms of type, condition, use, and jurisdiction. Chapter 3 also presents recent trends in population change, forest visitation, and recreational trips to the national forests.

Chapter 4, Funding and Investment Strategies, summarizes the recent investment history for FH projects in Colorado, identifies reasonably expected funding through 2030, and discusses the funding gap between available funds and needed improvements to the FH network. Chapter 4 also identifies additional opportunities for funding through partnerships with other agencies.

Chapter 5, Project Selection Process, describes the process for selecting projects that will receive FH Program funds. It provides a step-by-step account of the Tri-Agency call for projects and the rationale for why this process is necessary for the FH Program.

Chapter 6, Plan Implementation, summarizes how this LRTP will be implemented by the Tri-Agency and includes recommended actions for the Tri-Agency. Recommendations include ongoing system monitoring and the development of a process to identify routes for designation and/or de-designation on the FH network.



Chapter 2: Agency and Planning Coordination

This LRTP is intended to link partner agencies' long range planning efforts related to FHs. Each agency prepares its own long range plans for managing the resources under its jurisdiction. The long range plans that are particularly related to FHs in Colorado include USFS National Forest Land and Resource Management Plans (Forest Plans) and CDOT's 2035 Plan. This chapter discusses those plans, describes other factors and regulations that influence FH planning, and describes the public involvement process for this FH LRTP.

2.1 USFS National Forest Plans

The USFS has prepared a Land and Resource Management Plan for every national forest in the country. The Forest Plans are updated periodically. In general, each Forest Plan evaluates the existing conditions of the forest lands and resources within a specific national forest, defines desired future conditions, evaluates and sets standards for visual quality (e.g., along roads and rivers), and provides direction for managing the forest resources. Forest Plans also provide direction for maintaining and preserving visual quality along scenic byways, wild and scenic rivers, and wilderness areas.



View from Marvine-Phippsburg Road

Forest Plans provide the framework in which project decisions can be made on a case-by-case and site-specific basis. In relation to transportation planning, Forest Plans identify the types of travel that are suitable to particular parcels of land based on desired future conditions and other plan designations. Transportation decisions are directly related to the stated management objective for specific areas. If the management objective for a certain area changes, site-specific plans for road and trail management must be made separately from the forest plan to bring travel into compliance. Decisions about specific roads and trails are made through project-level analysis and

decision documents in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 and USFS planning regulations. Appendix E contains a summary of the functions and limitations of a Forest Plan. The following Forest Plans have been completed in Colorado to date:

- *Arapaho & Roosevelt National Forests and Pawnee National Grassland – 1997 Revision of the Land and Resource Management Plan*
- *Cimarron and Comanche National Grasslands – 1984 Forest Plan*
- *Pike and San Isabel National Forests – 1984 Forest Plan*
- *Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre and Gunnison National Forests – 1991 Amended Land and Resource Management Plan*
- *Rio Grande National Forest – 1996 Revision of the Land and Resource Management Plan*
- *Routt National Forest – 1998 Revision of the Land and Resource Management Plan*

- *San Juan National Forest – 1992 Amended Land and Resource Management Plan*
- *White River National Forest – 2002 Revision of the Land and Resource Management Plan*

The USFS also develops Travel Management Plans (TMP). These are transportation-specific plans developed to help ensure that specific transportation routes meet Forest Plan guidelines. TMP planning provides opportunities for the public and other key stakeholders to engage the USFS in discussions about transportation issues in specific areas of national forests. TMPs address only roads under USFS jurisdiction, not roads under state or county jurisdiction. The following TMPs have been completed in Colorado:

- *Grand Mesa National Forest – 1994 TMP as amended*
- *Uncompahgre National Forest – 2002 TMP and revision*
- *Gunnison National Forest – 2000 Interim Travel Restrictions EA, Final TMP anticipated in 2010*
- *Rio Grande National Forest – 2008 TMP*
- *San Juan National Forest – 2008 TMP*
- *White River National Forest – TMP anticipated completion in 2010*

For reading or printing of these planning documents, visit <http://www.fs.fed.us/r2/projects/>.

2.2 Colorado Department of Transportation's 2035 Plan

CDOT's 2035 Plan is the state's long range multi-modal transportation plan for Colorado's airports, railroads, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, state highways, and transit. It is a 20+ year (2008 to 2035) transportation plan that promotes safety, mobility, economic development, and environmental preservation and enhancement. Required by Colorado and federal statutes, CDOT's 2035 Plan guides development and investment in the transportation system. It includes a Statewide System of Corridor Visions that balance local, regional, and statewide transportation needs and becomes the basis for an integrated transportation vision for the state of Colorado. CDOT's 2035 Plan also includes CDOT's midterm implementation strategies that begin to identify tough choices to maintain the existing transportation system under the demands placed on the current system, given funding shortfalls.

CDOT's 2035 Plan's goals, policies, strategies, and implementation framework respond to the challenges facing Colorado's transportation system. CDOT's 2035 Plan policies emphasize:

- Preserving, maintaining, and enhancing the existing transportation system.
- Expansion of transportation facilities with local or private funds.
- Recognizing the role of all modes of transportation in addressing mobility needs and working with planning partners to leverage limited financial resources.

As mentioned previously, CDOT's 2035 Plan includes a Statewide System of Corridor Visions for the state's transportation system that balance local, regional, and statewide transportation needs and becomes the basis for an integrated transportation vision for the state of Colorado. Two of these key corridors are also FHs:



- US 160
- US 550

2.3 Consistency with Other Plans

This FH LRTP is intended to integrate with and inform future state, county, and Forest Plans. Consistency between plans helps identify projects with multiple-agency benefits and potential for partnerships. Furthermore, documenting FH long range vision, mission, and goals as well as individual projects will continue to assist local and regional planning in areas near FH systems.

In addition, this FH LRTP provides a means to enhance the consideration of environmental issues and impacts with the long range transportation planning process. As part of project selection, applicants are asked to provide information regarding the need for proposed projects and potential environmental impacts. Applicants are also asked to document any pre-project coordination with resource agencies or the public. This analysis conducted during the planning stage will impart great benefits to the project, if selected, when it moves forward into the NEPA process.

2.4 Other Factors that Influence Forest Highway Planning

Several factors have been influencing the federal FH Program over the last 10 years. Some of those factors are changing areas of emphasis for the program. These include inflation of construction costs, multi-modal considerations, and economic development opportunities.

2.4.1 Inflation of Construction Costs

Road and highway construction costs have shown volatility in recent years, but, overall, costs have continued to rise. From 2006 to 2008, the cost of rehabilitating some roadways increased at a rate greater than U.S. core inflation. In addition, the amount of road rehabilitation that is deferred each year has been growing as a result of funding limitations and deteriorating infrastructure conditions. Other factors contributing to increased construction costs are the remote location of FHs and relatively short construction seasons at high elevations.

The FH Program in Colorado is affected by rising costs of construction and is simply unable to deliver as many miles of road construction today as 10 years ago. Construction cost is a factor that must be considered when deciding how Colorado FH funds will be invested. Specifically, planners and decision makers should consider how available funds can provide more miles of improved road or more road deficiencies/conditions improved. Potential for combining or matching funds from various sources should also be evaluated.

2.4.2 Multi-Modal Considerations

States, metropolitan planning organizations (MPO), and Federal land management agencies consider alternative transportation solutions in their transportation plans. Likewise, the Colorado FH Program must consider alternative transportation modes when evaluating and developing proposed projects. Alternative transportation modes can be solutions for managing demand,



providing access, and enhancing environmental quality, among other issues. Alternative transportation solutions (ATS) may also provide additional funding opportunities. Section 3039 of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) required the Secretary of Transportation, in coordination with the Secretary of the Interior, to:

[...] undertake a comprehensive study of alternative transportation needs in national parks and related public lands managed by Federal land management agencies in order to [...] encourage and promote the development of transportation systems for the betterment of the national parks and other units of the National Park System, national wildlife refuges, recreational areas, and other public lands in order to conserve natural, historical, and cultural resources and prevent adverse impact, relieve congestion, minimize transportation fuel consumption, reduce pollution (including noise and visual pollution), and enhance visitor mobility and accessibility and the visitor experience. (FHWA, 2001).

In response to the directive in TEA-21, FHWA and the Federal Transit Administration, in cooperation with the Federal land management agencies, produced a study that assessed transit needs in national parks and other federal lands. Volume III of that study focused on NFS lands and, in particular, on 30 high-use sites in national forests. The “Federal Lands Alternative Transportation System Study, Summary of Forest Service ATS Needs” (Cambridge Systematics, Inc., 2004) included two potential sites in Colorado; one in the Arapaho & Roosevelt National Forest near the town of Nederland along the Peak-to-Peak Highway (FHs 27 and 29); the second along Mount Evans Scenic Byway near Idaho Springs (FH 54). The study identified the need for a transit shuttle to alleviate parking congestion and enhance visitor experience of the natural beauty of the area.

The following excerpt is from the “Federal Lands Alternative Transportation System Study, Summary of Forest Service ATS Needs” (Cambridge Systematics, Inc., 2004).

**Colorado – Arapahoe-Roosevelt
[Arapaho & Roosevelt] National Forest
Peak-to-Peak Transit Services**

The Arapaho and Roosevelt [Arapaho & Roosevelt] National Forests and Pawnee National Grassland encompass roughly 1.5 million acres of public land in the Rocky Mountains, foothills, and short grass prairie of north central Colorado. The topography includes prairie lands, rolling hills, and snow covered mountain areas with several peaks that are over 14,000 feet in elevation. Recreational opportunities include camping, hiking, picnicking, bicycling, fishing, viewing wildlife, snowshoeing, cross country skiing, and downhill skiing.



*Arapahoe-Roosevelt [Arapaho & Roosevelt] National Forest
Colorado – Indian Peaks Wilderness*

The Peak-to-Peak Highway is a National and State Scenic and Historic Byway that serves as a primary north-south travel corridor through the Boulder and Clear Creek Ranger

Districts of the Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forest. The 55-mile route provides access to a number of activity areas, including the Brainard Lake Recreation Area, Indian Peaks Wilderness Area, 10 campgrounds, numerous trail heads, and several communities. The route also provides a connection between the Rocky Mountain National Park in the north and the Mount Evans Scenic Byway and Wilderness Area in the south.

The Mount Evans area is located within the Clear Creek Ranger District and includes a popular 14-mile scenic roadway to the 14,264-foot summit of the mountain.

A Peak-to-Peak Transit Shuttle system has been proposed to enhance recreational opportunities at popular activity sites and reduce congestion at the trailheads served by the highway. The most significant need is for relief of traffic and parking congestion which occurs at the Brainard Lake area during summer weekends. A first phase option is to provide shuttle service within the Brainard Lake area itself. Users would be given the option of parking outside of the fee station and taking a shuttle or tram into the area. During times when the Brainard Lake parking area is full, use of the shuttle would be required. The bus transit system also could connect with the existing Regional Transit District [RTD] service approximately 17 miles away at the town of Nederland.

Another ATS option proposed is a transit shuttle for the Mt. Evans Byway to serve those visitors who arrive at the base of the mountain via their own automobile but would prefer to ride a shuttle van to the summit. Many individuals probably do not go to the summit because they are uncomfortable driving on the steep mountain roads with sharp turns and no guard rails. This alternative could involve purchase of vehicles by the Forest Service for use by existing private operators or contracting the service to a private operator.

2.4.3 Economic Development Opportunities

The economic impacts of tourism and recreation on federal lands have been studied in various contexts relating to impacts at the regional level; impacts to industry and recreational activities; and studies of individual parks, forests, tribal lands, and wildlife refuges. Relative to other states, Colorado contains a large number of national forests and FHs, and a sizeable area of national forest land. National forests and FHs, therefore, make an appreciable contribution to the state's economy. In Colorado, there are:

- 14 National forests and national grasslands (7 percent of the 175 national forests and grasslands in the U.S.)
- Approximately 14.5 million acres of national forest lands (7.8 percent of all the national forest lands within the U.S. [USFS, 2008])
- 1,473 miles of FHs (5 percent of the 29,200 miles of FH in the U.S.)
- Colorado's recreation industry contributes \$10 billion annually to the state economy (Outdoor Foundation, 2009)
- Recreation generates \$7.6 billion annually in sales statewide, accounting for approximately 4 percent of the state gross product (Outdoor Foundation, 2009)

2.5 Public Involvement

Public involvement occurs throughout the transportation planning process, and while FH public involvement and planning are unique, they are linked to existing long range and short-term planning efforts of CDOT, the counties, and the national forests in Colorado. FH planning builds upon, and is integrated with other planning efforts for consistency among the partner agencies' planning and public involvement activities, thereby providing multiple opportunities for public involvement.

Public involvement during transportation planning is perhaps best explained by distinguishing “policy level,” “plan level,” and “project level” public involvement opportunities. “Policy level” public involvement occurs during the development of a long range transportation plan, such as CDOT’s 2035 Plan, regional transportation plans (RTP), Forest Plans, and this FH LRTP. Such long range policy plans provide guidance and direction for a transportation program. In short, they address “the big picture.” “Plan level” public involvement occurs during development of shorter-term plans like the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), MPO transportation improvement programs (TIP), and the Federal Lands Highway TIP, that list specific desired improvements and often include prioritized lists of projects to be implemented over the plan’s timeframe. “Project level” public involvement occurs when specific projects are being developed through the process used to evaluate and assess projects under NEPA.

