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### Acronyms and Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADT</td>
<td>average daily traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDOT</td>
<td>Colorado Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSP</td>
<td>Colorado State Patrol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-25</td>
<td>Interstate 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-70</td>
<td>Interstate 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-76</td>
<td>Interstate 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOSS</td>
<td>Level of Service of Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLOS</td>
<td>maintenance level of service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>mile marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH 13</td>
<td>State Highway 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSM&amp;O</td>
<td>Transportation Systems Management &amp; Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 160</td>
<td>U.S. Route 160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 287</td>
<td>U.S. Highway 287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 40</td>
<td>U.S. Route 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 50</td>
<td>U.S. Route 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USFS</td>
<td>U.S. Forest Service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 1

Introduction

Rest areas are an amenity for long stretches of highway without services, they improve traveler comfort, and can improve safety by providing safe, easy access to parking for fatigued drivers. Rest areas also provide no-cost truck parking areas designed for large tractor trailers. Truckers use these rest areas both for normal stopping situations and emergency conditions, such as the closure of the interstate highway due to weather events. There are currently 27 Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT)-maintained rest areas in the state of Colorado.

In 2016, at the request of the Transportation Commission, CDOT began to study and evaluate its existing rest area program to determine the adequacy of the number of rest areas located within the state of Colorado and to develop policy guidance to establish a vision for the CDOT Rest Area Program. Rest areas in Colorado are located along Interstate 70 (I-70), Interstate 25 (I-25), Interstate 76 (I-76), as well as state highways. The objective was to identify the needs and benefits of the following:

- Construction of new rest areas
- Relocation to optimum locations of any existing rest areas
- Closure of existing rest areas
- Conceptual upgrades and maintenance needs for existing rest areas
- Characteristics for a Colorado “best-in-class” sustainable rest area system
- Partnership needs, benefits, and opportunities
- Possible re-designation for some rest areas to “recreational destination areas”
- Possible re-use for rest areas recommended for closure
- Emergency truck parking considerations

Chain stations were not included in the study, as they are limited to 30 minutes of parking and offer no alternative services.

A central outcome of the study process was the establishment and application of CDOT’s Rest Area Policy Statement. As detailed in Section 4, the Rest Area Policy Statement was developed to guide decisions regarding rest area maintenance, new facility construction, as well as rest area closure and transition to alternative uses. For the study to achieve recommendations that could be implemented by CDOT, policy criteria were applied to each rest area to determine how well each rest area meets the goals stated in the Rest Area Policy Statement.

This Statewide Rest Area Study – Phase I Report, Inventory and Assessment (Phase I Report), finalizes the process that began in 2016. It documents the methodology for the study, the results of the inventory and assessment, stakeholder engagement and coordination efforts, development and application of the Rest Area Policy Statement to existing rest areas. CDOT intends for this document to serve as a reference for future management decisions regarding rest areas.

System-wide and area specific recommendations that correspond to the Phase I Report are presented in the Statewide Rest Area Study – Phase II Report, Implementation Plan (Phase II Report). CDOT intends for the Phase II Report to serve as a living document that can be updated regularly to respond to changing maintenance needs, funding requirements or availability, and revisions to the Rest Area Policy Statement criteria, if necessary.
Goals and Objectives

The goal of the rest area study is to promote the safety and comfort of Colorado travelers.

The objective of the study is to recommend a statewide system of rest areas that complement the existing privately owned services, thus ensuring travelers have amenities available within a reasonable travel distance as they traverse the state. Through the study process, the following additional objectives have been identified for inclusion in the rest area system:

- Celebrating all that Colorado offers travelers
- Serving travelers’ needs in a cost-effective manner
- Providing services in a sustainable manner across the system

The system recommendation (documented in the Phase II Report) considered the need for new or upgraded facilities at existing rest areas, unnecessary rest areas within the system, and relocation of existing facilities for optimum spacing, and includes specific recommendations for each remaining rest area.
Methodology

CDOT began by forming a Project Leadership Team to direct the project. The project leadership team included CDOT Planning leaders, CDOT Region staff, and a representative from U.S. Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). A project team was also formed that included the CDOT project manager, the consultant, and representatives from the following CDOT groups: maintenance, freight, facilities, and Transportation Systems Management & Operations (TSM&O). Stakeholders interviewed included Colorado Motor Carriers Association, CDOT regional directors and staff, Colorado State Patrol (CSP) officers, and maintenance staff involved in day-to-day upkeep for each rest area. Project team and stakeholder meeting notes are included in Appendix A.

The project completed research into national standards for rest areas, a search of literature for best practices employed in other states, and interviews with stakeholders to establish the expectations for truck parking and rest areas within Colorado.

The development of the guidance began with research into best practices used by other states, including California, Connecticut, Florida, Illinois, Iowa, Maryland, Minnesota, Montana, New Jersey, New York, South Dakota, Pennsylvania, and Washington. These states were selected because they all have recently published similar types of studies. Further, the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials Guide for Development of Rest Areas on Major Arterials and Freeways was used as a model for the assessment. A review of regulatory requirements and operational strategies has been inventoried. Lastly, CDOT’s Statewide Plan, Freight Plan, and the Asset Management Plan were reviewed. Research summaries are included in Appendix B.

Input from stakeholder meetings is summarized in Table 3-1.

Table 3-1. Rest Area Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Colorado Motor Carriers</th>
<th>CDOT Staff</th>
<th>CSP</th>
<th>CDOT Maintenance Supervisors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Need more truck parking spaces.</td>
<td>Spend more on existing rest areas.</td>
<td>Need more truck parking spaces.</td>
<td>Cars and trucks will use public amenities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exits and entrance ramps are adequate.</td>
<td>Patrolled regularly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Install cameras for added security.</td>
<td>Rest areas need to represent Colorado at its best.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort</td>
<td>Needed for truck driver safety and comfort. However, most drivers will use private truck stops for their long rest periods.</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>Needed for truck driver safety and comfort. Some rest areas are used for parking before early morning deliveries.</td>
<td>Cars and trucks will use public amenities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>Trucks will park anywhere if rest areas are closed.</td>
<td>Rest areas need more investment in aging buildings.</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>Close as many rest areas as possible. The maintenance dollars can and should be spent on roadway maintenance. Contract for cleaning services at any remaining rest areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After conducting a review of national research, hosting meetings with region staff and stakeholders, and completing field reviews and assessment work, the project team developed a list of recommendations.
These recommendations, which were informed by the Rest Area Policy Statement, address defining the characteristics of a Colorado “best-in-class” sustainable rest area system; partnership needs, benefits, and opportunities; possible re-designation for some rest areas to “recreational destination areas;” and possible re-use for rest areas recommended for closure. These recommendations are presented in the Phase II Report.

