



VI. Recommended Transportation Improvement Plan

VI. RECOMMENDED TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Input from the Technical Advisory Committee, the Policy and Oversight Committee, and residents through public meetings provided valuable guidance throughout the process of developing, refining, and evaluating alternative transportation improvements for the Estes Valley. The Policy and Oversight Committee also wrestled with the essential issues related to the community's ability to generate funding for these improvements from both internal and external sources. This valuable input and corresponding deliberations helped shape the transportation plan for the Estes Valley. Almost all of the improvements considered in Chapter 3 address an existing problem or work to mitigate the impacts of future growth. For these reasons, the deliberations focused on urgent needs and the implementation priorities that would best address these needs. The transportation plan consists of the Vision Transportation Plan for the Estes Valley and a Near-Term Transportation Plan, consisting of a subset of the Vision Transportation Plan projects, to provide immediate response to existing needs. The TAC and POC prioritized the Vision alternatives based on safety and capacity needs, benefits and costs of the project, and the constraints imposed by likely funding availability. The highest priority projects are included in the Near-Term Transportation Plan. These improvements include highway improvements, implementation of transit service, bike and pedestrian facilities, parking, travel demand management measures and intelligent transportation systems.

A. Vision Transportation Plan

Recommendations included in the Vision Transportation Plan are summarized in Table 33.

Highway

Ten the twelve highway improvements reviewed as part of this report were included in the Vision Transportation Plan, and one was completed during this study.

- ◆ **Improve Community Drive/US 36 Intersection** - Summer traffic related to the rodeo grounds and off season school traffic volumes are high enough currently to meet auxiliary lane criteria in the State Highway Access Code. Potential use of the rodeo grounds for intercept parking related to transit service would increase the demand in the future. This project would add a westbound left turn lane and an eastbound right turn lane on US 36 at Community Drive.
 - Priority: Vision Transportation Plan

Table 33. Vision Transportation Plan

Highway	Transit –Visitor	Transit-Residential	Bike/Pedestrian	Parking	TDM	ITS
Elements						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Community Dr./US 36 ◆ US 36/Mary’s Lake to Crags ◆ Riverside & Downtown Couplets ◆ US 34/Mall Rd. ◆ US 36 Causeway ◆ Wonderview / Elkhorn ◆ US 34/Dry Gulch to Mall Rd. ◆ Western Bypass ◆ Fish Creek Rd. ◆ US 34 (West of Elkhorn)/Fall River Rd. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Small transit bus ◆ 3-4 routes ◆ Fixed-route / Fixed schedule, serves downtown, Chamber of Commerce/Visitor Center, Beaver Point, US 34 Motels, intercept lots, and YMCA ◆ Park integration at Beaver Point Transfer Center (RMNP Vision) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Flex-route / Call-and-Ride service ◆ Year-round transit service for multiple residential travel needs ◆ Expanded para-transit service for disabled ◆ Weekly out-of-valley service (by private provider if possible) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Fall River Trail ◆ US 36/Moraine Ave. Trail ◆ US 34/Bike Trail ◆ US 34 Bypass Bikeway ◆ The Ponds Trail ◆ Pawnee Trail ◆ Spur 66 Trail ◆ High Drive Trail ◆ Aspen Brook Trail ◆ Fish Creek Trail ◆ The North End Trail 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Intercept visitor parking built in conjunction with visitor transit service. Either US 34 near Dry Gulch or Chamber of Commerce/Visitor Center ◆ Supplemental spaces at H.S./rodeo grounds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Expand time constrained parking lots ◆ Paid parking ◆ Website ◆ Bike racks ◆ Bus shelters ◆ Employee incentives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Dynamic Message Signing for congestion and parking ◆ Information kiosks ◆ Highway Advisory Radio ◆ Integrated Signal System
Achievements						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Reduced congestion ◆ Improved safety 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Reduction in vehicle trips ◆ Connection to RMNP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Reduction in residential vehicle trips ◆ Alternative transportation for seasonal employees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Comprehensive system throughout the Estes Valley for alternate modes of travel 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Reduced congestion downtown ◆ Intercept visitors east of downtown 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Better utilization of public parking ◆ Encourage use of alternative modes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Better utilization of US 34 Bypass ◆ Better guidance to available parking
Preliminary Costs (2002 Dollars)						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ \$43M 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ \$2.0M - \$2.5M per year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Flex-route: \$250K - \$300k per yr. ◆ Call-and-Ride: \$200K-\$250K per yr. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ \$300K per year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ \$5.7M 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ \$200K 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ \$800K

Costs include construction and/or operations (transit) but not on-going maintenance.