Public involvement continues to be an integral part of the planning process for this LRTP. As such, the Tri-Agency has conducted initial outreach including the development of a FH website that provides current information, by state, for each FH LRTP (<http://www.cflhd.gov/LRTP/index.cfm>). In addition to the website, two newsletters were developed and distributed to forest supervisors, state department of transportation representatives, and county public works supervisors to solicit input on the mission, goals, and objectives, the project selection process, and the draft of this FH LRTP.

The result of the project selection process outlined in this LRTP (a list of approved projects for the FH program) will be included in CDOT’s STIP, which is subject to Colorado’s public involvement process associated with the CDOT 2035 Plan. Because these plans include statewide lists of projects proposed for implementation, public input is used to inform the process of project selection. Therefore, there is some project-specific input at the plan level of public involvement.

The public will have further opportunity to provide input on specific proposed projects through the process used to evaluate and assess projects under NEPA. All projects that include federal funding, such as FH projects, must comply with the NEPA process. The NEPA process requires public outreach at several stages: project scoping (to present the proposed project and identify potential issues), public review of the draft environmental document (environmental assessment or environmental impact statement), and public review of the final environmental impact statement. Additional public involvement opportunities are often provided, such as public meetings at various stages of project development.

Chapter 3: Existing Conditions and Trends

Understanding the current state of FHs is a prerequisite for planning future transportation projects. The dynamics of use, condition, and visitation are therefore considered in transportation funding decisions. Furthermore, this FH LRTP considers changes that are likely to occur in the future, such as increased traffic and visitation due to population increases. As is the nature of LRTPs, the intent is to identify future needs and plan for them proactively. The existing data in this chapter has informed the project selection process described in Chapter 5, and projects will be selected based on that process, not existing data alone.

This chapter offers a summary of the current state of FH transportation infrastructure in terms of type, condition, use, and jurisdiction. Indicators of future trends include population change, visitation, and timber harvesting activity.

3.1 Facility Inventory and Conditions

Currently, CFLHD collects information on road conditions through the Road Inventory Program every two years. Based on the data, it was determined there are 39 routes and 1,473 miles of FH roads in Colorado. Of these, 732 miles (50 percent) are paved and 741 miles (50 percent) are unpaved. Figure 2 summarizes the condition of the roadway network by surface type. Road conditions are also shown in Figure 3. The figures show that most of the FH roads in Colorado are in Good or Fair condition, while 11 percent of paved roads and 0 percent of unpaved roads are in Failed condition. Although most of the roads are in Good or Fair condition, as the network continues to age and traffic volumes increase, more of these Fair roads will deteriorate to Poor condition. Surface condition is an important factor to consider when selecting projects to construct as part of the LRTP, as it has a direct effect on FH operations and safety.

Figure 2
Roadway Condition





Figure 3
Colorado Forest Highway Condition



Source: FHWA, 2008
Note: Not all roads have been rated

There are 109 bridge structures or other structures on the FH road network in Colorado. Of the 109 structures, one bridge is classified as functionally obsolete and nine are classified as structurally deficient. A functionally obsolete bridge is one that was built to standards that are not used today. These bridges are not automatically rated as structurally deficient, nor are they inherently unsafe. Functionally obsolete bridges include those that have sub-standard geometric features such as narrow lanes, narrow shoulders, or inadequate vertical clearances. A bridge is considered structurally deficient if it has a Poor general condition rating for the deck, superstructure, substructure, or culvert. Figure 4 summarizes qualitative bridge structure sufficiency ratings. The location and conditions of these bridges are shown in Figure 5. For the most updated condition information, go to <http://www.cflhd.gov/FHRoadInv/index.cfm> and select the Colorado report.

Figure 4
Bridge Structure Sufficiency Rating





Figure 5
Forest Highway Bridge Condition



Source: FHWA traffic

FHs in Colorado share 14 routes and 476 miles with designated state routes. State routes typically carry higher traffic volumes than other routes, as they serve multiple trip purposes in addition to forest visitation and resource development. In addition, 996 miles of FH roads are shared with county routes. A list of FH routes collocated on state or county routes is included in Appendix F. It has been recognized that current average daily traffic data are still needed for county owned FHs. The overall average daily traffic data are displayed in Figure 6. Many of the FHs are also designated as national or state scenic byways. This is an important distinction, as scenic byways are eligible for additional funding and, therefore, would receive higher priority in project selection. FHs collocated on scenic byway routes are shown in Figure 7.

Surface and structure conditions are important on routes with higher average daily traffic due to the increased exposure to the traveling public. Routes with higher traffic volume will deteriorate faster than those with lower volume in most cases; therefore, priority should be given to routes that have both poor conditions and high traffic volumes.

Because these routes are either designated state routes or county owned FH routes, there is a greater chance to leverage funds to improve these roads. State routes may qualify for other funding sources that could be used to complete FH projects. Counties may have funding for road improvements that alone would not be enough to reconstruct a road but if combined with FH funding, these routes may have a better chance of being selected for improvements due to the opportunity to leverage funds.

An important factor when selecting a project is whether the county or state, as public road authorities, is willing to accept the road preservation responsibilities once the project is completed. If a public road authority is unable or unwilling to accept these duties, the project will have a harder time getting selected; therefore, this program cannot only be a data driven program, but needs to take into account agreements between all project partners.

Figure 6
Colorado Forest Highway Traffic Data





Figure 7
Colorado Scenic Byways



3.2 National Forest Trends in Colorado

The population of Colorado has increased 15 percent from 2000 to 2008 (U.S. Census). Generally, counties overlapping national forests have also increased in population during this period (with the exception of Jackson County, which decreased by 7 percent). Archuleta, Douglas, Garfield, Eagle, and Montrose counties are the top five in population growth among those with National Forests within their limits. Growth in these counties ranged from 18 to 39 percent from 2000 to 2008. Population change between 2000 and 2008 is shown in Figure 9.

According to the Colorado Department of Local Affairs, Colorado is anticipated to have a 56 percent population growth by 2035. While most of this growth is expected to be in metro Denver and the North Front Range, the Western Slope is anticipated to have an 81 percent population growth by 2035. This results in increased congestion for communities that are currently considered rural in nature.

Visitation to national forests in Colorado has also increased in recent years. Figure 9 shows recent visitation levels and percent change between 2002 and 2006 visits. The 2006 report, *Spending Profiles for National Forest Recreation Visitors by Activity* (Stynes & White), provided the basis for the recreation discussion. Figure 10 summarizes the 2006 segment shares for recreation visits to national forests in Colorado.

The forests with the highest visitation are White River and Arapaho & Roosevelt-Pawnee. This may be attributed to the location of the forests near tourist destinations including ski resorts. White River National Forest has more than 70 percent of recreational visits as non-local trips. Arapaho & Roosevelt-Pawnee has the second highest visitation, but the majority of the recreational trips (70 percent) are local trips. This can be attributed to the fact that the forest is located near population centers on the Front Range and many residents visit the forests.

Due to the lack of available and reliable data for resource extraction information (e.g., timber harvesting, oil, and gas), no thorough analysis was completed for this type of national forest use; however, for the limited data available on timber and logging, there has been an increase in the amount of timber harvested in recent years. Much of this increase is attributed to harvesting of dead trees afflicted by drought and disease.

Figure 8
Colorado Population Change by County






Figure 9
National Forest Visitation (2002 versus 2006)



Source: USFS

Figure 10
2006 Recreational Visits



Source: USFS

Note: Local visitors were defined as living within 50 miles of the recreation site. The uses are defined as follows:

- **Non-local day trips:** Non-local residents on day trips
- **Non-local over night (OVN)-national forest:** Non-local resident staying overnight on the national forest
- **Non-local OVN:** Non-local residents staying overnight on the national forest
- **Local day trips:** Local residents on day trips
- **Local OVN-national forest:** Local residents staying overnight on the national forest
- **Local OVN:** Local residents staying overnight on the national forest
- **Non-Primary:** Visits where recreating on the national forest is not the primary trip purpose

Chapter 4: Funding and Investment Strategies

Funding for the FH Program is anticipated to remain at current levels or experience minor increases in the next 20 years; however, with the initiatives, challenges, and changes in local funding and inflation, a well defined funding and investment strategy is critical to the program's success.

This LRTP establishes a project selection process that is designed to be objective, transparent, and capable of evaluating projects that serve the program goals. As part of the proposed project selection process, projects would compete equally based on individual merit in meeting FH Program goals, regardless of project scope. Project applications that articulate how they would address several of the investment guidelines would generally compete better for funds. With limited funding available for potential projects, the FH Program is committed to selecting projects that offer the greatest possible value to access and mobility, system performance, funding and economic development, and natural resource protection.

The ideal project for the FH Program in Colorado is defined as the project that:

- Provides sustainable access to and within Colorado national forests for use and enjoyment of the NFS lands and resources.
- Ensures a safe and reliable transportation network to and within Colorado's national forests.
- Uses innovative partnerships to fund FH projects and to support economic development opportunities at the local, regional, and national level.
- Maintains leadership in protecting and enhancing the natural environment.

This chapter summarizes the recent investment history for FH projects in Colorado, identifies reasonably expected funding through the planning horizon, and illustrates the funding gap between projected funding levels and anticipated need for FH improvements, based on current road and bridge inventory.

4.1 Recent Forest Highway Investments

Since 2005, the FH Program in Colorado has funded four individual construction projects totaling more than \$68 million. These projects include a combination of 3R (repair, resurfacing, and rehabilitation), 4R (repair, resurfacing, rehabilitation, and reconstruction), bridge rehabilitation, and safety improvements for the system, with the majority of the program spent on 3R and 4R projects. Table 2 summarizes these projects by project category. The Tri-Agency recognizes the need to provide a better balance between the types of projects in the program. Program balancing will enable the Tri-Agency to improve a wider range of needs throughout the state, while remaining consistent with the intent of the stated mission and goals of the FH Program. The project selection process, described in Chapter 5, Project Selection Process, describes the manner in which similar type projects will be compared against each other to ensure better program balancing.

Table 2
Colorado Forest Highway Project History

Project Name	Forest Unit	County	Description	Award Amount (in millions)
CO PFH 16 Marvine- Phippsburg	Routt	Rio Blanco	Aggregate surfacing and road rehabilitation	\$4.0
CO PFH 16 Marvine- Phippsburg	Routt	Rio Blanco	Slide repair	\$1.9
CO PFH 80 Guanella Pass Road	Arapaho & Roosevelt	Clear Creek, Park	Grading, drainage, retaining walls, asphalt resurfacing, bridge construction	\$51.7
CO PFH 81 Tarryall Creek Road	Pike	Park	Asphalt surfacing and drainage improvements	\$10.5
TOTAL				\$68.1

4.2 Funding Assumptions

Funding for the FH Program may change with the authorization of new transportation legislation. The annual allocation may remain at current levels or may experience minor increases in the next 20 years. With the initiatives, challenges, and changes in local funding and inflation, a funding and investment strategy is critical to the program's success through the planning horizon.

In fiscal year 2009, the FH program allocated approximately \$11.9 million for Colorado through the Federal Lands Highway Program, which was the maximum allocation under the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU). Because it is unknown at this time how much the next authorization will allocate to the FH program in Colorado, two financial scenarios were developed to illustrate the gap between the needs of the network and the available funding. As shown in Table 3, the two scenarios include one that assumes the current fiscal year allocation of \$11.9 million over the next 20 years, and another assuming a 20 percent increase in current funding over the 20-year period, beginning in fiscal year 2011. It is understood that the next authorization may not match either one of these scenarios; however, these scenarios illustrate methodology that will be used in analyzing the needs versus the available funding.



CO PFH 16 Marvine-Phippsburg

**Table 3
Anticipated Funding Scenarios through the Horizon Year (2030)**

Forecast Scenario	Annual Allocation (in millions)	20-Year Estimate (in millions)
Fiscal Year 09 Estimate	\$11.9	\$238
20 Percent Increase	\$14.3	\$285

4.3 Funding Needs for Stated Goals

Meeting the stated goals and objectives of the FH Program will require wise decisions regarding the program’s investment strategy. In order to achieve the goal of maintaining access to and within the national forest by maintaining and improving the condition of the transportation facilities, funding level expectations must be established. For illustration purposes, one possible strategy used to achieve this goal would be to base project programming and prioritization decisions on the worst condition roads and bridges.



CO PFH 80 Guanella Pass Road

This strategy analyzed the funding that would be needed to improve portions of the FH network that are in less than Good condition. Based on current road condition data, 632 out of a total of 1,473 miles of the roads in the Colorado FH system are rated in Fair or Poor condition. Therefore, this analysis assumes that some level of improvement can be made to nearly half of the road segments in the system. Table 4 summarizes the funding required to improve the worst 25 percent (\$268 million), 50 percent (\$406 million), and 75 percent (\$544 million) of the rated roads in the Colorado FH system, based on an estimated fiscal year 2009 improvement cost per mile.

Table 4
Estimated Funding Required to Improve the
Colorado Forest Highway Road Network

Rated Roads	Total Miles	Mileage Covered By Improvement	Percentage	Estimated Improvement Cost/Mile	Cost to Improve
Worst 25%	1474.09	368.52	25%		\$ 268,473,750
Failed	80.37	80.37	100.00%	\$1,500,000	\$ 120,555,000
Poor	106.30	106.30	100.00%	\$750,000	\$ 79,725,000
Fair	794.57	181.85	22.9%	\$375,000	\$ 68,193,750
Worst 50%	1474.09	737.04	50%		\$ 406,668,750
Failed	80.37	80.37	100.00%	\$1,500,000	\$ 120,555,000
Poor	106.30	106.30	100.00%	\$750,000	\$ 79,725,000
Fair	794.57	550.05	69.3%	\$375,000	\$ 206,388,750
Worst 75%	1474.09	1105.57	75%		\$ 544,867,500
Failed	80.37	80.37	100.00%	\$1,500,000	\$ 120,555,000
Poor	106.30	106.30	100.00%	\$750,000	\$ 79,725,000
Fair	794.57	794.57	100.00%	\$375,000	\$ 297,963,750
Good	485.55	124.33	25.61%	\$375,000	\$ 46,623,750

A similar analysis was conducted for improving the FH bridges. Table 5 summarizes the fiscal year 2009 estimated cost for improving bridges throughout the system. As shown in the table, it would cost more than \$12 million to improve the worst 25 percent of bridges and more than \$28 million to improve the worst 50 percent of bridges in the FH network.