3.1 System Assessment

To achieve recommendations, guidance was developed that allowed assessment from a statewide system perspective, as well as the individual needs for each existing rest area. Additionally, stakeholder insights played heavily into the recommendations for truck parking needs, particularly for emergency situations.

Collectively, the research and the stakeholder interviews highlighted the criteria shown in Table 3-2 as appropriate measures of the goals of safety, comfort, and availability of services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Measurement/Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Closest services</td>
<td>60-mile maximum or 1-hour travel time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incident rate on adjacent highway</td>
<td>The same or less than state average for this highway type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crime data onsite</td>
<td>Crimes reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort</td>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>Consider user volume measured against national standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>Direction of traffic served</td>
<td>Both or only one directional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impacts to local entities/facilities (consider local parking, CSP concerns, local law enforcement concerns, emergency parking)</td>
<td>Record concerns, consider mitigations, balance with cost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The system assessment was designed to review the individual rest areas as they relate to available privately owned services, such as truck stops, gas stations, restrooms, restaurants, and hotels. Further, the system assessment reviewed crash data for the adjacent interstates to determine if a higher than average crash history was occurring because of fatigued drivers.

CDOT uses an extensive maintenance level of service (MLOS) rating system to evaluate all the rest areas in the state. Each rest area has a rating between A–F, with A being the best and F being the lowest rating given. These ratings have also been documented. Statewide, the annual objective for CDOT is to maintain a MLOS of C or better.

3.1.1 Individual Rest Area Field Reviews

Field reviews of each rest area were conducted along with an inventory of available services at each interchange over the length of the highways. This inventory provided an assessment of the distance a truck or car must travel between available services. This distance varies through the state for trucks versus cars, as all services are not accessible to large trucks. This presents a problem unique to Colorado for the I-70 Mountain Corridor where services are readily available to cars, but may not be accessible for large trucks.

Field reviews and the stakeholder interviews brought to light an additional consideration for the system assessment—the benefits and opportunities presented by partnerships. Several rest areas are currently operated in partnership with municipalities or chambers of commerce. These rest areas represent the “best-in-class” facilities because they are staffed, travelers can be provided information about local sites, restaurants, and points of interest, and issues regarding minor maintenance and cleanliness of the
facility can be quickly addressed. They offer the municipalities a recreation area for local residents to use, a location for local memorials, and, in some cases, connections to local attractions.

Furthermore, rest areas that provide parking and access to recreation sites, such as trail heads, creek access, and snowmobiling areas, are operated in cooperation with the U.S. Forest Service (USFS). The Phase II Report recommends further discussions with USFS to design strategies that will service its mission, maintain the rest areas, and provide visitor access to these locations that celebrate Colorado’s outdoor amenities.

All the CDOT-owned rest areas and welcome centers in the state are shown in Figure 3-1. In addition to the CDOT rest areas that are included in this analysis, the USFS and Colorado Tourism Office-run rest areas and welcome centers are shown for reference. Individual rest area maps are included in Appendix C. The inventory logs for all services are included in Appendix D.

| Table 3-3. Criteria for Improvement Decisions at Individual Rest Areas |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Goal                        | Assessment Criteria         | Measure                     |
| Safety                      | Access from adjacent highway| Meets interstate design standards |
|                             | Safety issues               | Crime statistics            |
|                             | Flow of incoming and outgoing vehicles (internal area operations) | Crashes at the entrances |
|                             | Design of entrance and exit points on the highway (access operations) | Meets design standards |
|                             | Separation between truck parking and passenger parking | Appropriate signage and easy to maneuver |
| Comfort                     | General condition and required maintenance | Good condition to poor condition |
|                             | Number of truck parking spaces | Record the numbers, existence, and condition of these elements |
|                             | Passenger parking spaces    |                             |
| Utilities                   | Restrooms (running water)   | Visitor information         |
|                             | Power                       | Maps                        |
|                             | Vending machines            | Other pedestrian areas      |
|                             | Lighting                    | Overnight parking           |
|                             | Picnic area/tables          | Cell service/Wi-Fi availability |
|                             | Dog exercise area           | Recreational components     |
|                             | Phones                      |                             |

The individual area assessments provide an inventory of the rest areas, classify each according to type (or tier), and a basis for building improvement programs for each rest area. Recommendations for each rest area are included in the Phase II Report.

This inventory log includes the following for each rest area:

- A map of all the existing rest areas
- Distance to next like facility
- Number of parking stalls (vehicles and trucks)
- Safety of the area based on existing available safety data
- Sight lines from the highways and lighting conditions
- Quality of access
- Availability of utilities services
- Predicted usage
- Photographs
- Amenities
- Specialized maintenance needed
Conclusions

✓ There is no consistent template or operating system statewide. Each rest area is unique with regard to funding, mapping and wayfinding, and maintenance.

✓ All the rest areas do get used. Parking lots were not observed at capacity; however, none were deserted either.

3.1.2 Safety Assessment

The crash history for the interstates adjacent to the rest areas was analyzed looking for stretches of interstate where the number and type of crashes indicates fatigued drivers were continuing to drive because no designated rest area was available. The number and type of crashes were reviewed against statewide averages for interstate facilities. Table 3-4 summarizes the assessment. The full safety assessment is in Appendix B.

Table 3-4. Assessment: Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Measurement/Standard</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Crash rate on adjacent interstate highway</td>
<td>The same or less than state average (1.05) for this highway type.</td>
<td>Arriba Rest Area – 0.43 Burlington Rest area and Colorado Welcome Center – 0.43 Cuerno Verde Rest Area – 0.64 Deer Trail Rest Area – 0.60 Edwards Rest Area – 1.32 El Morro Rest Area – 0.64 Fruita Welcome Center – 0.57 Julesburg Welcome Center – 0.52 Poudre Rest Area and Colorado Welcome Center – 1.31 Pueblo (Northbound) Rest Area – 0.80 Pueblo (Southbound) Rest Area – 0.80 Rifle Rest Area – 0.79 Sterling Rest Area – 0.72 Vail Pass Rest Area – 1.33 Wiggins Rest Area – 0.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Safety | Crash rate on adjacent state/U.S. highway | The same or less than state average (varies) for this highway type. | Cortez Rest Area – 1.65 Elk Springs Rest Area – No Data Gobblers Knob Rest Area – 0.44 Hayden Rest Area – 1.86 Holly Rest Area – 0.97 Meeker Rest Area – No Data Shaw Creek Rest Area – 1.32 Virginia Dale Rest Area – 0.93 |

Conclusion

✓ Data do not indicate locations where crash numbers and types indicate fatigued drivers. Therefore, no new rest areas are warranted based on safety criteria.
Figure 3-1. Statewide Location Map
3.1.3 Usage Assessment

AASHTO (2001) provides a worksheet for estimating the needed facilities at a rest area, based mostly on the average daily traffic (ADT) of the adjacent roadway. Using this methodology, the usage a rest area should expect based on the traffic volumes on the adjacent roadway can be estimated.