- ◆ **Widen US 36 between Mary's Lake Road and Craggs Drive** - This roadway is the main connection between downtown Estes Park and the Beaver Meadows entrance to RMNP. Phase 1 would add paved shoulders, a center turn lane from Elm Road to Mary's Lake Road and a detached sidewalk. In addition, the Moraine Avenue (US 36) intersections at Craggs Drive and at Mary's Lake Road would be reconfigured. Phase 2 would add a second eastbound through lane through this segment once capacity improvements have been built in the downtown area.
 - Priority: Phase 1 – Near-Term Transportation Plan
Phase 2 – Vision Transportation Plan

- ◆ **Downtown Street Network Modifications** - Improvements to the downtown area would be phased to respond to traffic growth and available funding. The essential initial improvement would be the reconfiguration of the Moraine Avenue/Craggs Drive intersection (described previously). The next step (Phase 1) would build a new bridge across the Big Thompson River to connect to East Riverside Drive. This new connection would increase capacity and supplement Moraine Avenue (US 36) through downtown. When additional capacity is needed, a one-way system (Phase 2) would be considered that would have Moraine and Riverside as a north-south couplet and Elkhorn and Cleave as an east-west couplet.
 - Priority: Phase 1 – Near-Term Transportation Plan
Phase 2 – Vision Transportation Plan

- ◆ **Improve Mall Road/US 34 Intersection** - This project would add auxiliary lanes on US 34 at Mall Road and improve the grade of Mall Road on its approach to the intersection. The intersection would be signalized when warranted.
 - Priority: Near-Term Transportation Plan

- ◆ **Widen US 36 Causeway** - Safety and capacity improvements are needed between the US 36 intersections of Community Drive and Fish Creek Road where there is a causeway across Lake Estes. Phase 1 would widen the causeway to provide two six-foot paved shoulders. Auxiliary lanes would also be provided at the Community Drive intersection. Phase 2 would extend the existing four-lane section east from Fourth Street to Fish Creek Road.
 - Priority: Phase 1 - Near-Term Transportation Plan (included in Upper Front Range 2020 Plan)
Phase 2 - Vision Transportation Plan

- ◆ **Reconfigure Wonderview Avenue (US 34 Bypass)/Elkhorn Avenue (US 34 Business) Intersection** - This improvement would reorient the Elkhorn Avenue leg to create a more conventional right-angle intersection.
 - Priority: Vision Transportation Plan
- ◆ **Widen Big Thompson Avenue (US 34) from Dry Gulch Road to Mall Road** - This project would extend the three-lane cross section of Big Thompson Avenue to the eastern edge of the valley.
 - Priority: Vision Transportation Plan
- ◆ **Build Western Bypass** - This project would create a new road between Moraine Avenue (US 36) and Wonderview Avenue (US 34 Bypass). Including this project in the plan gives Estes Park the opportunity to preserve the right-of-way from future development.
 - Priority: Vision Transportation Plan
- ◆ **Widen Fish Creek Road** - This project would add two six-foot paved shoulders and guardrail (where needed) between Brodie Avenue and US 36. In addition, the roadway geometry would be improved where curves do not have adequate radii.
 - Priority: Vision Transportation Plan
- ◆ **Spot Improvements on US 34 (west of Elkhorn)** - This project would make spot safety improvements along US 34 between Elkhorn Avenue and the National Park entrance that would involve improving sight distance at intersections, flattening sharp curves, or adding guardrail.
 - Priority: Vision Transportation Plan

The Moccasin Drive connection to South St. Vrain Avenue was not recommended because of its impact to the nearby businesses and because the geometry of Moccasin Drive was not intended to carry a high volume of traffic.