Table 5
Estimated Funding Required to Improve Colorado Forest Highway Bridges

Rated Bridges	Total Number of Rated Bridges	Bridges Covered by Improvement	Total Bridge Square Feet	Estimated Improvement Cost per Square Foot	Cost To Improve
Worst 25%	109	27	50,064	\$250	\$ 12,515,972
Worst 50%	109	55	114,511	\$250	\$ 28,627,686

4.4 Gap Analysis

A gap analysis was performed to show the disparity between funds needed to make wholesale improvements in the FH system and what funding from known sources is likely to be available to make these improvements under either of the two funding scenarios shown in Table 3. Under the fiscal year 2009 funding scenario, the Colorado FH Program will see a \$43 million funding gap over the next 20 years to improve even the worst 25 percent of the system. Under the 20 percent increase funding scenario, these same improvements would result in a \$4 million surplus.

Additional improvements would result in significant shortages. Table 6 summarizes the anticipated funding gaps under the two different scenarios.

Table 6
Anticipated Funding Gap through Planning Horizon Year (2030)

Improvement Level	Estimated Improvement Cost (in millions)*	FY '09 Scenario \$238M (in millions)	20% Increase Scenario \$285M (in millions)
Worst 25%	(\$ 281.0)	(\$ 43.0)	(\$ 4.0)
Worst 50%	(\$ 431.7)	(\$ 193.7)	(\$ 146.7)
Worst 75%	(\$ 544.9)	(\$ 306.9)	(\$ 259.9)

*Bridge improvements considered at each improvement level for those currently rated Failed, Poor, or Fair.

Table 6 indicates that with a 20 percent increase to current funding levels, it will take approximately 40 years to return the entire FH system to an appropriate standard. Bringing the system up to Good condition within a more reasonable period of time can only be accomplished through an increase in available funding or a reduction in the size of the system. Available funding could include appropriated FH finds as well as other contributing funds.

4.5 Additional Funding/Partnering Opportunities

In addition to the funding provided through the Federal Lands Highway Program, other sources have been used for transportation improvements in past years through partnering with state and local agencies. Much of the federal funding that may be applied to FHs is available at the state and local level, which is why partnering is critical to addressing the recognized funding gap. The following funding categories address specific conditions or factors relevant to a particular project:

- Federal sources
- State sources
- Local sources

Federal Funding

SAFETEA-LU provides \$193.2 billion for highway transportation improvements. This funding is administered to states based on a formula, and is administered through the state departments of transportation. This funding focuses on transportation issues of national significance, while giving state and local transportation decision makers more flexibility in solving transportation problems. A large portion of the past federal funding has been through the Surface Transportation Program. Additional federal funding opportunities have included the Transportation Enhancements Program, High Priority Project Program, the Public Lands Highway – Discretionary Program, the Sarbanes Transit in Parks Program, and the National Scenic Byways Program. The following discussions provide additional information on these programs.

Transportation Enhancements

Transportation enhancement activities offer funding opportunities to help expand transportation choices and enhance the transportation experience through 12 eligible transportation enhancement activities related to surface transportation, including pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure and safety programs, scenic and historic highway programs, landscaping and scenic beautification, historic preservation, and environmental mitigation. Transportation enhancement projects must relate to surface transportation and must qualify under one or more of the 12 eligible categories, including bicycle and pedestrian facilities, landscaping and scenic beautification, and environmental mitigation.

High Priority Project Program

The High Priority Projects Program provides designated funding for specific projects identified in SAFETEA-LU. A total of 5,091 projects are identified, each with a specified amount of funding over the six years of the transportation legislation. This program can provide 80 percent of total project cost. The 20-percent match must come from non-federal sources. Federal land management agencies may provide the non-high priority projects' cost for projects on federal or Indian lands using Federal Lands Highway Program and/or Federal land management agency appropriated funds.

Public Lands Highway – Discretionary Program

Public Lands Highway – Discretionary Program funds are available for transportation planning, research, engineering, and construction of highways, roads, parkways, and transit facilities within federal public lands. These funds are also available for operation and maintenance of transit facilities located on federal public lands. Funding is provided for projects designated by Congress. Certain projects not designated by Congress may also be eligible. Only state departments of transportation can submit candidate projects for this program. Eligible projects may include:

- Transportation planning for tourism and recreational travel, including National Forest Scenic Byways, Bureau of Land Management Back Country Byways, National Trail System, and similar federal programs
- Adjacent vehicle parking areas
- Interpretive signs
- Acquisition of scenic easements and scenic or historic sites
- Provision for pedestrians and bicycles

Sarbanes Transit in Parks Program

The Sarbanes Transit in Parks Program is administered by the Federal Transit Administration in conjunction with the Department of the Interior and USFS. It is a competitive grant program open to the National Wildlife Refuge System, the National Park Service, Bureau of Land Management, Bureau of Reclamation, and USFS. The program funds capital and planning expenses for alternative transportation systems such as shuttle buses and bicycle trails. The goals of the program are to conserve natural, historical, and cultural resources; reduce congestion and pollution; improve visitor mobility and accessibility; enhance visitor experience; and ensure access to all, including persons with disabilities. In addition, 10 percent of the annual allocation is available for technical assistance in alternative transportation planning where project proposals are not

already well-developed. The total allocation for the Alternative Transportation for Parks and Public Lands program has been \$20 to \$27 million each year.

National Scenic Byways Program

The National Scenic Byways Program is funded through FHWA to help recognize, preserve, and enhance designated roads throughout the U.S. Designation is awarded to certain roads based on one or more archeological, cultural, historic, natural, recreational, and scenic qualities. SAFETEA-LU allocated \$175 million in funding over six years for byways-related projects. FHWA awards funds competitively each year covering 80 percent of project cost, with the requirement that the remaining 20 percent be matched by local, state, other federal or in-kind means.

State Funding

CDOT's STIP is a multi-year capital improvement program of transportation projects both on and off the State Highway System, funded with revenues from federal, state, and local funding sources. State revenues primarily come from the Highway Users Tax Fund and, now, the Funding Advancements for Surface Transportation and Economic Recovery (Senate Bill [SB] 09-108). If certain conditions are met, CDOT could also get money from the State General Fund per SB 09-228. The STIP includes six years, of which four are required by federal regulations, and the other two are for illustrative purposes. The STIP is updated every four years per federal regulations and adopted at the start of a state fiscal year (July 1). The Transportation Commission adopts the control totals for each STIP early in the process. All projects must be aligned with the visions, goals, and objectives of the corridors in the Statewide Transportation Plan.



CO PFH 81 Tarryall Creek Road

Local Funding

Colorado's five MPOs prepare a TIP, updated every four years, that is incorporated into the STIP without modification. The ten rural transportation planning regions do not prepare a TIP, but their projects are included in the STIP by CDOT. In the rural Transportation Planning Regions, they can create a Regional Planning Council to guide the development of the RTP. Projects in the MPO TIPs include federal, state, and local funds. Other local sources include local funds or in-kind donations such as right-of-way donation, utility relocation, and/or traffic control as part of the project implementation.

Chapter 5: Project Selection Process

Traditionally, the FH Program project selection has been a subjective process, conducted by the Tri-Agency partners during its annual programming meetings. This LRTP establishes a formalized project selection process, which is achieved through issuing a call for projects using a standardized project application. The Tri-Agency will evaluate completed applications based on how well each proposed project meets agreed upon goals, objectives, and selection criteria. The result of project selection is a list of prioritized projects that can be brought before the Tri-Agency partners for informed discussion and funding approval for inclusion in the FH Program and advancement into project development. This process is intended to be used as a guide for programming future projects. The Tri-Agency may alter the process as needed to be responsive to emergency needs, changes in the funding allocations, and other urgent programming needs.


5.1 Forest Highway Call Process

On an annual basis, the Tri-Agency will determine if a call is needed to generate projects for the FH Program. In some instances, there may be some variance from this schedule if, for example, larger corridors have been previously programmed for construction over a number of years. The process consists of the following steps and is shown in Figure 11:

- Call for Projects – USFS, CDOT, and/or counties submit applications to the Tri-Agency.
- Project Selection – Tri-Agency ranks project proposals and selects projects for programming.
- Programming – Tri-Agency includes projects in the 7-Year FH Program, assigns a program year and program amount, and then projects are added to the STIP.

The following sections describe each of these steps in more detail.

**Figure 11
Project Call and Selection Process**



5.1.1 Call for Projects

The purpose of the call process is to solicit potential projects in a transparent and unbiased fashion. The following steps discuss the call process and project applications in more detail.

Step 1: CFLHD issues call for project

Each local USFS office, CDOT, and county with a FH will receive the call packet. The call packets will be made available electronically and will have instructions on how to complete the application. The call packet will also include the details on the goals of the FH program that are used to score each project. A complete call packet example is included in Appendix G.

Step 2: USFS, State DOTs, and counties prepare project applications and submit to Tri-Agency Representatives

Once the USFS, CDOT, and counties receive their packets, it is their responsibility to complete the project applications to the best of their ability. It is the responsibility of the entity proposing a project to supply the necessary information to complete the project application. It is understood that data may not be available for all of the project application questions, but the agency may use anecdotal information as a substitute. Any projects initiated by the county must have the project application submitted through either CDOT or USFS to certify that the application is complete.

Step 3: USFS and State DOTs sign project application and forward to Tri-Agency

After the USFS and CDOT complete their project applications and review applications initiated by counties for completeness, they submit all project applications to CFLHD. CFLHD compiles all project applications and distributes to members of the Tri-Agency for their review.

5.1.2 Project Selection

Once project applications are received, CFLHD distributes the information to the Tri-Agency partners for review of all materials and independent ranking of projects based upon established selection criteria.

Twenty-three CFR §660 established a list of seven criteria (listed in Table 1) for the Tri-Agency to jointly select the projects that will be included in the FH Program. As discussed in Chapter 2, Agency and Planning Coordination, these criteria relate directly to the goals and objectives used in this LRTP. While these criteria are presented in the national regulations, the Tri-Agency has latitude to apply more weight to one or more criteria, and to develop additional guidance for the types of projects that will rank higher. Once the Tri-Agency drafted these selection criteria and weightings, a second newsletter was sent to local USFS and county offices for their input. These comments were incorporated into the scoring criteria.

As this is a 20-year long range planning document, the needs of the system may change during this extended time. To address any changes in needs, the Tri-Agency may establish, through cooperation with the counties and USFS office, a varied weighting scheme or perhaps a set aside portion of the funding dollars to address these issues.

Consistent with the objectives developed in Chapter 1, Introduction, specific criteria were identified that will provide a measure of how well a particular project meets the FH Program's goals. Total points assigned to each goal category are a function of the relative importance that the Tri-Agency places on achieving a particular goal category relative to the mission of the FH Program. FH transportation goals and selection criteria are summarized in Table 7.

After meetings with Tri-Agency partners and comments received from counties and local USFS offices, it was determined that the Access and Mobility and System Performance goals were the two most important goals, with regard to project selection. Both were deemed to have equal importance; therefore, an equal number of points was assigned to each goal. Once the points for the remaining goal were assigned, points were assigned to each performance measure based on the importance of the measure to partnering agencies.



Table 7
Forest Highway Program Transportation Goals and Selection Criteria
Used for Project Ranking

Goals/Project Selection Criteria	Score
Access and Mobility	30
• Type and amount of NFS lands accessed	
• Average daily traffic on FH	
• Overall improvement of the FH network	
• Linkages to alternate modes	
System Performance	30
• Anecdotal safety data	
• Road surface/bridge condition	
• Reduction of maintenance/user cost	
Funding and Economic Development	20
• Support of economic development	
• Percent of leveraged funds	
Natural Resource Protection	20
• Improvement to health of the NFS lands	
• Level of conflict with environmentally sensitive resources	
• Level of coordination required	

Step 4: Tri-Agency Annual Meeting (project ranking and programming)

A planning work session is then scheduled for the Tri-Agency to discuss the merits of each project proposal based on the established weighted criteria. Depending on the outcome of discussion, a project may proceed in one of three ways:

- Advance - Project is programmed
- Need more information - Additional information is collected before a program decision is made
- Drop - Project receives no further consideration.

Low-ranked projects or those with insufficient information may be removed from the project list at this time. Projects of greater complexity and high ranking may require additional information before a programming decision can be made. Top ranked projects are programmed. In extreme cases, situations may arise that require action be taken to address urgent and immediate needs within the FH system. When such unanticipated acts of nature occur, the Tri-Agency retains the authority to re-prioritize and re-allocate funds to projects that must be completed to address safety concerns or immediate risks of catastrophic failure.

Each member of the Tri-Agency scores projects based on the selection criteria in Table 7. Once each of the projects is scored, each member of the Tri-Agency must rank the projects depending on the scope. For example, small safety projects will be ranked among other small safety projects, and large reconstruction projects will be ranked among other large reconstruction projects, and so forth. This is done because the overall program has \$11.9 million per year and programming will have to be flexible through a mix of a few large reconstruction projects, with bridge replacements, or spot improvements.