Actual usages at two rest areas were estimated based on the number of “flushes” counted on any given day (Table 3-5). This anecdotal estimate has shown that the actual usage at these two rest areas was less than half of the predicted usage given using AASHTO’s guidance. Reasons for this could be attributed to the proximity to alternative amenities, or that there has been a bigger cultural shift in how drivers use rest areas statewide.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>ADT</th>
<th>Estimated Usage based on formulas recommended in national literature</th>
<th>Estimated Usage based on water consumption at individual rest areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arriba Rest Area</td>
<td>9,100</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vail Pass Rest Area</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusions

✓ Estimated usage based on water consumption at individual rest areas is less than expected usage calculated using nationally recognized formulas.

✓ The proximity of rest areas to each other does not decrease the usage.

3.1.4 Spacing Assessment

AASHTO (2001) provides guidance for the distribution of rest areas within a statewide system. The goal is to provide services, public or private, every 60 miles or 1 hour of drive time. Services within this spacing should include food, fuel, restrooms, overnight accommodations, and overnight truck parking.

All rest areas, truck parking facilities, and road amenities within 0.25 mile of the interstate, at each interchange, were assessed throughout the state. This assessment is recorded in the CDOT-Owned Rest Area Inventory Table in Appendix D and presents the amenities available to travelers along the interstates within Colorado. At each interchange along I-25, I-70, and I-76, the availability of food, fuel, restrooms, overnight accommodations, and overnight truck parking spaces was assessed. This provided an inventory and spacing of available amenities needed by all travelers. This inventory was used in the statewide system assessments, shown in Table 3-6, as well as the recommendations for individual rest areas. Along state highways, rest area alternatives within 60 miles of each rest area were located.

Using this information and the field work, Table 3-6 was developed to record the spacing of all services along the interstates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locations</th>
<th>Measurement/Standard and Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-70 East</td>
<td>Services are available on average every 11 miles. If all rest areas were closed, private services would provide for all travel needs within a 1-hour drive time throughout this length of interstate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-70 West</td>
<td>Without the Vail Rest Area, the stretch between Georgetown and Vail exceeds the 60-mile/1-hour travel time measurement for private services that can accommodate trucks. No services would be available to truck drivers for approximately 69 miles. The Vail Rest Area should remain open so as not to exceed the recommended spacing criteria regarding trucks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-25 South</td>
<td>Services are available on average every 5 miles. If all rest areas were closed, private services would provide for all travel needs within a 1-hour drive time throughout this length of interstate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3-6. Assessment: Spacing of Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locations</th>
<th>Measurement/Standard and Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-25 North</td>
<td>Services are available, on average, every 5 miles. If all rest areas were closed, private services would provide for all travel needs within a 1-hour drive time throughout this length of interstate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-76</td>
<td>Services are available, on average every 10 miles. If all rest areas were closed, private services would provide for all travel needs within a 1-hour drive time throughout this length of interstate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Conclusions

- Closing all interstate rest areas in the state would leave stretches of interstate in violation of the distance-between-services criteria.
- State highway rest areas are needed throughout the state to meet the minimum distance between services criteria.

### 3.2 Features Common to Quality Rest Areas

During the field work for this report, meetings were held with CSP officers who patrol the rest areas and CDOT maintenance personnel who work at the rest areas. During these meetings, several common features were mentioned as related to “best-in-class” amenities. The following were common observations regarding such rest areas:

- Staffed on a full-time basis, thus more likely to be clean (restrooms, trash) and less likely to be inviting to criminal activities.
- Staff available to provide travelers with information about Colorado and the local sights or amenities.
- Used by adjacent municipalities, thus seen as an asset to the community.
- Present a positive impression of what is important in Colorado and the community surrounding the rest area.

Furthering this discussion, several commonalities emerged to help define a quality rest area:

- Rest areas that serve multiple purposes
- Rest areas that use partnerships for maintenance
- Welcome centers that are regularly staffed

### Conclusion

- Rest areas should have multiple purposes and be maintained in partnership with others who benefit from the rest area, such as municipalities, chambers of commerce, or USFS.
SECTION 4

Rest Area Policy Statement Development

This section presents the Rest Area Policy Statement that CDOT developed through the rest area planning process and summarizes the policy definitions, guidance, and criteria used to evaluate rest areas and make management decisions regarding future improvements, maintenance, or closure.

Input on the policy statement was provided in meetings with the CDOT Regional Transportation Directors, Maintenance Supervisors, and through a series of Rest Area Work Group meetings, which included representatives from FHWA, Colorado Tourism Branch, and the following CDOT groups: Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning, Division of Transit and Rail, Statewide Planning, Communications, Traffic Safety, Civil Rights, Systems Planning, Regional Planning, Scenic Byways, Environmental Programs, Information Management Branch, and the Division of Transportation Systems Management and Operations.

4.1 Rest Area Policy Statement

CDOT should ensure that public rest area facilities or acceptable alternatives are available with reasonable spacing along interstates and key corridors within the state for the safety, comfort, convenience, and information needs of motorists. Rest area parking and comfort stations should be free of charge and accessible at all hours. Rest areas at key entrances to the state should be provided to help drive tourism and economic vitality. CDOT should pursue partnerships at rest areas to maximize both effectiveness and funding opportunities, and to promote safety and sustainability.

4.2 Policy Definitions

The following defines terminology used in the Rest Area Policy Statement.

**Rest Area:** “Safety Rest Area” per 23 CFR 752. A roadside facility safely removed from the traveled way with parking and such facilities for the motorist deemed necessary for his or her rest, relaxation, comfort and information needs.

**Acceptable Alternatives:** Acceptable alternatives are private or public facilities that are accessible at all hours and can be accessed by motorists free of charge.

**Reasonable Spacing:** Stopping opportunity every 60 miles or 1 hour of drive time, per AASHTO Guidance.

**Key Corridors:** Non-interstate freight corridors as identified in the Colorado Freight Plan and/or a critical recreational corridor that warrants a rest area for demonstrable safety reasons.

4.3 Policy Guidance

**Acceptable Alternatives:** Along with being accessible at all hours and free of charge to motorists, acceptable alternatives should meet the minimum requirements for reasonable spacing, safety, comfort, and convenience as detailed below. There should be several acceptable alternatives available to ensure system redundancy.