Reconfiguring North St. Vrain (US 36)/Fish Creek Road/Mall Road intersection was completed in the summer of 2002.

Visitor Transit

Vision visitor transit service recommendations include fixed-route transit service between downtown Estes Park, the Chamber of Commerce/Visitor Center, Beaver Point (connection to RMNP service) and US 34 east of downtown Estes Park. Supplemental transit service to the YMCA and the rodeo grounds is also included in the Vision Transportation Plan.

Residential Transit

Year round flex-route/Call-and-Ride residential transit service is recommended in the Vision Transportation Plan. Fixed-route service is not recommended because projected ridership estimates for the Valley indicate that there is not a strong enough ridership base to support this type of service.

Bike/Pedestrian

All of the bike and pedestrian facilities described in Chapter 3 are recommended in the Vision Transportation Plan. These paths would provide a comprehensive system throughout the Estes Valley that would allow pedestrians and bicycles to meet their mobility needs without using an automobile.

Parking

Long-term, the increase in visitation to downtown Estes Park and the increase in commercial development in the downtown area is expected to increase the demand for downtown parking. Without implementing any travel demand management measures, 525 additional public parking spaces would be needed to serve downtown Estes Park. However, because placing additional parking in the downtown core would encourage more people to drive into downtown, the additional parking is recommended east of downtown where visitors can be intercepted prior to entering the congested downtown core area. Some future parking demand would be satisfied by the parking built in conjunction with the visitor transit service. The number of parking spaces and location of additional future parking would need to be reassessed after the transit system has been implemented.

Travel Demand Management/Intelligent Transportation Systems

The Travel Demand Management (TDM) program recommended for the Estes Valley is multi-faceted. The major focus is starting a bus system that would serve both the downtown and RMNP by providing intercept parking east of downtown. This could ease congestion in downtown and provide relief for over-utilized parking in both downtown and RMNP. Paid parking in the downtown would encourage use of alternative travel modes. An interconnected system of bicycle and pedestrian paths throughout the community also provides an alternative to travel by automobile. Information technology gives the Estes Valley the opportunity to improve traffic operations by informing travelers about real-time conditions and directing them to more efficient and effective opportunities to utilize the transportation system. Highway advisory

radio (HAR) will apprise travelers of options as they enter the community. This is reinforced by dynamic message signs (DMS) at specific locations that would give information about transit, intercept parking, alternate routes, and parking availability.

B. Near-Term Transportation Plan

Recommendations made in the Near-Term Transportation Plan are summarized in Table 34. Figure 36 illustrates the Near-Term Transportation Plan improvements.

Highway

Four of the eleven improvements recommended in the Vision Transportation Plan are included in the Near-Term Transportation Plan. These include the following:

- ◆ **Reconfigure the Craggs Drive/Moraine Avenue Intersection.** Throughout the study process this intersection was identified as a problem area in Estes Park. Residents consistently identified it as confusing and unsafe. This improvement was included because of the existing need to increase the capacity of this intersection and to improve the confusing configuration.
- ◆ **Improve East Riverside Drive.** These improvements to East Riverside Drive were included to increase the capacity of the street network in downtown Estes Park. This improvement in conjunction with the reconfiguration of the Craggs Drive/Moraine Avenue intersection would allow motorists traveling between downtown Estes Park and RMNP to utilize both Moraine Avenue or East Riverside Drive.
- ◆ **Widen US 36 Causeway.** This improvement would add shoulders and a guardrail to US 36 between Community Drive and Fish Creek Road, thereby increasing both the safety and the capacity of this stretch of highway.
- ◆ **Improve US 34/Mall Road Intersection.** Improvements to this intersection would include turn lanes and improving the grade of the Mall Road approach. This improvement is included in the Near-Term Transportation Plan because the existing volumes warrant auxiliary turn lanes at the intersection. Together these improvements would increase the capacity of the intersection and improve safety.