Any projects that needed additional information prior to being programmed will have it collected during this step. This time will also be used for site visits to recommended projects that have major rehabilitation, reconstruction, or new construction. The site visit will include a road safety audit.

5.1.3 Programming

The efforts of this process culminate in a recommended list of projects to advance to the Tri-Agency program meeting for inclusion in the 7-Year FH Program. Once the Tri-Agency has approved the project list and prioritization, each project will advance to Step 5.

Step 5: Projects assigned funding and program year on CFLHD TIP

Each approved project is assigned a program year and program amount, based on funding availability and other programming considerations. As mentioned previously, there are only \$11.9 million per year, and programming will need to be flexible by having a mix of projects with different scales of scope.

Step 6: CFLHD TIP submitted to CDOT

After funding and program years are assigned, the list of projects is sent to CDOT for inclusion in the STIP.

Step 7: Project delivery

The final step for each project is project delivery. CFLHD prepares engineering drawing, constructs the project, and turns it over to the agency with jurisdiction.

5.2 Unconstrained Program of Projects

Upon finalization of this LRTP, the first call for projects under this new plan will go out to forests, counties, and the state. All applications will then go through the project selection process outlined in this chapter. Following the program meeting, the projects identified for programming will be added to the unconstrained list of projects and updated following each call. This list will be included in future updates to the LRTP once the first call is issued and projects are selected. The current 7-year FH Program list of funded projects is provided in Appendix H. The project selection process described in this chapter will not alter currently programmed project obligations.

Chapter 6: Recommendations for Future Plan Activities

This FH LRTP establishes a formalized project selection process, which is achieved through issuing a call for projects, establishing project application materials, and using agreed upon goals, objectives, and selection criteria to evaluate and rank projects. The result of project selection is a list of prioritized projects that can be brought before the Tri-Agency partners for informed discussion and funding approval for inclusion in the FH Program and advancement into project development. Several action items have been identified during the development of the Colorado LRTP. These items are summarized in Table 8.

Table 8
Long Range Transportation Plan Action Items

No.	Action Item	Description
1	Improve data collection and monitoring	<p>In addition to the Road Inventory Program, additional data, such as average daily traffic and crash data, should be collected to monitor all FHs, specifically on county and USFS routes where current data is not available.</p> <p>Data for resource extraction should also be collected. Typically, vehicles used for resource extraction are larger and heavier vehicles that cause more damage to the roadway. Average daily traffic and crash data are also important to determine the amount of traffic using a FH and the associated crash rates with that FH. The data gathered during these monitoring efforts may then be used in future LRTP updates to change how projects are ranked, or how project selection is determined based on the needs and performance of the FH network.</p>
2	Set performance objectives for FH program	<p>The Tri-Agency should create performance measures and quantifiable targets to assist in ranking and selecting projects. Targets for each goal area should be established in 3-5 year strategic plans. The partner agencies will use those targets to evaluate how well the FH Program is achieving the goals.</p>
3	Complete system-wide FH route validation	<p>Prior to the expiration of the next federal transportation funding authorization, a review of the current FH network should be conducted. Forest Supervisors and Regional CDOT representatives will be asked to evaluate FH's within their respective jurisdictions. The evaluation will include comparing the service provided by each individual route with current land management needs and the FH criteria found in 23 United States Code §101 and 23 CFR §660.105(d). The evaluation should prioritize existing FHs based on how well they meet the designation criteria. Proposals for new FH routes may also be identified at this time. The Tri-Agency partners can then discuss the evaluations to determine which routes are suitable for continued or new designations. These are initial steps that should be implemented in the short term to ensure that the current FH network continues to meet the intent of the FH program.</p>

**Table 8
Long Range Transportation Plan Action Items**

No.	Action Item	Description
4	Update LRTP every five years	This LRTP is intended to be a living document that will require some changes over time and will need to be updated in order to reflect changes in project selections, goals and objectives, or any other items that may affect the project selection process. It is anticipated that the update cycle will be every five years. The LRTP updates will take into account the current FH network, existing conditions based on road inventory data, and the list of programmed projects.
5	After first project call, reevaluate project selection process	Once the initial call for projects is complete, the Tri-Agency should evaluate the project selection process. Some things to consider would be the number of project applications received, the types of projects, agencies submitting projects, location of projects, etc. These factors will help determine if there needs to be additional outreach to agencies, more description on the types of projects that are eligible, etc.
6	Consider a safety set-aside in project programming	Consider a safety set aside equal to approximately 10 percent of the program for safety improvements. Projects would typically cost less than \$500,000 and could consist of low cost-high return projects such as signing and delineation at crash prone locations. Part of this process could also include completing road safety audits or assessments on an on-going basis as issues arise.

APPENDIX A

Appendix A: Tri-Agency Roles

FH planning requires the involvement of federal, state, and local governments to ensure suitable outcomes for all organizations involved. The three primary agencies involved in FH planning (CDOT, USFS, and CFLHD) have very specific roles and responsibilities as part of the planning and implementation of FH projects as listed in the following table. Colorado counties also play a vital role in the FH Program by assuming the role of operator and maintainer of many FHs following project construction. In many cases, counties obtain right of way and handle utility relocations for projects on their roads, as part of their funding contribution. Typically, counties work through CDOT during most of the project planning and design. CDOT represents all counties as part of their role in the Tri-Agency.

Agency Roles in Forest Highway Project Development

Role/Responsibility	Counties	CDOT	USFS	CFLHD
Proposes routes for FH designation	X	X	X	
Approves proposed routes for FH designation				X
Coordinates with local governments on proposed FH routes and projects		X	X	
Proposes projects for the FH Program	X	X	X	
Selects/approves projects for FH program		X	X	X
Enters in project agreement		X	X	X
Concurs with project plans and estimates*		X	X	
Inspects and approves final construction		X	X	X
Contributes cooperative funding for projects	X	X	X	
Obtains right of way and assumes maintenance responsibility	X	X		
Administers FH program funds				X
Advertises, awards, and administers construction contract				X

*CFLHD develops project plans and estimates



APPENDIX B

Appendix B: Colorado Forest Highway Program Background

Forest Highway History

In 1891, Congress authorized the creation of Forest Reserves, now called National Forests. Forests were to be conserved to assure a permanent national timber supply; to preserve scenic and wilderness areas for recreational use by the public; and to safeguard the steady flow of streams that supplied water for domestic, farm, and industrial use.

Federal participation in forest road construction began when Congress passed the Federal-Aid Road Act in 1916. This act appropriated \$10 million (\$1 million per year for 10 years) for the "[...] survey, construction, and maintenance of roads and trails within or only partly within the national forests when necessary for the use and development of resources upon which communities within and adjacent to the national forests are dependent."

It was not until the passage of the Federal Highway Act of 1921 that two types of forest roads were defined:

- Forest Development Roads - those forest roads that are needed primarily for management of the national forests
- Forest Highways (FH) - those forest roads which must serve the national forests and also serve the communities within and adjacent to the national forests

During the first 50+ years of the program, most of the funds were expended on routes which were of primary importance to the states, counties, or communities within or adjacent to the national forests. Most of those routes were of statewide importance and were then, or later became, state primary highways.

The 1978 Surface Transportation Assistance Act changed the direction of the FH Program by redefining forest roads, forest development roads, and FHs:

- "The term 'forest road or trail' means a road or trail wholly or partly within, or adjacent to, and serving the National Forest system and which is necessary for the protection, administration, and utilization of the National Forest system and the use and development of its resources."
- "The term 'forest development road and trail' means a forest road or trail under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service."
- "The term 'Forest Highway' means a forest road under the jurisdiction of, and maintained by, a public authority, and open to public travel."

A primary effect of these new definitions was increased FH Program emphasis on local roads with less emphasis on state highways. This was possible because requirements that such routes be "[...] of primary importance to the States, Counties, or communities [...], and on the Federal-Aid System" had been eliminated.

Although many miles of roads have met the requirements of FH designation in Colorado, funding for their improvement has remained in short supply. Congress had authorized an amount of \$33 million for each year from 1955 to 1982. These funds were made available to Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) for expenditure in the various States according to an apportionment formula based on the area and value of the national forests in each State.

The 1991 Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) combined the FH Program and Public Lands under the Public Lands Highway Program. Sixty-six (66) percent of these Public Lands funds were allocated for use on FHs using the same formula as applied in FY 1987 to FY 1991. This formula used the Area/Value formula for 66 percent of the funding and the FHWA/USFS relative needs formula for the remaining 34 percent.

The 1998 TEA-21 did not alter any of the allocation formulas for 66 percent of the Public Lands funds but did increase the amount of funding for FHs. The FH funds available are as follows:

Year	Total Forest Highway Funds
1998	\$129.4 Million
1999	\$162.4 Million
2000	\$162.4 Million
2001	\$162.4 Million
2002	\$162.4 Million
2003	\$162.4 Million
2004	\$162.4 Million
2005	\$171.6 Million
2006	\$184.8 Million
2007	\$184.8 Million
2008	\$191.4 Million
2009	\$198.0 Million

Allocations for the FH Program in Colorado, from 2002 to 2009, were as follows:

Year	Forest Highway Allocations in Colorado
2002	\$10.5 Million
2003	\$10.5 Million
2004	\$10.5 Million
2005	\$10.5 Million
2006	\$10.7 Million
2007	\$11.1 Million
2008	\$11.5 Million
2009	\$11.9 Million
<i>Annual Average 2002-2009</i>	<i>\$10.9 Million</i>

TEA-21 also legislated the following program changes:

- Allowed Public Lands funds to be used for the state/local share for Federal-Aid Highway funded projects.
- Reduced the administrative takedown to 1.5 percent.
- Placed an annual limitation on Public Land's funds.
- Provided full obligation limitation for future fiscal year carryover funds.
- Authorized funds, which exceed the obligation limitation for FY 1998 to 2003, to be distributed to the states as Surface Transportation Program funds. These funds lose their funding designation and are not available for obligation by Federal Land Management agencies.

Because of the legislative and regulatory changes over the past decade, there is now more county involvement in the program as the Forest needs generally are on those local roads connecting the forest to the main state highways. With these changes, the objective of the FH Program has been clarified, i.e., to construct or improve roads serving the national forest and its resources and which connect the national forest to the main state transportation network.

Forest Highway Designation

FHs are designated as such if they meet certain criteria. The list of designated forest highways is not fixed. Routes can be added or removed at any time. Forest Highway route designation may be requested by the Colorado Department of Transportation, the USFS or by a county through the state. Routes are designated by Central Federal Lands Highway (CFLHD) Division Engineer with concurrence of the USFS and the state. Routes do not have to be designated before a project can be proposed, but a route must be designated before FH funds are expended on it.

Route designation proposals must contain information on the criteria listed below and must be coordinated with the local USFS representatives who can provide information on USFS use of the proposed route. USFS support for the proposed designation is very important.

The Forest Service Manual Chapter 7700

7741.1 - Route Designation: Forest highways are a special classification of forest roads. They are specifically designated State or local government roads that meet the criteria listed in 23 CFR 660.105. The designation of forest highways is not intended to form a "system" of roads. Instead, the purpose of the designation is to identify State and local government roads that qualify for construction and reconstruction funding under the forest highway program.

The challenge is that the FH routes in Colorado are not by themselves a “system” of roads, but are part of state and county road systems. Many roads in the State of Colorado will meet the definition of a FH, the key is what roads need all or part of the FH Program to truly meet the needs of accessing the national forests.

To be designated as a FH, a route must:

1. Be wholly or partially within, or adjacent to, and serving the National Forest System (NFS) (23 USC §101).
2. Be necessary for the protection, administration, and utilization of the NFS (23 USC §101).
3. Be necessary for the use and development of NFS resources (23 USC §101).
4. Be under the jurisdiction of a cooperator and open to public travel (23 CFR §660.105).
5. Provide a connection between NFS resources and one of the following (23 CFR §660.105):
 - a. A safe and adequate public road
 - b. Communities
 - c. Shipping points
 - d. Markets dependent on these resources
6. Serve one of the following (23 CFR §660.105):
 - a. Local needs such as schools, mail delivery, commercial supply
 - b. Access to private property within the NFS
 - c. A preponderance of NFS generated traffic
 - d. NFS generated traffic that has a significant impact on road design or construction.

APPENDIX C

Appendix C: 23 CFR 660, Subpart A—Forest Highways

Authority:

16 USC §§1608–1610; 23 USC §§101, 202, 204, and 315; 49 CFR 1.48.

Source:

59 FR 30300, June 13, 1994, unless otherwise noted.

§660.101 Purpose.

The purpose of this subpart is to implement the Forest Highway (FH) Program which enhances local, regional, and national benefits of FHs funded under the public lands highway category of the coordinated Federal Lands Highway Program. As provided in 23 USC 202, 203, and 204, the program, developed in cooperation with State and local agencies, provides safe and adequate transportation access to and through National Forest System (NFS) lands for visitors, recreationists, resource users, and others which is not met by other transportation programs. Forest highways assist rural and community economic development and promote tourism and travel.

§660.103 Definitions.

In addition to the definitions in 23 USC 101(a), the following apply to this subpart:

Cooperator means a non-Federal public authority which has jurisdiction and maintenance responsibility for a FH.

Forest highway means a forest road under the jurisdiction of, and maintained by, a public authority and open to public travel.

Forest road means a road wholly or partly within, or adjacent to, and serving the NFS and which is necessary for the protection, administration, and utilization of the NFS and the use and development of its resources.