**Safety:** Rest areas promote safety by:

- Mitigating driver fatigue by providing a safe place for drivers to rest, nap, and change drivers
- Providing emergency parking and pull offs during weather events and road closures
- Providing an alternative to road side or shoulder stopping
Mitigating distracted driving by providing a safe place to pull over to text, make a phone call, check e-mail, etc.

Rest areas should be accessible at all hours and be free of charge to provide the maximum safety benefit.

**Comfort:** Rest areas should provide parking, toilet facilities, and lighting. Rest areas should be kept clean and maintained regularly. All rest areas must be ADA compliant. Specific comfort amenities will vary by rest area tier, as defined in Section 4.5.

**Convenience:** Rest areas should be easily accessible from the roadway, especially on interstates where easy on/off access points do not exist. Rest areas should have good directional signage and be shown on travel maps. Specific amenities will vary by rest area tier, as defined in Section 4.5.

**Information needs:** Rest areas should be inviting to travelers and provide basic information, such as travel maps. Rest areas should be branded so there is a minimum level of consistency between all CDOT rest areas. Specific information amenities will vary by rest area tier, as defined in Section 4.5.

### 4.4 Policy Statement Criteria

The following criteria have been established to determine how well each CDOT-maintained rest area meets the goals stated in the Rest Area Policy Statement. Application of these criteria to each individual rest area is included in the CDOT-Owned Rest Area Inventory Table in Appendix D.

#### 4.4.1 Minimum Required Distance to Acceptable Alternatives (Safety/Comfort/Convenience)

As noted in Section 3.1.4, AASHTO guidance suggests that services should be provided, either public or private, every 60 miles or 1 hour of drive time. Services within this spacing should include food, fuel, restrooms, overnight accommodations, and overnight truck parking. Spacing for each rest area was evaluated to determine if acceptable alternatives were located within 60 miles of the existing rest area facilities.

#### 4.4.2 Key Entrance to the State

A rest area that meets this criterion is located on an interstate highway near the entrance to the state.

#### 4.4.3 Interstate or Key Corridor

This criterion identifies whether rest areas are located on an interstate highway or a key corridor (as defined previously).

#### 4.4.4 Safety

Level of Service of Safety (LOSS) and crash pattern characteristics for the roadways adjacent to each rest area. A rest area is justified where LOSS measures exhibit a crash frequency above the statewide average for facility type or certain crash patterns are observed. A spreadsheet evaluating how this policy criterion applied to each rest area is included in Appendix B.

### 4.5 CDOT Rest Area Tiers

The Rest Area Policy identifies three types (or tiers) or rest areas throughout the state. The tier classification for each rest area is included in the CDOT-Owned Rest Area Inventory Table in Appendix D. All CDOT Rest Areas, regardless of tier should provide toilet facilities and parking. They should be kept
clean and be maintained regularly. All rest areas should provide lighting at all hours and emergency/payphone services to promote safety and security. All rest areas must be ADA compliant. Rest areas should be inviting to travelers, provide a basic level of information to the traveling public, and have consistent branding.

4.5.1 Tier 1 – Rest Area Welcome Centers
These locations are fully developed rest areas with extensive kiosk information, indoor information racks with maps and brochures, and staffing for at least some portion of the day. These rest areas have paved parking, flush toilets, hot and cold potable water, heating and air conditioning, picnic tables, cell phone service, and internet service. These are located at key entrances to the state or at key points of interest. Welcome Center rest areas serve to support tourism for the state or the local region. Current welcome centers are owned by CDOT but are often operated in partnership with the Colorado Tourism Office or with a local tourism office. Not every Welcome Center will have freight truck parking, as the locations for these are often in closer proximity to a town center or historic area, and may be less accessible for freight traffic.

4.5.2 Tier 2 - Standard
These locations have paved parking for automobiles, trucks and recreation vehicles. Standard rest areas have flush toilets, heating, picnic tables, mid-range kiosk information, and cell phone service. They may or may not have potable water. Some may have indoor information racks with maps and brochures if supplied and maintained through partner organizations.

4.5.3 Tier 3 – Basic
These facilities have parking spaces (paved or gravel) for automobiles and trucks. Basic rest areas have vault or pit toilets, and minimal kiosk information. They may or may not have cell phone service, picnic tables or heating. They do not have potable water.
SECTION 4

Individual Site Assessments

All the rest areas located on Colorado’s interstates are included in this study. These interstates have been divided into individual systems or segments as described below:

- I-70 East (E-470 to the Kansas Border)
- I-70 West (C-470 to the Utah Border)
- I-76 (E-470 to the Nebraska Border)
- I-25 North (E-470 to the Wyoming Border)
- I-25 South (E-470 to the New Mexico Border)

In addition to the interstates, the following major truck routes in the state were also inventoried:

- State Highway 13 (SH 13)
- U.S. Route 40, 50, and 160, and U.S. Highway 287

5.1 Region 1

There are no CDOT-owned rest areas in Region 1; however, the Gateway Visitor Center in Georgetown and the Herman Gulch Rest Area provide similar services within the region.

CDOT and the Georgetown Trust cooperated to create a mutually beneficial facility, the Georgetown Gateway Visitor Center. The Trust had operated a small Visitor Center at this location since 1996 that provided information about, and interpretation of, the Georgetown Silver Plume National Historic Landmark District. Following the closure of restrooms at the Eisenhower/Johnson Tunnels in 2001, CDOT required a new location for those services. The Gateway Visitor Center, constructed in 2003, was jointly financed by the partners, both of which continue to support the project.

Herman Gulch Rest Area is currently maintained and operated by USFS. CDOT currently uses this rest area to park equipment when not in use. CDOT is currently in conversations with USFS to formalize agreements to upgrade this facility.

5.2 Region 2 Rest Areas

There are six CDOT-owned rest areas in Southeastern Colorado (CDOT Region 2):

- Cuerno Verde Rest Area
- El Morro Rest Area
- Gobblers Knob Rest Area
- Holly Rest Area
- Pueblo Northbound Rest Area
- Pueblo Southbound Rest Area

1 In 2009, the north and southbound rest areas at Larkspur were closed and demolished due to the high cost of repairs and maintenance, as well as safety concerns. Since this rest area has not been part of the system for several years, it is not included in this report. However, the CDOT-owned land at the former southbound rest area was identified as potential truck chain-up location in inclement weather. This will be evaluated further in CDOT’s current update to the Colorado State Highway Freight Plan.
Figure 5-1. Region 2 Rest Areas and Welcome Centers
5.2.1 Cuerno Verde Rest Area

The Cuerno Verde Rest Area is located at the junction of I-25 and Highway 165. The rest area has a maintained green space with walking paths, restrooms, picnic areas, visitor’s information, vending machines, and pet areas and is Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant and is a local point of interest. Within a half mile of the rest area are four restaurants and a Diamond Shamrock gas station, providing alternative passenger and truck services.