Table 34. Near-Term Transportation Plan

Highway	Transit – Visitor	Transit – Residential	Bike/ Pedestrian	Parking	TDM	ITS
Elements						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Craggs Drive / Moraine Ave. Intersection Improvements ◆ Improve Riverside (2-way street) ◆ US 36 Causeway ◆ US 34/Mall Road Intersection 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Small transit bus ◆ Fixed-route with fixed schedule, serves Chamber of Commerce/Visit or Center, US 34 hotels, Beaver Point and downtown ◆ Park Integration at Beaver Point Transfer Center (RMNP Vision) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ General public Call-and-Ride service ◆ Year-round transit service for multiple residential travel needs ◆ Expanded paratransit service for disabled 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Fall River Trail ◆ US 36/Moraine Ave. Trail ◆ US 34 Bike Trail ◆ US 34 Bypass Bikeway 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Alternative 1 - intercept lot at Chamber of Commerce/Visit or Center (500 spaces) ◆ Or ◆ Alternative 2 – 100 spaces at Chamber of Commerce/Visit or Center and 250 spaces at Dry Gulch 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Expand time constrained parking lots ◆ Website ◆ Bike racks ◆ Bus shelters 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Dynamic Message Signing for congestion and parking ◆ Information kiosks ◆ Highway advisory radio ◆ Integrated signal system
Achievements						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Reduced congestion ◆ Improved safety 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Reduction in vehicle trips ◆ Connection to RMNP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Reduction in residential vehicle trips ◆ am/pm service for seasonal employees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Connectivity throughout Valley 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Reduced congestion downtown ◆ Intercept visitors east of downtown 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Better utilization of public parking ◆ Encourage use of alternatives modes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Better utilization of US 34 Bypass ◆ Efficient search for parking
Preliminary Costs (2002 Dollars)						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Approx. \$9.8M 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ \$1.2M per year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Call-and-Ride: \$200K to \$250K per yr. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ \$300K per year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ \$1.8M (Alt 1) or \$1.6 M (Alt 2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ \$200K 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ \$400K

Costs include construction and/or operations (transit) but not on-going maintenance.

Visitor Transit

Recommendations in the Near-Term Transportation Plan include fixed-route visitor transit service between downtown Estes Park, the Chamber of Commerce/Visitor Center, Beaver Point (connection to RMNP service) and along US 34 east of downtown Estes Park.

Residential Transit

Call-and-Ride service is included in the Near-Term Transportation Plan. Ridership estimates for the Valley indicate that there is not a strong enough ridership base to support a flex-route service in the near-term.

Bike/Pedestrian

Four bike/pedestrian facilities are included in the Near-Term Transportation Plan. They include:

- ◆ **Fall River Trail.** This bike/pedestrian facility would be a separated shared-use path along US 34 connecting downtown to the RMNP Fall River entrance.
- ◆ **US 36/Moraine Avenue Trail.** This pedestrian/bike path would include both a separated, 10-foot wide concrete path and a signed shared roadway between downtown and the intersection of Spur 66.
- ◆ **US 34 Bikeway.** This bike lane would run along the north side of US 34 east of downtown and would only require modifications to signing and striping of the existing shoulder.
- ◆ **US 34 Bypass Bikeway.** This bike lane would travel along the US 34 bypass, north of downtown. It would require restriping and signing of the existing shoulders on the US 34 bypass.

Parking

The Near-Term Transportation Plan includes two possible options for parking depending on the transit service route implemented. The first option would include 250 parking spaces for downtown use at the Chamber of Commerce/Visitor Center and 250 spaces for long-term parking for employees and RMNP visitors. The second option would include 100 spaces for downtown use in a new parking lot near Dry Gulch Road and 250 spaces for employees and RMNP visitors. Both options would place parking east of downtown to intercept visitors prior to them entering the congested downtown core area.

Travel Demand Management/Intelligent Transportation Systems

The Near-Term Transportation Plan includes a number of TDM and ITS measures. Dynamic message signs (DMS) and highway advisory radio (HAR) could be implemented almost immediately to advise visitors of congestion and alternate routes. These would be supplemented when the transit system is implemented. In addition, implementing time constraints on more of the downtown parking lots would increase parking turnover and reduce parking duration. Downtown employees should be encouraged to carpool, use alternate forms of transportation or park in the peripheral parking lots if they must drive on the busiest summer days. Paid parking for downtown parking lots could be implemented in the near future or when transit service through downtown is operational.