Jurisdiction means the legal right or authority to control, operate, regulate use of, maintain, or cause to be maintained, a transportation facility, through ownership or delegated authority. The authority to construct or maintain such a facility may be derived from fee title, easement, written authorization, or permit from a Federal agency, or some similar method.

Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) means that organization designated as the forum for cooperative transportation decision making pursuant to the provisions of part 450 of this title.

Metropolitan Transportation Plan means the official intermodal transportation plan that is developed and adopted through the metropolitan transportation planning process for the metropolitan planning area.

National Forest System means lands and facilities administered by the Forest Service (FS), U.S. Department of Agriculture, as set forth in the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resource Planning Act of 1974, as amended (16 USC 1601 note, 1600–1614).

Open to public travel means except during scheduled periods, extreme weather conditions, or emergencies, open to the general public for use with a standard passenger auto, without restrictive gates or prohibitive signs or regulations, other than for general traffic control or restrictions based on size, weight, or class of registration.

Public authority means a Federal, State, county, town, or township, Indian tribe, municipal or other local government or instrumentality with authority to finance, build, operate, or maintain toll or toll-free facilities.

Public lands highway means: (1) A forest road under the jurisdiction of and maintained by a public authority and open to public travel or (2) any highway through unappropriated or unreserved public lands, nontaxable Indian lands, or other Federal reservations under the jurisdiction of and maintained by a public authority and open to public travel.

Public road means any road or street under the jurisdiction of and maintained by a public authority and open to public travel.

Renewable resources means those elements within the scope of responsibilities and authorities of the FS as defined in the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resource Planning Act of August 17, 1974 (88 Stat. 476) as amended by the National Forest Management Act of October 22, 1976 (90 Stat. 2949; 16 U.S.C. 1600–1614) such as recreation, wilderness, wildlife and fish, range, timber, land, water, and human and community development.

Resources means those renewable resources defined above, plus other nonrenewable resources such as minerals, oil, and gas which are included in the FS's planning and land management processes.

Statewide transportation plan means the official transportation plan that is: (1) Intermodal in scope, including bicycle and pedestrian features, (2) addresses at least a 20-year planning horizon, and (3) covers the entire State pursuant to the provisions of part 450 of this title.

§660.105 Planning and route designation.

(a) The FS will provide resource planning and related transportation information to the appropriate MPO and/or State Highway Agency (SHA) for use in developing metropolitan and statewide transportation plans pursuant to the provisions of part 450 of this title. Cooperators shall provide various planning (23 USC 134 and 135) information to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) for coordination with the FS.

(b) The management systems required under 23 USC 303 shall fulfill the requirement in 23 U.S.C. 204(a) regarding the establishment and implementation of pavement, bridge, and safety management systems for FHs. The results of bridge management systems and safety management systems on all FHs and results of pavement management systems for FHs on



Federal-aid highways are to be provided by the SHAs for consideration in the development of programs under §660.109 of this part. The FHWA will provide appropriate pavement management results for FHs which are not Federal-aid highways.

(c) The FHWA, in consultation with the FS, the SHA, and other cooperators where appropriate, will designate FHs.

(1) The SHA and the FS will nominate forest roads for FH designation.

(2) The SHA will represent the interests of all cooperators. All other agencies shall send their proposals for FHs to the SHA.

(d) A FH will meet the following criteria:

(1) Generally, it is under the jurisdiction of a public authority and open to public travel, or a cooperator has agreed, in writing, to assume jurisdiction of the facility and to keep the road open to public travel once improvements are made.

(2) It provides a connection between adequate and safe public roads and the resources of the NFS which are essential to the local, regional, or national economy, and/or the communities, shipping points, or markets which depend upon those resources.

(3) It serves:

(i) Traffic of which a preponderance is generated by use of the NFS and its resources; or

(ii) NFS-generated traffic volumes that have a substantial impact on roadway design and construction; or

(iii) Other local needs such as schools, mail delivery, commercial supply, and access to private property within the NFS.

§660.107 Allocations.

On October 1 of each fiscal year, the FHWA will allocate 66 percent of Public Lands Highway funds, by FS Region, for FHs using values based on relative transportation needs of the NFS, after deducting such sums as deemed necessary for the administrative requirements of the FHWA and the FS; the necessary costs of FH planning studies; and the FH share of costs for approved Federal Lands Coordinated Technology Implementation Program studies.

§660.109 Program development.

(a) The FHWA will arrange and conduct a conference with the FS and the SHA to jointly select the projects which will be included in the programs for the current fiscal year and at least the next 4 years. Projects included in each year's program will be selected considering the following criteria:

- (1) The development, utilization, protection, and administration of the NFS and its resources;
- (2) The enhancement of economic development at the local, regional, and national level, including tourism and recreational travel;
- (3) The continuity of the transportation network serving the NFS and its dependent communities;
- (4) The mobility of the users of the transportation network and the goods and services provided;
- (5) The improvement of the transportation network for economy of operation and maintenance and the safety of its users;
- (6) The protection and enhancement of the rural environment associated with the NFS and its resources; and
- (7) The results for FHs from the pavement, bridge, and safety management systems.

(b) The recommended program will be prepared and approved by the FHWA with concurrence by the FS and the SHA. Following approval, the SHA shall advise any other cooperators in the State of the projects included in the final program and shall include the approved program in the State's process for development of the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program. For projects located in metropolitan areas, the FHWA and the SHA will work with the MPO to incorporate the approved program into the MPO's Transportation Improvement Program.

§660.111 Agreements.

(a) A statewide FH agreement shall be executed among the FHWA, the FS, and each SHA. This agreement shall set forth the responsibilities of each party, including that of adherence to the applicable provisions of Federal and State statutes and regulations.

(b) The design and construction of FH projects will be administered by the FHWA unless otherwise provided for in an agreement approved under this subpart.

(c) A project agreement shall be entered into between the FHWA and the cooperator involved under one or more of the following conditions:

- (1) A cooperator's funds are to be made available for the project or any portion of the project;
- (2) Federal funds are to be made available to a cooperator for any work;

- (3) Special circumstances exist which make a project agreement necessary for payment purposes or to clarify any aspect of the project; or
- (4) It is necessary to document jurisdiction and maintenance responsibility.

§660.112 Project development.

(a) Projects to be administered by the FHWA or the FS will be developed in accordance with FHWA procedures for the Federal Lands Highway Program. Projects to be administered by a cooperator shall be developed in accordance with Federal-aid procedures and procedures documented in the statewide agreement.

(b) The FH projects shall be designed in accordance with part 625 of this chapter or those criteria specifically approved by the FHWA for a particular project.

§660.113 Construction.

(a) No construction shall be undertaken on any FH project until plans, specifications, and estimates have been concurred in by the cooperator(s) and the FS, and approved in accordance with procedures contained in the statewide FH agreement.

(b) The construction of FHs will be performed by the contract method, unless construction by the FHWA, the FS, or a cooperator on its own account is warranted under 23 U.S.C. 204(e).

(c) Prior to final construction acceptance by the contracting authority, the project shall be inspected by the cooperator, the FS, and the FHWA to identify and resolve any mutual concerns.

§660.115 Maintenance.

The cooperator having jurisdiction over a FH shall, upon acceptance of the project in accordance with §660.113(c), assume operation responsibilities and maintain, or cause to be maintained, any project constructed under this subpart.

§660.117 Funding, records and accounting.

(a) The Federal share of funding for eligible FH projects may be any amount up to and including 100 percent. A cooperator may participate in the cost of project development and construction, but participation shall not be required.

(b) Funds for FHs may be used for:

- (1) Planning;
- (2) Federal Lands Highway research;
- (3) Preliminary and construction engineering; and
- (4) Construction.

(c) Funds for FHs may be made available for the following transportation-related improvement purposes which are generally part of a transportation construction project:

- (1) Transportation planning for tourism and recreational travel;
- (2) Adjacent vehicular parking areas;
- (3) Interpretive signage;
- (4) Acquisition of necessary scenic easements and scenic or historic sites;
- (5) Provisions for pedestrians and bicycles;
- (6) Construction and reconstruction of roadside rest areas including sanitary and water facilities; and
- (7) Other appropriate public road facilities as approved by the FHWA.

(d) Use of FH funds for right-of-way acquisition shall be subject to specific approval by the FHWA.

(e) Cooperators which administer construction of FH projects shall maintain their FH records according to 49 CFR part 18.

(f) Funds provided to the FHWA by a cooperator should be received in advance of construction procurement unless otherwise specified in a project agreement.

APPENDIX D

Appendix D: Partner Agency Mission and Goals

Although the vision, mission, and goals were developed collaboratively between Tri-Agency partners, each agency retains vision, mission, or goals that are of unique interest to the individual agency. The interests of individual Tri-Agency partners are summarized below.

CDOT

The mission of CDOT is to provide the best multi-modal transportation system for Colorado that most effectively moves people, goods, and information. CDOT's values include:

- Safety: Work and live safely. Protect human life, preserve property, and put employee safety before production.
- People: Value our employees. Acknowledge and recognize the skills and abilities of coworkers, place a high value on employee safety, and draw strength from diversity and commitment to equal opportunity.
- Integrity: Earn Colorado's trust. Be honest and responsible and hold to the highest moral and ethical standards.
- Customer Service: Satisfy customers. With a can-do attitude work together and with others to respond effectively to customer's needs.
- Excellence: Committed to quality. Leaders and problem solvers, continuously improving products and services in support of the commitment to provide the best transportation systems for Colorado.
- Respect: Respect each other. Kind and civil with everyone, and act with courage and humility.

U.S. Forest Service

The USFS mission is to sustain the health, diversity, and productivity of the Nation's forests and grasslands to meet the needs of present and future generations. USFS goals include:

- Effective public service – Ensure the acquisition and use of an appropriate corporate infrastructure to enable the efficient delivery of a variety of uses.
- Multiple benefits to people – Provide a variety of uses, values, products, and services for present and future generations by managing within the capability of sustainable ecosystems.
- Ecosystem health – Promote ecosystem health and conservation using a collaborative approach to sustain the nation's forests, rangelands, and watersheds.

Federal Lands Highway

The Federal Lands Highway mission is to continually improve transportation access to and through federal and tribal lands through stewardship of Federal Land Highway programs by providing balanced, safe, and innovative roadways that blend into or enhance the existing environment, and by providing technical services to the transportation community. The goals include:

- Safety – Continually improve highway safety.
- Mobility – Continually improve access and condition of transportation.



- Productivity – Continually improve economic efficiency.
- Human and Natural Environment – Protect and enhance the natural environment and communities affected by highway transportation.

APPENDIX E

Appendix E: Forest Plan Functions

The following table summarizes the functions and limitations of National Forest Land and Resource Management Plans (Forest Plans) related to a variety of topics.

What a Forest Plan Does and Does Not Do

<i>Topic</i>	<i>The Forest Plan</i> does...	<i>The Forest Plan</i> does not...
Laws, regulations, and policies	Use guidance provided by the Forest Service Handbook, Forest Service Manual, and other federal regulations and policies to create an over-arching management plan for the National Forest.	Make law, regulations, or policy. The Revised Forest Plan is not a policy-making document; it reflects agency policy and goals.
Budget for local Forest Service operations	Consider the financial feasibility of implementing Plan goals and objectives.	Determine funding levels for the National Forest (budget allocations are determined in other ways).
Travel management	Identify what kinds of travel are suitable to particular parcels of land, based on desired future conditions (DFCs) and other designations. This can vary by season.	Make the decision to open, close, or otherwise restrict use of a specific road or trail to certain modes of travel (such as ATVs or mountain bikes). If the management objective for certain parcels changes, site-specific plans for road and trail management will have to be made separately from the Forest Plan to bring travel into compliance. Decisions about specific roads and trails are made through project-level NEPA analysis and decision documents.
Timber harvests	Identify sustainable annual yields. Identify which lands are suitable for timber harvests for various objectives, including timber production.	Identify individual areas that will be offered for sale.
Timber sales	Provide direction and standards to determine where and how sales can take place, based on goals and objectives.	Approve any site-specific timber sale.
Grazing allotments	Analyze and disclose which lands are suitable for grazing. Describe the parameters or standards grazing practice shall attain.	Make decisions about what to do with vacant allotments or allotment management plans and permit renewals.



<i>Topic</i>	<i>The Forest Plan</i> does...	<i>The Forest Plan</i> does not...
Land exchanges	Identify values and considerations to be evaluated in potential exchange of land parcels. Identify landscapes where opportunities to consolidate landownership patterns should or should not be pursued to meet DFCs and objectives.	Identify or prioritize specific parcels for exchanges. Guidance for required analyses for land exchanges is in Forest Service manuals and handbooks.
Ski areas	Identify which lands have DFCs, objectives, standards, and suitability that emphasize ski-based resorts.	Approve creation of any additional infrastructure such as lifts, runs, or snowmaking facilities.
Endangered species	Provide DFCs, objectives, and standards to ensure sustainable habitat conditions for species that have been listed for protection under the Endangered Species Act.	Decide which species will be protected under the Endangered Species Act. These decisions are made by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS).
Hunting and wildlife management	Describe desired conditions, objectives, and standards for managing the habitat for many game and non-game species.	Set hunting seasons, designate areas as open or closed to hunting, or set harvest levels or hunting fees. Seasons and limits are set by Colorado Division of Wildlife (except for migratory birds, which are set by USFWS.)
Wilderness	Recommend to Congress those areas that are capable and suitable for designation as wilderness. Allocate land to area designations that are managed for wilderness values.	Create or designate lands as Wilderness.
Wild, scenic and recreational rivers	Identify river segments eligible for further study as wild, scenic, or recreational under the nation's Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. Allocate land to river corridors that must be managed to maintain the values that provide eligibility for wild, scenic, and/or recreational rivers.	Designate those rivers as wild, scenic, or recreational. A finding of eligibility does not automatically launch further study.
Law enforcement	Emphasize cooperative partnerships and collaborative activities with stakeholder groups, local communities, and governments.	Include directives about law enforcement, specify enforcement staffing, or budget for those operations.