5.2.1.1 Utilization

This rest area has a predicted usage of 320 vehicles per hour. Actual usage statistics are unavailable; however, upon a recent visit, 6 of 36 passenger spaces, 0 of 3 ADA compliant (accessible) parking spaces, and 2 of 21 truck spaces were in use.

5.2.1.2 Specialized Maintenance Needed/Improvements Required

The structures at this site received a grade B rating. There are no specialized maintenance needs or improvements required at this location, although the maintained greenspace may be better used for truck parking. Region 2 has contracts for third-party maintenance and cleaning of this facility.

5.2.1.3 Rest Area Policy Criteria Evaluation

The following policy criteria were applicable to the Cuerno Verde Rest Area:

- Interstate or Key Corridor: The Cuerno Verde Rest Area is located on I-25, which is an interstate highway.
- Safety: LOSS measures near the Cuerno Verde Rest Area exhibited a crash frequency above the statewide average for the facility type.
5.2.2 El Morro Rest Area

The El Morro Rest Area is located at the junction of I-25 and El Morro Road, 4.5 miles north of downtown Trinidad. There is a Colorado Welcome Center location in downtown Trinidad that provides public restrooms, free coffee, internet access, phone/fax, picnic sites, rest area, and a children’s play area but is not accessible for trucks. Ten miles south of the El Morro Rest Area at Starkville there is a weigh station and chain-up area, Trinidad fuel stop, and 20 truck parking spaces.

5.2.2.1 Utilization

The El Morro Rest Area has a predicted usage of 248 vehicles per hour. Actual usage statistics are unavailable; however, upon a recent visit to the facility, 5 of 35 passenger spaces, 0 of 3 accessible parking spaces, and 3 of 20 truck spaces were in use. The Colorado Scenic and Historic Byways program has made improvements to the rest area, including adding telescopes and bike racks. If use changes are considered at this location, its relationship with the Santa Fe Trail Scenic and Historic Byway—Mountain Branch should be further investigated and considered.
5.2.2.2 Specialized Maintenance Needed/Improvements Required

Built in 2000, the structures at this site are constructed from steel frames and received a grade B rating. To maintain the current level of service as a welcome center and rest area, the only necessary improvement would be upgraded picnic tables.

5.2.2.3 Rest Area Policy Criteria Evaluation

The following policy criteria were applicable to the El Morro Rest Area.

✓ Key Entrance to the State: The El Morro Rest Area is located on I-25 near Trinidad, CO, and is the first state-maintained rest area for travelers entering Colorado from New Mexico.

✓ Interstate or Key Corridor: The El Morro Rest Area is located on I-25, which is an interstate highway.

✓ Safety: The 2-mile stretch centered on the El Morro Rest Area exhibited an elevated crash pattern for drivers unfamiliar with the area.

Figure 5-3. El Morro Rest Area
5.2.3 Gobblers Knob Rest Area

Gobblers Knob Rest Area is located on the west side of U.S. Highway 287 (SH 287) between Lamar and Springfield. The closest truck and passenger services are 27 miles away. The only public amenity available at this location is restroom access. CDOT also has a maintenance barn in use on the property.

5.2.3.1 Utilization
This rest area has a predicted usage of 79 vehicles per hour. Actual usage statistics are unavailable; however, upon a recent visit, 1 of 15 passenger spaces, 0 of 1 accessible parking spaces, and 2 of 6 truck spaces were in use.

5.2.3.2 Specialized Maintenance Needed/Improvements Required
Built in 2000, the structures at this site are constructed from reinforced concrete and received a grade B rating. This facility is relatively low cost to maintain, with cleaning and operating costs estimated at $30,000 annually. There are no specialized maintenance needs or improvements required to continue operations at this location.

5.2.3.3 Rest Area Policy Criteria Evaluation
The following policy criterion was applicable to the Gobblers Knob Rest Area.

✓ Interstate or Key Corridor: The Gobblers Knob Rest Area is located on US 287, which is a Colorado critical freight corridor.
5.2.4  Holly Rest Area

The Holly Rest Area is located on the south side of U.S. Route 50 (US 50) and is approximately 5 miles from Holly and 20 miles from Lamar. The rest area has direct access from US 50 via an exclusive left-turn lane for westbound traffic and an exclusive right-turn lane for eastbound traffic. Available amenities include restrooms, picnic areas, trailer dump, and a point of interest. There are alternative passenger services 2 miles away in Kansas and alternative truck services 4 miles away near Holly.

5.2.4.1  Utilization

This rest area has a predicted usage of 37 vehicles per hour. Actual usage statistics are unavailable; however, upon a recent visit, 2 of 13 passenger spaces, 0 of 5 accessible parking spots, and 2 of 6 truck spaces were in use.

5.2.4.2  Specialized Maintenance Needed/Improvements Required

There are no specialized maintenance needs or improvements required at this location. Region 2 has contracts for third-party maintenance and cleaning of this facility.

5.2.4.3  Rest Area Policy Criteria Evaluation

The following policy criterion was applicable to the Holly Rest Area.

✓ Interstate or Key Corridor: The Holly Rest Area is located on US 50, which is a Colorado critical freight corridor.

Figure 5-5. Holly Rest Area
5.2.5 Pueblo (Northbound) Rest Area

The Pueblo (Northbound) Rest Area is located off I-25 near Mile Marker (MM) 115. The rest area has direct access from the interstate; however, it is only accessible to drivers traveling in the northbound direction. Available amenities include restrooms, picnic areas, vending machines, and pet areas. The closest alternative passenger and truck services are 11 miles away.

5.2.5.1 Utilization

This rest area has a predicted usage of 570 vehicles per hour. Actual usage statistics are unavailable; however, upon a recent visit, 8 of 47 passenger spaces, 0 of 2 accessible parking spaces, and 5 of 20 truck spaces were in use.

5.2.5.2 Specialized Maintenance Needed/Improvements Required

Built in 2005, the structures at this site are constructed of masonry and received a grade B rating. There are no specialized maintenance needs or improvements required to continue operations at this location. Region 2 has contracts for third-party maintenance and cleaning of this facility.

5.2.5.3 Rest Area Policy Criteria Evaluation

The following policy criteria were applicable to the Pueblo (Northbound) Rest Area.

- Interstate or Key Corridor: The Pueblo (Northbound) Rest Area is located on I-25, which is an interstate highway.
- Safety: The 2-mile stretch centered on the Pueblo (Northbound) Rest Area exhibited an elevated crash pattern for drivers who fall asleep at the wheel.
5.2.6   Pueblo (Southbound) Rest Area

The Pueblo (Southbound) Rest Area is located off I-25 near MM 112. It is accessible from southbound I-25 and the west Frontage Road. Available amenities include restrooms, picnic areas, vending machines, and pet areas. The closest alternative passenger and truck services are 8 miles away.