C. Institutional and Financing Approach

As described previously, the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Policy Oversight Committee (POC) defined an initial set of priorities from among the entire list of projects. Those priorities include elements of the bicycle/pedestrian trail system, critical roadway and parking projects, and the initial components of a local transit system. Those priorities reflect several basic policy directions regarding the future of transportation in the Estes Valley and establish a range of likely implementation costs for the Plan. An assessment of potential revenue sources and yields provides the basis for developing a fiscally constrained scenario; that is, a plan that reflects future revenue constraints. In this case, those constraints relate to the type of institutional framework used and the community's willingness to devote financial resources to transportation improvements.

Three issues are central to the fiscally constrained scenario for the Estes Valley. First, should the community implement some form of expanded transit service for visitors and residents? Second, if the transit service decision is affirmative, then what institutional arrangement provides the community the most favorable and flexible mechanism to start and operate such service and address other transportation priorities? Finally, what is the preferred financing mechanism to generate additional revenues to fund the defined plan?

A consensus emerged from the TAC and POC to move forward with plans to implement a community transit system, at least on a limited scale basis. As described previously, the fundamental components of the system include continued support for the current Special Transit service, startup of a Call-and-Ride service for residents, and startup of seasonal bus service for visitors linking downtown and RMNP. Over time, the seasonal service could expand in terms of capacity and/or route length. As discussed earlier, two important factors weighing into this decision were the need to do something to alleviate highway congestion during the peak season and the opportunities created by such a system to cooperate with the RMNP, the YMCA and others in developing a more extensive and integrated service.

The affirmative decision regarding implementation of transit service precipitated deliberations regarding the preferred institutional arrangement. The consensus by the TAC and POC in this regard was to support formation of a Rural Transportation Authority (RTA), with the Town of Estes Park and the EPURA both remaining active in the funding of certain transportation projects using available discretionary funding. From the committees' perspective, the principal attributes and benefits offered by an RTA included the following:

- ◆ The formation of the RTA and approval of the funding mechanism(s) are both subject to a public vote of approval. Both committees identified the need for a public referendum.
- ◆ Colorado's statutory authority defines a wide range of transportation improvements that are eligible for funding by RTAs. Furthermore, an RTA provides a vehicle for generating additional revenues, not just for transit, but for other projects as well. Generating additional revenues is necessary to avoid cutbacks in other municipal services funded via existing mechanisms if the Town assumed operational responsibility for transit service.
- ◆ The RTA would have a separate governing board that could focus on transit and transportation needs while the Town's board of trustees must address a wide range of issues.
- ◆ The RTA provides flexibility to adapt and phase service changes over time.

With those recommendations in place, choices regarding preferred funding mechanism(s) remained. Several factors guided those choices. Among them were revenue yield, electorate and political acceptability, consistency with the historical and desired image of Estes Park as a welcoming resort community, and the efficiency of collection. As a matter of record, the consensus among the TAC and POC was that the Town, EPURA and the prospective RTA should pursue all available FHWA, CDOT and other state and federal grants, program revenues and special appropriations to support the transportation plan and supplement whatever local revenues were devoted to transportation. In particular, the Town and RTA should pursue Federal Transit Administration funds to support the detailed transit service planning, startup and initial operations. Support was voiced for creating a broad-based funding approach that tapped into multiple sources of local revenues, for example, development impact fees and a combination of lodging and sales taxes. Ultimately, however, the primary point of consensus was to support an RTA sales tax as the primary source of local revenues. The key factors and benefits associated with the use of a sales tax included the following:

- ◆ Visitors to RMNP pay a large share of sales taxes collected locally. These visitors are responsible for much of the congestion and other demands on the system addressed in the Plan.
- ◆ The use of sales taxes would capture revenue from a larger share of visitors than other types of visitor-oriented taxes and fees.
- ◆ Sales tax revenues will rise with inflation, population growth and increases in RMNP visitation. Other sources are less responsive to growth in the future.