Source: http://www.fs.fed.us/r2/gmug/policy/plan_rev/lwg/mtg_notes/unc_notes/10102002_plans_do_dont.sht



APPENDIX F

Colorado Forest Highways (May 2007)

FH Route	SR/CR	Route Name	Description of Termini	CDOT Region	TPR	STIP #	2035 LRTP - Corridor?	National Forest	County	Length (MI)	Length (KM)
1	SR-145	Dolores- Rico	This route starts at the junction with 17th Street and Central Avenue in Dolores and proceeds northeasterly 60.22 miles (96.89 km) on SR-145 to the junction with Telluride-Placerville Road.	5	SW/GV		Yes	San Juan Uncompahgre	Montezuma Dolores San Miguel	60.22	96.89
2	US-550	Durango-Red Mountain	This route starts at the junction with CR-200 and proceeds northerly 56.33 miles (90.63 km) on US-550 to the west forest boundary.	5	SW/GV		Yes	San Juan Uncompahgre	La Plata San Juan Ouray	56.33	90.63
5	SR-17	Cumbres Pass	This route starts at the New Mexico State Line and proceeds easterly 25.84 miles (41.58 km) on SR-17 to Conejos River Campground 12 miles west of Antonito.	5	SW/SLV		Yes	Rio Grande	Archuleta Conejos	25.84	41.58
7	SR-149	South Fork-Lake City	This route starts at the junction with US-160 at South Fork and proceeds northwesterly on SR-149 71.30 miles (114.72 km) to the junction with Henson Creek, 2 miles south of Lake City.	3 & 5	GV/SLV		Yes	Rio Grande Gunnison	Rio Grande Mineral Hinsdale	71.3	114.72
8	US-160	Mancos-Hesperus	This route starts at the Montezuma - LaPlata County line, east of Mancos, and proceeds easterly 6.31 miles (10.15 km) on US-160 to the south forest boundary northwest of Hesperus.	5	SW		Yes	San Juan	Montezuma La Plata	6.31	10.15
10	SR-12	Cuchara Pass	This route starts at the Las Animas - Huerfano County line and proceeds northerly 9.18 miles (14.77 km) on SR-12 to the junction with the Cucharas River, 9 miles southwest of La Veta.	2	SC		Yes	San Isabel	Las Animas Huerfano	9.18	14.77
11	SR-92	Black Mesa	This route starts at Crystal Creek and proceeds southeasterly 19.83 miles (31.9 km) on SR-92 to Curecanti Creek.	3 & 5	GV/SLV		Yes	Gunnison	Montrose Gunnison	19.83	31.91
12	CR-12	Somerset-Crested Butte	This route starts at the junction of SR-133 at Paonia Reservoir and proceeds easterly 29.94 miles (48.17 km) over CR-12 to the junction with Wildcat Creek, west of Crested Butte.	3	GV/SLV			Gunnison	Gunnison	29.96	48.21
13	SR-65	Cedaredge-Mesa	This route starts at the junction with FR 123, 10 miles north of Cedaredge, and proceeds northwesterly 26.56 miles (42.72 km) on SR-65 to the junction with CR IE.00, south of Mesa.	3	GV/GVMPO		Yes	Grand Mesa	Delta Mesa	26.56	42.74
15	SR-133	McClure Pass	This route starts at the junction with CR 12 and proceeds northerly 37.30 miles (60.02 km) on SR-133 to the junction with Thompson Creek, south of Carbondale.	3	GV/IM		Yes	Gunnison	Gunnison	37.3	60.02
16	CR-8, CR-132, CR-15, CR-17	Marvine-Phippsburg	This route starts at the junction of CR-12, 9.7 miles east of Buford and proceeds easterly 42.82 miles (68.93 km) over Rio Blanco CR-8, 3.93 miles (6.32 km) over Routt CR-132, 1 mile (1.61 km) over Routt CR-15 and 4.23 miles (6.81 km) over Routt CR-17 to the junction with SR-131 at Phippsburg.	3	NW	SNW6844		White River Routt	Rio Blanco Routt	52	83.67
20	CR-129	Hahns Peak	This route starts at the junction with US-40, 3 miles west of Steamboat Springs, and proceeds northerly 56.20 miles (90.43 km) over CR-129 to the Wyoming State Line near the Little Snake River.	3	NW			Routt	Routt	56.2	90.43
22	SR-14	Cameron Pass	This route starts at the junction with the south fork of the Michigan River, southeast of Waldon, and proceeds easterly 69.54 miles (111.89 km) on SR-14 to the junction with US-287 northwest of Fort Collins.	3 & 4	NW/UFR/NFR		Yes	Roosevelt	Jackson Larimer	69.54	111.89
26	SR-7	South Saint Vrain	This route starts at the junction with SR-72 in Raymond and proceeds northerly 19.17 miles (30.84 km) over SR-7 to the junction with US-36 in Estes Park.	4	UFR/DRCOG		Yes	Roosevelt	Larimer Boulder	19.17	30.84

FH Route	SR/CR	Route Name	Description of Termini	CDOT Region	TPR	STIP #	2035 LRTP - Corridor?	National Forest	County	Length (MI)	Length (KM)
27	SR-72	Nederland-Raymond	This route starts at the junction with SR-119 at Nederland and proceeds northerly 21.61 miles (34.77 km) over SR-72 to the junction with SR-7 in Raymond.	4	DRCOG		Yes	Roosevelt	Boulder	21.61	34.77
29	SR-119	Idaho Springs-Boulder	This route starts at the junction of US-6 and proceeds northerly 25.77 miles (41.46 km) over SR-119 to the junction with SR-72 in Nederland.	1 & 4	DRCOG		Yes	Arapaho Roosevelt	Gilpin Boulder	25.77	41.46
54	SR-103	Mt. Evans Highway	This route starts at the junction with business I-70 at Idaho Springs and proceeds southerly 13.23 miles (21.29 km) on SR-103 to Echo Lake, then southerly 14.41 miles (23.19 km) on SR-5 to the top of Mt. Evans.	1	DRCOG		Yes	Arapaho	Clear Creek	27.64	44.47
59	CR-742, CR-209, CR-306	Almont-Buena Vista	This route starts at the junction with SR-135 in Almont and proceeds easterly 25.07 miles (40.34 km) over Gunnison CR-742, 13.48 miles (21.69 km) over Gunnison CR-209 and 19.23 miles (30.94 km) over Chaffee CR-306 to the junction with US-24 in Buena Vista.	3 & 5	SLV/GV	SGV6845		Gunnison San Isabel	Gunnison Chaffee	57.78	92.97
60	CR-38	West Dolores	This route starts at the junction with SR-145 near the crossing of the West Dolores River and proceeds northeasterly 32.25 miles (51.89 km) over CR-38 to the junction with SR-145 North of Rico.	5	SW			San Juan	Montezuma Dolores	32.25	51.89
61	CR-600, CR-631	Piedra Road	This route starts at the junction with US-160 in Pagosa Springs and proceeds northerly 15.08 miles (24.26 km) over Archuleta CR-600 and 6.35 miles (10.22 km) over Hinsdale CR-631 to the junction with TR-583.	3 & 5	SW/GV			San Juan	Archuleta Hinsdale	21.43	34.48
62	CR-245, FDR-245, CR-17, Burro Mtn Rd	Newcastle-Buford	This route starts at the junction with US-6 in New Castle and proceeds northerly 4.86 miles (7.82 km) over CR-245, 22.87 miles (36.8 km) over FDR-245, 11.2 miles (18.02 km) over CR-17 and 4.44 miles (7.14 km) over the Burro Mountain Road to CR-8 in Buford.	3	IM/NW			White River	Garfield Rio Blanco	43.37	69.78
63	CR-31, CR-44Z	Dolores-Norwood	This route starts at the junction with SR-145 in Dolores and proceeds northerly 38.32 miles (61.66 km) over CR-31 and 19.64 miles (31.67 km) over CR-44Z to SR-145 east of Norwood.	5	SW/GV			San Juan Uncompahgre	Montezuma Dolores San Miguel	57.96	93.26
64	CR-501	Vallecito Road	This route starts at the junction with US-160 in Bayfield and proceeds northerly 19.32 miles (31.09 km) over CR-501 to FDR-602 on the north end of Vallecito Reservoir.	5	SW			San Juan	La Plata	19.32	31.09
65	CR-103	Laramie River Road	This route starts at the junction with SR-14, east of Cameron Pass, and proceeds northerly 32.01 miles (51.5 km) on CR-103 along the Laramie River to the south end of Wyoming SR-10 at the State Line.	4	UFR			Roosevelt	Larimer	32.03	51.54
66	CR-80C, CR-162, CR-69	Deadman Road	This route starts at the junction with CR-103 (FH-65, Laramie River Road) at Four Corners and proceeds easterly 1.66 miles (2.67 km) on CR-80C and southeasterly 29.68 miles (47.76 km) on CR-162 past Red Feather Lakes to Goodell Corner and then southerly 3.16 miles (5.08 km) on CR-69 to SR-14 in Rustic.	4	UFR			Roosevelt	Larimer	34.5	55.51
67	CR-21, CR-14	Summitville Road	This route starts at the junction with FH-69 (CR-380/FDR-667) at Elwood Pass west of Summitville and proceeds northeasterly 12.03 miles (19.36 km) on CR-21 and 17.72 miles (28.51 km) on CR-14 to the junction with US-160 in Del Norte.	5	SLV			Rio Grande	Rio Grande	29.74	47.85

FH Route	SR/CR	Route Name	Description of Termini	CDOT Region	TPR	STIP #	2035 LRTP - Corridor?	National Forest	County	Length (MI)	Length (KM)
68	CR-250, FDR-250, CR-255	Alamosa River Road	This route starts at FR-380 (FH-69), near the Stunner Campground, and proceeds easterly 2.9 miles (4.67 km) on Conejos CR-250, 6.05 miles (9.73 km) on FDR-250 in Rio Grande County, 9.15 miles (14.72 km) on Conejos CR-250 and 11.36 miles (18.28 km) on CR-255 to SR-15 west of Capulin.	5	SLV			Rio Grande	Conejos Rio Grande	29.46	47.4
69	CR-250, CR-380, CR-21	Conejos-South Fork	This route starts at the junction with SR-17 and proceeds northwesterly 28.72 miles (46.21 km) on Conejos CR-250, 7.79 miles (12.53 km) on Conejos CR-380, 15.43 miles (24.83 km) on Rio Grande CR-21, and 2.98 miles (4.79 km) on Mineral CR-380 to the junction with SR-160.	5	SLV			Rio Grande	Conejos Rio Grande	54.92	88.37
70	CR-90, CR-90A	Naturita-Montrose	This route starts at the junction with SR-141, 4 miles east of Naturita and proceeds northeasterly 28.65 miles (46.1 km) on Montrose CR-90, 0.67 miles (1.08 km) on Ouray CR-90A and 12.83 miles (20.64 km) on Montrose CR-90 to the junction with SR-90 west of Montrose.	3 & 5	GV			Uncompahgre	Montrose	42.15	67.82
72	CR-47Z, CR-JJ45, CR-EE58, CR-15, CR-62.5	Sanborn Park (Dave Wood Road)	This route starts at the junction with SR-145 five miles east of Norwood and proceeds northeasterly 2.65 miles (4.26 km) on San Miguel CR-47Z, 18.51 miles (29.78 km) on Montrose CR-JJ45, 1.35 miles (2.17 km) on Montrose CR-EE58, 6.8 miles (10.94 km) on Ouray CR-15, 9.57 miles (15.4 km) on Montrose CR-62.5 to the junction with SR-90 west of Montrose.	5	GV			Uncompahgre	San Miguel Montrose Ouray	38.88	62.56
73	CR-265, CR-FF70, CR-71, CR-R70	Buzzard Divide	This route starts at the junction with SR-133 (FH-15), 6 Miles west of McClure Pass, and proceeds northwesterly 9.47 miles (15.24 km) on Gunnison CR-265, 9.3 miles (14.96 km) on Delta CR-FF70, 5.77 miles (9.28 km) on Mesa CR-71.4, 9.58 miles (15.41 km) on Mesa CR-R70 to Mesa CR-330E (Silt-Collbran Road).	3	GV/ GVMPO			Gunnison Grand Mesa	Gunnison Delta Mesa	34.13	54.92
74	CR-Y50, CR-30, CR-M26, CR-26	Divide Road	This route starts at the junction with FH-72 near Johnson Springs and proceeds northwesterly 3.76 miles (6.05 km) on Montrose CR-Y50, 4.04 miles (6.5 km) on Ouray CR-30, 6.68 miles (10.75 km) on Montrose CR-Y50, 31.15 miles (50.12 km) over Columbine Pass on Montrose CR-M26, 34.6 miles (55.67 km) on Mesa CR-26.1 to the junction with SR-141, 15 Miles southwest of Whitewater.	3 & 5	GV/ GVMPO			Uncompahgre	Montrose Ouray Mesa	80.23	129.09
75	CR-29, BB-29, CR-M26, CR-Q37, CR-D.00	Delta-Nucla	This route starts at the junction with SR-97 south of Nucla and proceeds northeasterly 5.56 miles (8.95 km) on Montrose CR-29, 16.04 miles (25.81 km) on Montrose BB29, FH-74 near Columbine Pass. It then follows FH-74 approximately one mile. Then northerly 3.94 miles (6.34 km) on Montrose CR-M26, 17.63 miles (28.37 km) on Montrose CR-Q37 and 5.92 miles (9.53 km) on Delta CR-D.00 to SR-348 south of Delta.	3 & 5	GV			Uncompahgre	Montrose Delta	49.09	78.99
76	State Street, CR 765	Cumberland Pass	This route starts at CR-76 in Pitkin and proceeds north 0.6 miles (0.97 km) on State Street and 26.75 miles (43.04 km) on CR-765 to the junction with FH-59 near Taylor Park Reservoir.	3	GV			Gunnison	Gunnison	27.35	44.01
77	CR-5, CR-15, CR-45, CR-KK-14, CR-NN-14	Los Pinos-Cebolla	This route starts at the junction with SR-149 west of Slumgullion Pass and proceeds northeasterly 14.32 miles (23.04 km) on Hinsdale CR-5, 1.82 miles (2.93 km) Hinsdale CR-15, 1.93 miles (3.11 km) Hinsdale CR-45, 15.41 miles (24.79 km) Saguache CR-KK-14 and 9.59 miles (15.43 km) Saguache CR-NN-14 to the junction with SR-114 near the crossing of Los Pinos Creek.	3 & 5	GV/SLV			Gunnison	Hinsdale Saguache	43.07	69.3