5.2.6.1   Utilization

This rest area has a predicted usage of 570 vehicles per hour. Actual usage statistics are unavailable; however, upon a recent visit, 16 of 47 passenger spaces, 0 of 3 accessible parking spaces, and 3 of 30 truck spaces were in use.

5.2.6.2   Specialized Maintenance Needed/Improvements Required

Built in 2005, the structures at this site are constructed of masonry and were rebuilt in 2014 and received a grade A rating. The current waste composting system is not working and will require $200,000 to clean it out. This will need to be done regardless of the determined best course of action for the facility.

5.2.6.3   Rest Area Policy Criteria Evaluation

The following policy criteria were applicable to the Pueblo (Southbound) Rest Area.

✓ Interstate or Key Corridor: The Pueblo (Southbound) Rest Area is located on I-25, which is an interstate highway.

✓ Safety: The 2-mile stretch centered on the Pueblo (Southbound) Rest Area exhibited an elevated crash pattern for drivers who fall asleep at the wheel.
5.3 Region 3 Rest Areas

There are 11 CDOT-maintained welcome centers/rest areas in Region 3 (northwest Colorado), which include:

- Bair Ranch Trailhead
- Edwards Rest Area
- Elk Springs Rest Area
- Fruita Rest Area/Welcome Center
- Grizzly Creek Trailhead
- Hanging Lake Trailhead
- Hayden Rest Area
- Meeker Rest Area
- No Name Trailhead
- Rifle Rest Area
- Vail Pass Rest Area

Of these 11, the four rest areas in Glenwood Canyon are not included in this analysis due to their inclusion as a measure to minimize harm and their unique role as recreational access. These rest areas are Bair Ranch, Grizzly Creek, Hanging Lake, and No Name.
Figure 5-8. Region 3 Rest Areas and Welcome Centers
5.3.1  Edwards Rest Area

The Edwards Rest Area is located on the north side of I-70 between Edwards and Wolcott. The rest area has direct access from the interstate; however, it is only accessible to drivers traveling in the westbound direction. Available amenities include restrooms, picnic areas, trailer dump, vending machines, pet areas, and recreation access. There are alternative passenger services less than a mile away and alternative truck services 16 miles away near Eagle.

5.3.1.1  Utilization

This rest area has a predicted usage of 429 vehicles per hour. Actual usage statistics are unavailable; however, upon a recent visit, 13 of 44 passenger spaces, 0 of 2 accessible parking spaces, and 6 of 22 truck spaces were in use. This facility is used as an important emergency storage and parking facility in the event of Vail Pass closures. The community also uses the facility for recreation and river access. The site also serves as a city-run recycling facility.

5.3.1.2  Specialized Maintenance Needed/Improvements Required

Built in 1985, the structures at this site are constructed of masonry and received a grade C rating. To continue operating in its current role this site would require new lighting.

5.3.1.3  Rest Area Policy Criteria Evaluation

The following policy criteria were applicable to the Edwards Rest Area.

✓ Minimum Required Distance to Acceptable Alternatives (Safety/Comfort/Convenience): The nearest acceptable alternative service location to the west for trucks is located 66.5 miles from the Edwards Rest Area.

✓ Interstate or Key Corridor: The Edwards Rest Area is located on I-70, which is an interstate highway.

✓ Safety: The 2-mile stretch centered on the El Morro Rest Area exhibited an elevated crash pattern for drivers who fall asleep at the wheel.
5.3.2 Elk Springs Rest Area

The Edwards Rest Area is located off U.S. Route 40 (US 40) at MM 37. Available amenities include restrooms, and picnic areas. There are alternative passenger services 23 miles away and alternative truck services 33 miles away.

5.3.2.1 Utilization

This rest area has a predicted usage of 13 vehicles per hour. Actual usage statistics are unavailable; however, upon a recent visit, none of the available parking was in use.

5.3.2.2 Specialized Maintenance Needed/Improvements Required

This facility is relatively low cost to maintain because of the nature of the pit toilets. There are no specialized maintenance needs or improvements required to continue operations at this location.

5.3.2.3 Rest Area Policy Criteria Evaluation

The following policy criterion was applicable to the Elk Springs Rest Area.

- Interstate or Key Corridor: The Elk Springs Rest Area is located on US 40, which is a Colorado critical freight corridor.
5.3.3  Fruita Rest Area/Welcome Center

The Fruita Rest Area/Welcome Center is one of the Colorado Welcome Center locations and is operated in partnership with the Colorado Tourism Office. The welcome center is located near the junction of I-70 and Colorado State Highway 340 and is accessible from both eastbound and westbound I-70. Available amenities include restrooms, picnic areas, trailer dump, vending machines, pet areas, free coffee, internet access, maps and brochures, recreational vehicle parking, and a children's play area. There are alternative passenger and truck services less than a mile away.

5.3.3.1  Utilization

This rest area has a predicted usage of 170 vehicles per hour. Actual usage statistics are unavailable; however, upon a recent visit, 4 of 33 passenger spaces, 0 of 4 accessible parking spaces, and 0 of 6 truck spaces were in use.

5.3.3.2  Specialized Maintenance Needed/Improvements Required

A sidewalk was recently added to link this facility to adjacent restaurants. Additional desired improvements include removal of grass or addition of irrigation water systems.

5.3.3.3  Rest Area Policy Criteria Evaluation

The following policy criteria were applicable to the Fruita Rest Area/Welcome Center.

---

Figure 5-10. Elk Springs Rest Area
5.3.4 Hayden Rest Area

The Hayden Rest Area is located on US 40 between Hayden and Craig. The facility can be accessed from both directions of US 40. Available amenities include restrooms, and picnic areas. There are alternative passenger and truck services 10 miles away. The only water available is non-potable water pulled from a collection box.

5.3.4.1 Utilization

This rest area has a predicted usage of 110 vehicles per hour. Actual usage statistics are unavailable; however, upon a recent visit, two passenger vehicles were observed at the facility. Hayden Rest Area is operational for seasonal usage only and gated when not operational.

5.3.4.2 Specialized Maintenance Needed/Improvements Required

Desired improvements include repaving and addition of a non-potable well for water.
5.3.4.3 Rest Area Policy Criteria Evaluation

The following policy criteria were applicable to the Hayden Rest Area.

- Interstate or Key Corridor: The Hayden Rest Area is located on US 40, which is a Colorado critical freight corridor.

- Safety: LOSS measures near the Hayden Rest Area exhibited a crash frequency above the statewide average for the facility type.