- ◆ Because of the above and the precedents of even higher sales tax rates established in other vacation and recreation resort communities, sales taxes are generally regarded as more acceptable to residents, politicians and visitors.
- ◆ The collection and distribution of sales taxes is efficient because the underlying mechanisms already exist.

With the decision to rely on sales taxes, the final issue was to establish a target tax rate so that future revenues could be estimated and one or more fiscally constrained scenarios developed. Colorado statutes limit the maximum permissible rate for RTAs to 1.0 percent. Assuming voter approval and collections starting in 2004 and extending through 2020, a one-half cent (0.5 percent) rate could generate nearly \$18.5 million and a one-cent rate (1.0 percent) would generate nearly \$37 million (2002 dollars with no assumed inflation) by 2020 – see Table 35.

Table 35. Sales Tax Rate Comparison

Sales Tax Rate	2005	2010	2015	2020	Cumulative 2004 to 2020
0.5 Percent	\$875,000	\$1,018,000	\$1,171,000	\$1,338,000	\$18,417,000
1.0 Percent	\$1,750,000	\$2,036,000	\$2,343,000	\$2,676,000	\$36,834,000
Note: Projected sales and property taxes do not reflect inflation, but do allow for increases due to population growth, RMNP visitation increases and new development.					

The differences in revenue availability have significant implications for the pace at which future transportation improvements can be funded and whether transit service can be expanded in the future. Two funding scenarios, one assuming a 0.5 percent tax rate, the other a 1.0 percent rate, illustrate these differences. Both assume the use of long-term debt to fund several high-priority highway projects, with the remaining revenues dedicated to transit and other projects.

With the former, \$3.3 million in long-term debt would be issued to fund two high-priority highway projects – improvements to the US 34/Mall Road and Moraine Road/Crags Drive (Donut Haus) intersections. Debt service to retire the debt would require about \$5.8 million. Other priorities that could be funded from the available revenue stream include a joint-use downtown/transit service parking lot, the Call-and-Ride transit service for residents, the basic seasonal transit service linking downtown and the RMNP, intelligent transportation system (ITS) improvements and about \$100,000 per year for new bicycle and pedestrian trails – see Table 36. Even this basic program requires about \$800,000 more than would be available, but it is reasonable to expect that this shortfall could be covered via FTA, FHWA or CDOT transportation funding programs.

Table 36. EVTP Funding Summary, Assuming a 0.5 Percent RTA Sales Tax

	2003 to 2007	2008 to 2012	2013 to 2020	TOTALS
RTA Sales Tax Revenue ^{1/} Funded Improvements	\$3,555,000	\$5,090,000	\$9,772,000	\$ 18,417,000
Streets/Roads/Parking (debt) ^{2/}	\$1,059,000	\$1,324,000	\$3,442,000	\$5,825,000
ITS	\$200,000	\$200,000	-	\$400,000
Bike/Ped Trails	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$800,000	\$1,800,000
Transit (Town/RMNP link) ^{3/}	\$1,500,000	\$2,500,000	\$4,000,000	\$8,000,000
Call-and-Ride	\$600,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,600,000	\$3,200,000
Total Expenditures	\$3,859,000	\$5,524,000	\$9,842,000	\$19,225,000
Notes: ^{1/} Assumes new tax enacted beginning in 2004 ^{2/} Based on issuance of \$3,300,000 in long-term debt in 2004 (20 yrs. @ 5.0 percent) ^{3/} Assumes transit service is initiated in 2005. No FTA funding is assumed for this scenario.				

Raising the incremental sales tax rate to 1.0 percent increases the available revenue to nearly \$37 million (2002 dollars). As a result, all of the projects in the preceding example would be funded. In addition, the principal amount of the initial debt issuance would increase to \$6.8 million, funding major improvements to Riverside Drive. The transit system could extend service along the US 34 motel row to the Dry Gulch area beginning in 2010, with attendant investments in transit-related infrastructure, such as a maintenance facility and shelters. The Call-and-Ride service could be expanded and funding for new bicycle and pedestrian trails increased to \$300,000 annually, rather than the \$100,000 annually in the previous example.