FH Route	SR/CR	Route Name	Description of Termini	CDOT Region	TPR	STIP #	2035 LRTP - Corridor?	National Forest	County	Length (MI)	Length (KM)
78	CR-10, CR-8, CR-860, CR-P77, CR-V81	Owl Creek-Cimarron	This route starts at the junction with US-550 north of Ridgeway and proceeds east and north 4.02 miles (6.47 km) on Ouray CR-10, 11.66 miles (18.76 km) on Ouray CR-8, 7.0 miles (11.26 km) on Gunnison CR-860, 8.67 miles (13.95 km) on Gunnison CR-858, 0.77 miles (1.24 km) on Montrose CR-P77 and 10.12 miles (16.28 km) on Montrose CR-V81 to the junction with US-50 south of Cimarron.	3 & 5	GV/SW			Uncompahgre	Ouray Gunnison Montrose	42.24	67.96
79	CR-AA50, CR-59.0, CR-58.5	Trickle Park	This route starts at the junction with SR-65 approximately 10 miles southeast of Skyway and proceeds east and north 8.97 miles (14.5 km) on Delta CR-AA50, 6.82 miles (10.97 km) on Mesa County CR-59.0 and 7.59 miles (12.21 km) on Mesa CR-58.5 to the junction with SR-330 at Collbran.	3	GV/ GVMPO			Grand Mesa	Delta Mesa	23.38	37.62
80	CR-62, CR-381, Rose St	Guanella Pass	This route starts at the junction with US-285 at Grant and proceeds northerly 10.19 miles (16.4 km) on Park CR-62, 12.2 miles (19.63 km) on Clear Creek CR-381 over Guanella Pass and 1.12 miles (1.8 km) on Rose Street to 2nd Street in Georgetown.	1	DRCOG/ CFR	SCF6848/ SDN6849		Pike Arapaho	Park Clear Creek	23.51	37.83
81	CR-77	Tarryall Creek	This route starts at the junction with SR-24 near the town of Lake George and proceeds northwesterly 41.45 miles (66.69 km) on CR-77 to the junction with US-285 at Jefferson.	1	CFR	SCF7003		Pike	Park	41.45	66.69

APPENDIX G

Do you have a designated
Forest Highway route under your
jurisdiction **in need of improvement?**



The Colorado Forest Highway Tri-Agency is now accepting project applications.

The enclosed packet of materials includes the following items for your review and use in submitting a project to the Colorado Forest Highway Tri-Agency for consideration of inclusion in the 7-Year Forest Highway Program for funding:

- Description of the Forest Highway Program Project Selection Process
- Forest Highway Application Instructions
- Forest Highway Application Signature Page
- Forest Highway Project Application
- Forest Highway Program Project Selection Criteria

If you are interested or intend to submit a project application, please contact Ryan Tyler, Forest Highway Program Manager at the Central Federal Lands Highway Division of FHWA with any questions or to obtain assistance with completing your application.

Don't delay!
Project applications are due
Date XX, XXXX.

Forest Highway Project Selection Process

Background:

The Forest Highway (FH) Program was established with the passage of the Federal Highway Act of 1921. Over the history of the program, each state containing National Forests, has designated Forest Highways under the direction of the Federal Land Highway Division that provide public access to National Forests and benefit the forest, states, and local communities. Currently, there are approximately 1,473 miles of roadway in Colorado that are designated as FHs.

Purpose:

The purpose of this process is to generate candidate projects when there is a need or opportunity in the program of a particular state. Each of the proposed candidate projects will be consistent with and/or support the vision, mission, and goals of the long range transportation plan for the Forest Highway program in the state.

Process:

Step 1: CFL issues call for projects

Each local USFS office, CDOT, and county with a FH will receive the call packet. The call packets will be made available electronically and will have instructions on how to complete the application. The call packet will also include the details on the goals of the FH program that are used to score each project.

Step 2: Forest Service, State DOTs, and counties prepare project applications and submit to Tri-Agency Representatives

Once the USFS, CDOT, and counties receive their packets, it is their responsibility to complete the project applications to the best of their ability. It is the responsibility of the entity proposing a project to supply the necessary information to complete the project application. It is understood that data may not be available for all of the project application questions, but the agency may use anecdotal information as a substitute. Any projects initiated by the county must have the project application submitted through either CDOT or USFS to certify that the application is complete.

Step 3: Forest Service, and State DOTs sign project application and forward to Tri-Agency

After the USFS and CDOT complete their project applications and review applications initiated by counties for completeness, they submit all project applications to CFLHD. CFLHD compiles all project applications and distributes to members of the Tri-Agency for their review.

Step 4: Tri-Agency Annual Meeting (project ranking and programming)

A planning work session is then scheduled for the Tri-Agency to discuss the merits of each project proposal based on the established weighted criteria. Depending on the outcome of discussion, a project may proceed in one of three ways:

- Advance - Project is programmed
- Need more information - Additional information is collected before a program decision is made
- Drop - Project receives no further consideration

Forest Highway Project Selection Process

Step 5: Projects assigned funding and program year on CFL TIP


Each approved project is assigned a program year and program amount, based on funding availability and other programming considerations. As mentioned previously, there are only \$11.9 million per year, and programming will need to be flexible by having a mix of projects of different sizes or scopes of work.

Step 6: CFL TIP submitted to CDOT

After funding and program years are assigned, the list of projects is sent to CDOT for inclusion in the STIP.

Step 7: Project delivery

The final step for each project is project delivery. CFL prepares engineering drawing, constructs the project and turns it over to the agency with jurisdiction.



Colorado Forest Highway Project Application Instruction Sheet

General Information:

The Tri-Agency (USFS, CDOT, CFL) will review project applications and rank them based on weighted selection criteria developed as part of the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). The selection criteria are directly related to the goals and objectives developed for the LRTP. The top ranked projects will be discussed at the annual Tri-Agency program meetings to develop an approved project list funded through the Forest Highway (FH) Program.

Please note that the top ranked project is not guaranteed funding and the approved list of projects will be agreed upon by the Tri-Agency. Project approval resides with the Tri-Agency. The Tri-Agency will select a balanced program made up of some large project with smaller projects used to fill in the gaps. Typical projects are those involving construction or reconstruction and are not maintenance (chipseal, potholes, etc.) projects.

For projects on County-owned routes, applications must be submitted through CDOT or the USFS. Routes under USFS or state jurisdiction may be submitted individually. Please be sure to secure all of the appropriate signatures for the application to be considered complete. By signing the application, you and the co-signer certify the completeness of the application; this does not indicate the approval of the project.

Additional information on the Forest Highway program is located at <http://www.cflhd.gov/LRTP/>

You may provide your responses on additional sheets, as necessary. However, applications must be no longer than 10 pages and must be received by (Date) to be considered.

The following information is intended to aid you in filling out the application.

Question 1:

FHWA will complete all design, NEPA clearance, and construction of the selected projects, except as otherwise agreed by Tri-Agency.

Cooperator – A State or local government agency that has jurisdiction over and/or maintenance responsibility for forest highways.

Functional classification: <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/flex/ch03.htm>

Please note that due to federal funding requirements, right-of-way (ROW) acquisition must comply with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 and is the responsibility of the Cooperator.

Question 3:

In the project description, include items such as roadway width, surface type, structures, approximate design speed, and any work affecting drainage structures.

Question 8:

Average Daily Traffic (ADT) – The average number of vehicles on a road during the day. To calculate the ADT, take the total traffic volume during a given time period (in 24-hour periods)

and divide it by the number of days in that time period. This data should not be collected during the peak season.

Seasonal Average Daily Traffic (SADT) – The average number of vehicles on a road during a typical day in the peak season

Recreation Visitor Day (RVD) – A recreational visitor day is 12-person hours of participation in a recreational activity, whether it is 12 hours by 1 person, or 1 hour each by 12 different people, or some combination of time and people.

% Forest Generated Traffic – The percent of traffic traveling to/from the National Forest.

% Non-Forest Generated Traffic – The percent of traffic traveling through a National Forest with a separate destination.

Question 9:

Consider whether this project fills in gaps or missing links in the transportation network or whether travel restrictions, bottlenecks, and/or load limits that prevent all-weather travel are alleviated by this project improvement.

Question 10:

Alternate mode improvements could include transit, bicycles, pedestrians, equestrians, park-and-rides, etc.

Question 11:

Identify deficient or lacking road features that contribute to safety hazards. Include engineering analysis if available. Also include crash data, animal/vehicle collisions, reported incidents, and/or anecdotal information that can be used to identify a safety issue.

Question 12:

Standard pavement condition ratings are available from CFL at <http://www.cflhd.gov/FHRoadInv/documents/cofh2008.pdf>

Question 14:

Bride condition information can be found from the National Bridge Inventory <http://nationalbridges.com/>

Question 15:

To identify whether your FH route is on a designated National Scenic Byway, click on the following link. www.byways.org

Question 16:

This estimate will be used to compare approximate construction cost relative to other projects. Projects will not be ranked based on cost.

3R –Resurfacing, Rehabilitation, and Restoration

Projects include some application or road rehabilitation (scarification, pulverization, etc. of existing Asphalt Concrete Pavement (ACP)), addition of supplemental aggregate surface course, and the placement of ACP. Minor guardrail, signing, and other appurtenances included on a case by case basis.

4R –Resurfacing, Rehabilitation, Restoration, and Reconstruction

Light 4R – Projects typically include minor widening off the roadway bench. Primarily regarding the road template and resurfacing. Projects do not include walls but can include minor guardrail, signing, and other appurtenances.

Medium 4R – Projects include widening where some walls will be included. Projects will also include earthwork to address some vertical or horizontal alignment deficiencies. Guardrail, signing, and other appurtenances are included.

Heavy 4R – Projects include major widening along a route including heavy use of cut and/or fill walls. Typical work includes major earthwork operations to address some vertical/horizontal alignment deficiencies. Work also includes aggregate surface course and ACP. Guardrail, signing, and other appurtenances included.

Question 18:

Some examples include reduction in existing road-related sedimentation, fish passage improvements, managing visitor access to appropriate camping areas, directing vehicles away from sensitive natural resources, etc.

Question 19:

To identify potential Threatened & Endangered Species in your project area, click on the following link. <http://www.fws.gov/Endangered/wildlife.html>

Colorado Forest Highway Project Application Signature Page

Project Contact Person

The contact name below is the individual from the sponsoring agency who will serve as the agency representative for this project, and has direct knowledge of the information contained within this Forest Highway project application.

Name:	
Address:	
City:	
State:	
Phone:	
Fax:	
E-mail:	

Authorized Signature

The signature below indicates approval of this project from the sponsoring agency and authorizes this request for project selection from the Forest Highway Program.

Signature:	
Printed Name:	
Title:	
Agency/Organization:	
Date:	

Tri-Agency Certification

This application is CERTIFIED TO BE COMPLETE. By signing below, the Tri-Agency representative (Forest Service or CDOT) will forward this application on to the Forest Highway program for project consideration.

National Forest/State:	
Name:	
Title:	
Date:	
Phone:	

Colorado Forest Highway Project Application

Instructions:

For projects on County-owned routes, applications must be submitted through the State Department of Transportation or the U.S. Forest Service. Routes under U.S. Forest Service or state jurisdiction shall be submitted individually. Applications must be received by (Date) to be considered.

If you are considering this application for your project and would like assistance in completing this form, please contact:

Forest Highway Program Manager
Central Federal Lands Highway Division
12300 West Dakota Ave
Lakewood, CO 80228
Phone: 720.963.3729

Additional information on the Forest Highway program can be found at <http://www.cflhd.gov/LRTP/>

Checklist of Requirements for certification:

- Four (4) copies of the completed and signed project applications no longer than 10 pages
- Signature sheet
- Forest-level map
- Project-level map indentifying termini
- Up to 5 photos of project location
- Is the project on the Forest Highway Network?
- Is the project consistent with the Forest Land Management Plan?