5.3.5 Meeker Rest Area

The Meeker Rest Area is located on SH 13 at MM 27. The facility can be accessed from both directions on SH 13. Available amenities include restrooms, and picnic areas. There are alternative passenger and truck services 11 miles away.

5.3.5.1 Utilization

This rest area has a predicted usage of 37 vehicles per hour. Actual usage statistics are unavailable; however, upon a recent visit, one truck was observed at the facility.
5.3.5.2 Specialized Maintenance Needed/Improvements Required

This rest area has a predicted usage of 37 vehicles per hour based on the ADT on SH 13. Actual usage statistics are unavailable; however, upon a recent visit, none of the available parking was in use.

This facility is relatively low cost to maintain because of the nature of the pit toilets. There are no specialized maintenance needs or improvements required to continue operations at this location.

5.3.5.3 Rest Area Policy Criteria Evaluation

The following policy criterion was applicable to Meeker Rest Area.

✓ Interstate or Key Corridor: The Meeker Rest Area is located on SH 13, which is a Colorado critical freight corridor.

5.3.6 Rifle Rest Area

The Rifle Rest Area is located north of I-70 near the town of Rifle. The facility can be accessed by exiting I-70 from either direction. Available amenities include restrooms, picnic areas, visitor information, and trailer dump. There are alternative passenger services less than a mile away and alternative truck services 28 miles away.
5.3.6.1 Utilization
This rest area has a predicted usage of 266 vehicles per hour. Actual usage statistics are unavailable; however, upon a recent visit, 1 of 53 passenger spaces, 0 of 6 accessible parking spaces, and 2 of 7 truck spaces were in use.

5.3.6.2 Specialized Maintenance Needed/Improvements Required
Built in 1983, the structures at this site are constructed from steel frames and received a grade C rating. There are no immediate specialized maintenance needs or required improvements.

5.3.6.3 Rest Area Policy Criteria Evaluation
The following policy criteria were applicable to the Rifle Rest Area.

- Interstate or Key Corridor: The Rifle Rest Area is located on I-70, which is an interstate highway.
- Safety: LOSS measures near the Rifle Rest Area exhibited a crash frequency above the statewide average for the facility type. Additionally, the 2-mile stretch centered on the Rifle Rest Area exhibited an elevated crash pattern for drivers asleep at the wheel.
5.3.7 Vail Pass Rest Area

The Vail Pass Rest Area is located off I-70 and Shrine Pass Road. The facility can be accessed by exiting I-70 at Exit 190, Shrine Pass Road, from both eastbound and westbound directions. Available amenities include restrooms, picnic areas, and trailhead access. There are alternative passenger services 1 mile away and alternative truck services 43 miles away.

5.3.7.1 Utilization

This rest area has a predicted usage of 434 vehicles per hour and actual usage of 300 vehicles per hour. It is heavily used year-round for recreational activities.

5.3.7.2 Specialized Maintenance Needed/Improvements Required

Built in 1980, the structures at this site are constructed of masonry and received a grade C rating. To continue operating in its current role, with frequent heavy use, the facilities at this location should be completely replaced.

5.3.7.3 Rest Area Policy Criteria Evaluation

The following policy criteria were applicable to the Vail Pass Rest Area.

- Minimum Required Distance to Acceptable Alternatives (Safety/Comfort/Convenience): The nearest acceptable alternative service location to the east for trucks is located 76 miles from the Vail Pass Rest Area.
- Interstate or Key Corridor: The Vail Pass Rest Area is located on I-70, which is an interstate highway.
- Safety: LOSS measures near the Vail Pass Rest Area exhibited a crash frequency above the statewide average for the facility type. Additionally, the 2-mile stretch centered on the El Morro Rest Area exhibited an elevated crash pattern for drivers unfamiliar with the area.

5.4 Region 4 Rest Areas

CDOT currently maintains three rest areas on I-70, north and east of the Denver Metro Area, which include:

- Deer Trail Rest Area
- Arriba Rest Area
- Burlington Rest Area and Colorado Welcome Center

CDOT currently maintains three rest areas on I-76, which include:

- Julesburg Welcome Center
- Sterling Rest Area
- Wiggins Rest Area

CDOT currently maintains two rest areas outside of Fort Collins, which include:

- Poudre Rest Area and Colorado Welcome Center
- Virginia Dale Rest Area
Figure 5-15. Region 4 Rest Areas and Welcome Centers
5.4.1 Arriba Rest Area

The Arriba Rest Area is located off I-70 at MM 383.3. The facility can be accessed by exiting I-70 at Exit 383 from either direction. Available amenities include restrooms, picnic areas, vending machines, and pet areas. There are alternative passenger and truck services 12 miles away in Flagler.

5.4.1.1 Utilization

This rest area has a predicted usage of 205 vehicles per hour and actual usage of 60 vehicles per hour. Upon a recent visit, 8 of 25 passenger spaces, 0 of 2 accessible parking spaces, and 3 of 9 truck spaces were in use. Buses often use this as a layover location for long trips.

5.4.1.2 Specialized Maintenance Needed/Improvements Required

Built in 1995, the structures at this site are constructed of masonry and received a grade C rating. To continue operating in its current role, the facility needs no immediate improvements; however, it is estimated that major improvements will be required in the 5- to 15-year timeframe.

5.4.1.3 Rest Area Policy Criteria Evaluation

The following policy criteria were applicable to the Arriba Rest Area.

- Interstate or Key Corridor: The Pueblo Arriba Rest Area is located on I-70, which is an interstate highway.
- Safety: The 2-mile stretch centered on the Arriba Rest Area exhibited an elevated crash pattern for drivers unfamiliar with the area.

Figure 5-16. Arriba Rest Area
5.4.2 Burlington Rest Area and Colorado Welcome Center

The Burlington Rest Area and Colorado Welcome Center is located off I-70 at MM 437.6. The rest area has direct access from the interstate; however, it is only accessible to drivers traveling in the westbound direction. Available amenities include restrooms, picnic areas, trailer dump, visitor information, vending machines, pet areas, and a point of interest. There are alternative passenger and truck services less than a mile away.

5.4.2.1 Utilization

This rest area has a predicted usage of 209 vehicles per hour. Actual usage statistics are unavailable; however, upon a recent visit, 6 of 50 passenger spaces, 0 of 8 accessible parking spaces, and 3 of 13 truck spaces were in use. This rest area operates under a 5-year contract with the City of Burlington for maintenance and capital improvements and serves the dual purposes of rest area and welcome center.

5.4.2.2 Specialized Maintenance Needed/Improvements Required

Built in 1997, the structures at this site are constructed of masonry and received an interior finish upgrade in 2013. This facility received a grade A rating and requires no specialized maintenance needs or improvements required to continue operating in its current capacity.