Table 37 summarizes the TAC and POC committees' consensus regarding the near-term funding plan assuming the 1.0 percent sales tax. As shown, this plan too results in a modest shortfall, about \$560,000. Again, sufficient other funds would likely be available to cover the shortfall amount.

Table 37. EVTP Funding Summary, Assuming a 1.0 Percent RTA Sales Tax

	2003 to 2007	2008 to 2012	2013 to 2020	TOTALS
RTA Sales Tax Revenue ^{1/} Funded Improvements	\$7,110,000	\$ 10,180,000	\$ 19,543,000	\$ 36,833,000
Streets/Roads/Parking (debt) ^{2/}	\$2,198,400	\$2,748,000	\$7,145,000	\$ 12,091,400
ITS	\$400,000		-	\$400,000
Bike/Ped Trails	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,600,000	\$4,600,000
Transit (Town/RMNP link) ^{3/}	\$1,500,000	\$3,900,000	\$9,600,000	\$15,000,000
Call-and-Ride	\$750,000	\$1,250,000	\$2,000,000	\$4,000,000
Transit Infrastructure ^{4/}	-	\$1,300,000	-	\$1,300,000
Total Expenditures	\$6,348,400	\$10,698,000	\$20,345,000	\$37,391,400
Notes:				
^{1/} Assumes new tax enacted beginning in 2004				
^{2/} Based on issuance of \$6,850,000 in long-term debt in 2004 (20 yrs. @ 5.0 percent)				
^{3/} Assumes transit service is initiated in 2005 and expands to a larger system in 2010. No FTA funding is assumed for this scenario.				
^{4/} Allowance for a maintenance facility, shoulder pullouts, bus stops, etc.				

The expanded scope and accelerated timing of improvements afforded by the higher tax rate appealed to both the TAC and POC in that it moved the community further towards the committees' collective Vision Transportation Plan to address the community's needs. Consequently, the consensus was to support the higher sales tax rate for the RTA.

With the TAC and POC having outlined the fundamental elements of an institutional arrangement and fiscally constrained funding plan, they opted to defer further consideration of several remaining issues to the governing boards for the Town, EPURA and the RTA. Those issues and a brief comment on each follow below.

- ◆ **Metered on-Street Parking** - The committees discussed the use of metered parking in selected parking locations to promote turnover and to avoid the use of parking intended for transit users by downtown employees. Furthermore, if metered parking was initiated, the use of policies to charge only during the peak season, during peak hours, or for specific periods, i.e., the first 30 minutes free, was encouraged.
- ◆ **Transit Fares** - The subject of fares for transit service was deferred to the RTA. The general sentiment supported the concept of fares. At the same time, the use of a general sales tax and concerns about whether fares would discourage ridership weighed against the use of fares. In the end, a sense emerged that fares for the Call-and-Ride service or for down-valley service would be appropriate, with special fares/discounts for senior citizens.

- ◆ **Rocky Mountain National Park** - RMNP uses funds generated from entrance fees to fund its current Bear Lake shuttle operation. The Park is considering options to expand its transit service within the Park to meet future demand. The need for such expansion would become critical when the Town's service linking downtown and RMNP starts as it would increase demand, but not increase overall visitation levels or entrance fee receipts. Consequently, the initiation of such service will require coordinated planning efforts between the Park and the RTA. Coordination will also be necessary with respect to service funding, particularly given the increased transit demand in the Park with no corresponding increase in entry fees.

- ◆ **Transit Operations Planning** - As plans to implement transit service progress, the committees identified the need for efficient transit operations. In particular, the opportunity to explore shared bus parking and maintenance facilities, staff and perhaps even equipment, between the Town, the Park, the school district, the county and CDOT was cited as an example for such efficiencies. Factors cited in support of this concept include limited availability and high cost of land, the seasonal and complementary nature of some of the peak demands on the various services (for example, the school transportation and Town summer bus programs), and the opportunities to support year-round employment. The latter would bring social and economic benefits, as well as alleviating some of the seasonal demands on housing.