Send completed applications to the appropriate Tri-Agency representative:

National Forest applicants:

Transportation Engineer
USDA-FS Region 2
740 Simms Street
Golden, CO 80401-4720
303-275-5195

County or CDOT applicants:

Colorado Department of Transportation
Project Development Branch
CFLHD Forest Highway Program
4201 E. Arkansas Ave, 4th Floor
Denver, CO 80222

Colorado Forest Highway Project Application

(To be completed by Forest Service, State, or County and Forest/State)

General Project Information

1. Project Identification

Forest Highway (FH) Route #:	FH Inventory Name:
Local Route #:	
Other (local) Road Names/Designator (if any):	
Agency with Jurisdiction (authority to control traffic):	
Agency currently maintaining roadway:	
Cooperator (Entity with authority to finance, build, or maintain a public highway. This entity will assume jurisdiction and maintenance of the improved roadway):	
Functional Classification (Show official designation of route):	
<input type="checkbox"/> National Highway System <input type="checkbox"/> Arterial <input type="checkbox"/> Major Collector <input type="checkbox"/> Minor Collector <input type="checkbox"/> Local Road	
Termini (mileposts or landmarks):	Begin: End:
Project Length: _____ Miles	

Key Items of work (check all that apply):

- Paving Road base or Surface Course Major Concrete Structures
 Major culverts Roadside Safety Structures Earthwork Bridges
 Other (please specify): _____

Right-of-Way (ROW) Acquisition: (ROW acquisition is the responsibility of the Cooperator)

Is ROW acquisition required? Yes No

(if "no" then proceed to Utilities question)

Classification of ROW required for project: Extensive (5 or more parcels)
 Minor (1-5 parcels)

How does the Cooperator plan to acquire and pay for ROW?

What is the anticipated timeline to acquire ROW?

Utilities: (Utility/Railroad coordination and relocation is the responsibility of the Cooperator) Identify utilities in the roadway corridor.

Would relocation be required? Yes No

Estimated Total Project Construction Cost (From page 5): \$ _____

Total Contribution to Project (From page 6): \$ _____

Colorado Forest Highway Project Application

2. Problem Statement: Summarize the need for this project. What purpose does this roadway serve? List physical and functional deficiencies, anticipated changes in road use, or known safety problems. Describe consequences and actions that will be taken if FH funding is not received.

3. Description of proposed work: Provide a summary of the work required to complete this project.

4. Describe any other improvements planned/programmed on this FH currently or in the next 20 years. What, if any improvements have been made in the past 10 years on this road? Indicate when, if known. (Identify funding sources, if known):

5. Who are the key partners in this project? What role have these partners played on this project to date? Describe the support and/or opposition that this proposed project may receive from outside organizations and/or the public. (*Also, include Forest Service/State/Community coordination efforts completed to date.*)

6. Describe how/why this project is consistent with each approved plan as applicable. (*e.g., Forest Land Management Plan, Local Comprehensive Plan, Regional Transportation Plan, State Regional Tourism Plan, Scenic Byway, or other Corridor Management Plan*)

Colorado Forest Highway Project Application

Evaluation Criteria

Please provide your responses to the following questions related to each of the Forest Highway Program evaluation criteria. Your responses should be 1-2 paragraphs in length. Although the previous questions were to provide general information, they will also be used for project consideration. Please see the included instruction sheet for assistance with answering each of the questions. Items in italics below each question are intended to help describe the type of information that might be addressed for each question. Your response does not need to address each item.

Access and Mobility

7. List the type (*e.g., recreation, resource extraction, local commuting*) and amount of use accessed by this route. Who are the primary users of the transportation network? Does the road provide the only access to the area? What is the major traffic generator (destination) along this route?

8. Provide any available traffic data from recent counts or other documented sources (please list sources):

	Current	20 Yr Projection	Source
Average Daily Traffic			
Seasonal Average Daily Traffic			
Recreation Visitor Days (RVD)			
% Forest Generated Traffic			
% Non-Forest Generated Traffic			

9. How will the proposed project improve the continuity of the transportation network? How does this project improve and/or change the access and/or utilization of major destinations along this route in the National Forest System?

10. To what extent does this project improve or provide linkages to alternate modes? Please explain in detail. *Note: This will not apply to most projects.*

Condition and Safety

11. How will this project improve safety?

12. Provide existing road surface condition using standard pavement condition ratings. If aggregate road, provide inches of aggregate remaining.

Colorado Forest Highway Project Application

13. Describe current maintenance practices. To what extent will this project decrease user and/or maintenance cost?

14. List structure(s) and condition included in this improvement project, if any:

National Bridge Inventory Structure #	Bridge Dimension LxW	Bridge Inventory Sufficiency Rating (1-100)	Structurally Deficient?	Functionally Obsolete?

Funding and Economic Development

15. Describe how the project supports economic development at the local, regional, or state level (Temporary economic development, i.e., construction employment will not be counted). Identify the breadth of industries that would benefit from this project. *(Consider industries such as tourism/recreation, timber, mining, energy development, etc.)* How is the local economy tied to the transportation network near this project? How will the proposed project improve the transportation network and support the community's economic goals/needs? Is the project located on a designated scenic byway? If yes, identify the scenic byway.

16. **Construction Cost Estimate:** Fill in amount for appropriate scope items given the Central Federal Lands unit cost listed after each item. Please check all that apply.

- Bridge replacement
Square Feet (SF) of Bridge: _____ x \$250/SF = \$ _____
- Pulverize and aggregate surfacing
Number of Miles: _____ x \$75k/mile = \$ _____
- 3R (i.e., Pulverize/Pave)
Number of Miles: _____ x \$375k/mile = \$ _____
- Light 4R (i.e., Regrade Road Template)
Number of Miles: _____ x \$750k/mile = \$ _____
- Medium 4R (i.e., Widening, Minor Wall Work)
Number of Miles: _____ x \$1.5M/mile = \$ _____
- Heavy 4R (i.e., Major Widening, Major Wall Work)

Colorado Forest Highway Project Application

Number of Miles: _____ x \$3.0M/mile = \$_____

Other: _____
Unit: _____ x \$_____ /unit = \$_____

ESTIMATED TOTAL COST OF PROPOSED PROJECT: \$_____
(Transfer this number to page 2)

17. Proposed Contribution to Project (include cost sharing and in-kind donations): (Cost share, leveraging commitment to build adjacent project, etc.)
What year are these contributions committed?

- Surface Transportation Program
Amount: \$_____
- Safety set-aside
Amount: \$_____
- Bridge Set-Aside Program
Amount: \$_____
- Scenic Byway Program
Amount: \$_____
- State/Local (including local bonds, or partnerships through MPOs)
Amount: \$_____
- Earmark
Amount: \$_____
- Enhancement
Amount: \$_____
- In-kind donations (including ROW donations, utility relocation, traffic control, etc.)
Amount: \$_____
- Other: (specify)
Amount: \$_____

ESTIMATED TOTAL CONTRIBUTION TO SUPPLEMENT PROJECT:
\$_____
(Transfer this number to page 2)

Natural Resource Protection

18. Please describe any opportunities this project provides to address existing environmental concerns.

Colorado Forest Highway Project Application

19. Identify all potentially sensitive natural or cultural resource issues associated with this project from the list below. Please provide narrative explaining the extent of potential impacts resulting from the proposed project on all the following environmentally sensitive resources that apply to your project (*e.g., project will replace historic bridge, project goes through critical habitat, project involves a unique wetland complex, etc.*)

- Wetlands/Water Resources
- Threatened & Endangered Species
- Sensitive Species
- Other biological resources (fisheries, wildlife, species of concern, etc)
- Wild & Scenic River
- Non-attainment areas (air quality)
- Historic & archaeological resources
- Native American areas/concerns
- Wilderness or roadless areas
- Parks & recreation areas/wildlife refuge (Section 4(f)/6(f))
- Hazardous materials
- Other:

20. Describe any coordination that has occurred with Forest Service interdisciplinary team and/or regulatory resource agencies (*e.g., Army Corps of Engineers, Fish and Wildlife Service, State Fish and Game*) with regard to specific resource concerns.

Other Remarks:

Project Evaluation Criteria
For Information Purposes Only – To Be Completed by the Tri-Agency

	<i>Points</i>	<i>Additional Comments</i>
Access and Mobility	30	
Type and amount of National Forest access Low 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 High	10	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Type and amount of uses accessed</i> ▪ <i>Does this project serve as the primary access to National Forest lands or does it provide necessary redundancy?</i> 		
What level of use does the Forest Highway route segment on which the project is located receive? Low 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 High	10	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Average Daily Traffic</i> ▪ <i>Percent Forest Generated Traffic</i> 		
To what extent does this project improve the Forest Highway network? Low 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 High	8	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Does the project fill a gap or missing link in the transportation network providing access to National Forest Lands?</i> ▪ <i>Is this project connected to other projects on the same or adjacent routes completed in the past 10 years or one that is planned over the next 10 years?</i> ▪ <i>Does project remove travel restriction, bottleneck, load limit, or provide all weather travel?</i> 		
How does project improve or provide linkages to alternative modes? Not at all 0 1 2 Extensively	2	
System Performance	30	
To what extent will this project improve safety? Low 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 High	10	
Road surface condition or bridge condition (based on PCR or NBIS sufficiency rating) Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Poor	15	
To what extent will this project decrease user and/or maintenance cost? Low 1 2 3 4 5 High	5	

Project Evaluation Criteria

	<i>Points</i>	<i>Additional Comments</i>
<p>Funding and Economic Development</p> <p>To what extent does the project support economic development? Low 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 High</p> <p>Percent of leveraged funds None 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 High</p>	<p>20</p> <p>10</p> <p>10</p>	
<p>Natural Resource Protection</p> <p>To what degree does project improve the health of the National Forest System Lands? Little or not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Extensively</p> <p>What level of conflict is anticipated with environmentally sensitive resources? High 1 2 3 4 5 Low</p> <p>What level of potential coordination with regulatory agencies will be necessary for this project? High 1 2 3 4 5 Low</p>	<p>20</p> <p>10</p> <p>5</p> <p>5</p>	

APPENDIX H

2/20/2009

**ORIGINAL 2010 FOREST HIGHWAY PROGRAM
COLORADO
SEVEN-YEAR-PLAN**

APPENDIX 1

\$0

PROJECT	ROUTE NAME	TYPE OF WORK	FISCAL YEAR							
			*FY10	*FY11	*FY12	*FY13	*FY14	*FY15	*FY16	
			ALLOCATION	\$11,900,000	\$11,900,000	\$11,900,000	\$11,900,000	\$11,900,000	\$11,900,000	\$11,900,000
			*ACTUAL/PROP. BAL. BORROW/(LOANS)	\$0	\$0	\$11,000,000	(\$9,000,000)	(\$1,000,000)	(\$1,000,000)	\$0
			**ACTUAL LOANS or (REPAYMENTS)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
			CARRYOVER & ROLLUP	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
			TOTAL AVAILABLE	\$11,900,000	\$11,900,000	\$22,900,000	\$2,900,000	\$10,900,000	\$10,900,000	\$11,900,000
ALL ROUTES ALL ROUTES FH 81-1(3) ALL ROUTES	STATEWIDE STATEWIDE TARRYALL CREEK ROAD STATEWIDE	PE-10 CE-10 22 km 3R & minor 4R CONTINGENCIES	\$1,200,000 \$1,200,000 \$9,000,000 \$500,000							
ALL ROUTES ALL ROUTES FH 59-1(4) ALL ROUTES	STATEWIDE STATEWIDE TAYLOR RIVER ROAD STATEWIDE	PE-11 CE-11 20 km (12.4 mi) 4R CONTINGENCIES		\$1,200,000 \$1,200,000 \$9,000,000 \$500,000						
ALL ROUTES ALL ROUTES FH 80-1(2) & 2(4) ALL ROUTES	STATEWIDE STATEWIDE GUANELLA PASS STATEWIDE	PE-12 CE-12 8 km (4.9mi) 4R in Park Co CONTINGENCIES			\$1,200,000 \$1,200,000 \$20,000,000 \$500,000					
ALL ROUTES ALL ROUTES ALL ROUTES	STATEWIDE STATEWIDE STATEWIDE	PE-13 CE-13 CONTINGENCIES				\$1,200,000 \$1,200,000 \$500,000				
ALL ROUTES ALL ROUTES FH 81-1(4) ALL ROUTES	STATEWIDE STATEWIDE TARRYALL CREEK ROAD STATEWIDE	PE-14 CE-14 22 km 3R & minor 4R CONTINGENCIES					\$1,200,000 \$1,200,000 \$8,000,000 \$500,000			
ALL ROUTES ALL ROUTES FH 59-1(5) ALL ROUTES	STATEWIDE STATEWIDE TAYLOR RIVER ROAD STATEWIDE	PE-15 CE-15 20 km (12.4 mi) 4R CONTINGENCIES						\$1,200,000 \$1,200,000 \$8,000,000 \$500,000		
ALL ROUTES ALL ROUTES FH 81-1(5) ALL ROUTES	STATEWIDE STATEWIDE TARRYALL CREEK ROAD STATEWIDE	PE-16 CE-16 22 km 3R & minor 4R CONTINGENCIES								\$1,200,000 \$1,200,000 \$9,000,000 \$500,000
**ACTUAL LOANS or (REPAYMENTS): No Borrow/Loans Available in FY10			TOTAL SPENT							
			\$11,900,000	\$11,900,000	\$22,900,000	\$2,900,000	\$10,900,000	\$10,900,000	\$11,900,000	
CARRYOVER->			\$0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
			FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16

<--FY10 Backup

<-- FY12 backup <-- FY12 backup