5.4.2.3 Rest Area Policy Criteria Evaluation

The following policy criteria were applicable to the Burlington Rest Area and Colorado Welcome Center.

✓ Key Entrance to the State: The Burlington Rest Area and Colorado Welcome Center is located on I-70 near Burlington, CO, and is the first state-maintained rest area for travelers entering Colorado from Kansas.

✓ Interstate or Key Corridor: The Burlington Rest Area and Colorado Welcome Center is located on I-70, which is an interstate highway.

Burlington Rest Area and Colorado Welcome Center
- I-70 MM: 437.6
- # of Passenger Vehicle Spaces: 58
- # of Truck Spaces: 13
- Access: Partial
- Predicted Usage: 209 vehicles per hour
- Tier: Tier 1 - Rest Area Welcome Center
5.4.3 Deer Trail Rest Area (Currently Closed)

The Deer Trail Rest Area is located along I-70, near the town of Deer Trail. Specifically, the facility is approximately 70 miles east of Denver, at MM 332. The rest area is currently closed while improvements are being made to I-70 in this area, but when open, has direct access from the interstate; however, it is only accessible to drivers traveling in the eastbound direction.

The developed site is triangular in shape on the east side of the interstate. Amenities at the deer trail rest area include restrooms, picnic areas, pet areas, and phones.

5.4.3.1 Utilization

This rest area has a predicted usage of 214 vehicles per hour. Actual usage statistics are unavailable; however, upon a recent visit, 20 of 44 passenger spaces, 0 of 4 accessible parking spaces, and 5 of 12 truck spaces were in use.

5.4.3.2 Specialized Maintenance Needed/Improvements Required

Built in 1972, the structures at this site are constructed of masonry and received a grade C rating. To reopen the facility, approximately $4 million would be needed for rehabilitation of the water treatment facilities, in addition to the ongoing pumping activities required to stay in compliance with the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment discharge permit.
5.4.3.3 Rest Area Policy Criteria Evaluation
The following policy criterion was applicable to the Deer Trail Rest Area.

✔ Interstate or Key Corridor: The Deer Trail Rest Area is located on I-70, which is an interstate highway.

5.4.4 Julesburg Welcome Center
The Julesburg Welcome Center is located just outside of Julesburg, south of the Nebraska-Colorado border at MM 180.5 of I-76. It can be accessed by taking Exit 180, U.S. Route 385, from both eastbound and westbound I-76. Available amenities include restrooms, picnic areas, trailer dump, visitor information, free coffee, internet access, a children’s play area, vending machines, pet areas, and a point of interest. There are alternative passenger services less than a mile away and alternative truck services 15 miles away.

5.4.4.1 Utilization
This rest area has a predicted usage of 144 vehicles per hour. Actual usage statistics are unavailable; however, upon a recent visit, 8 of 40 passenger spaces, 0 of 3 accessible parking spaces, and 2 of 10
truck spaces were in use. This location serves as the welcome center and visitor information location along the Nebraska-Colorado border.

5.4.4.2 Specialized Maintenance Needed/Improvements Required

The structures at this site are wood frame structures built in 1995 and were repainted in 2012, they received a grade B rating. Recent sewer work has provided a temporary fix to the Cast Iron sewer, but additional work is required. Sewer improvements are estimated to cost between $30,000 and 40,000. There is also a need for upcoming HVAC improvements estimated at $80,000.

5.4.4.3 Rest Area Policy Criteria Evaluation

The following policy criteria were applicable to the Julesburg Welcome Center.

- Key Entrance to the State: The Julesburg Welcome Center is located on I-76 near Julesburg, CO, and is the first state-maintained rest area for travelers entering Colorado from Nebraska.
- Interstate or Key Corridor: The Julesburg Welcome Center is located on I-76, which is an interstate highway.

Figure 5-19. Julesburg Welcome Center
5.4.5 **Poudre Rest Area and Colorado Welcome Center**

The Poudre Rest area and Colorado Welcome Center is located on the west side on I-25, approximately 30 miles south of the Wyoming-Colorado state border. It can be accessed by both northbound and southbound I-25 via Exit 268 for Prospect Road. Available amenities include restrooms, picnic areas, visitor information, free coffee, internet access, phone/fax, a children’s play area, vending machines, pet areas, a point of interest, and nature preserve access. There are alternative passenger services 1 mile away and alternative truck services 13 miles away.

5.4.5.1 **Utilization**

This rest area has a predicted usage of 1,279 vehicles per hour. Actual usage statistics are unavailable; however, upon a recent visit, 6 of 40 passenger spaces, 0 of 4 accessible parking spaces, and 8 of 34 truck spaces were in use. This location serves as the welcome center and visitor information location along the Wyoming-Colorado border.

5.4.5.2 **Specialized Maintenance Needed/Improvements Required**

Built in 2007, the structures at this site are constructed from steel frames and received a grade B rating. There are no specialized maintenance needs or improvements required for the Poudre Rest Area and Colorado Welcome Center to continue operating in its current role.

5.4.5.3 **Rest Area Policy Criteria Evaluation**

The following policy criteria were applicable to the Poudre Rest Area and Colorado Welcome Center.

- **Key Entrance to the State:** The Poudre Rest Area and Colorado Welcome Center is located on I-25 near Fort Collins, CO, and is the first state-maintained rest area for travelers entering Colorado from Wyoming.

- **Interstate or Key Corridor:** The Poudre Rest Area and Colorado Welcome Center is located on I-25, which is an interstate highway.

- **Safety:** The 2-mile stretch centered on the El Morro Rest Area exhibited an elevated crash pattern for drivers who fall asleep at the wheel.
5.4.6 Sterling Rest Area

The Sterling Rest Area is located on the west side of I-76 at MM 125. It can be accessed by taking Exit 125 from either direction of travel on I-76. Available amenities include restrooms, picnic areas, trailer dump, vending machines, pet areas, a point of interest, trailhead access and river access. There are alternative passenger and truck services less than a mile away.

5.4.6.1 Utilization

This rest area has a predicted usage of 135 vehicles per hour. Actual usage statistics are unavailable; however, upon a recent visit, 7 of 41 passenger spaces, 0 of 3 accessible parking spaces, and 1 of 18 truck spaces were in use.

5.4.6.2 Specialized Maintenance Needed/Improvements Required

Built in 2000, the structures at this site are constructed of masonry and received a grade B rating. There are no specialized maintenance needs or improvements required at this location.
5.4.6.3 Rest Area Policy Criteria Evaluation
The following policy criteria were applicable to the Sterling Rest Area.

- Interstate or Key Corridor: The Sterling Rest Area is located on I-76, which is an interstate highway.
- Safety: LOSS measures near the Sterling Rest Area exhibited a crash frequency above the statewide average for the facility type.

5.4.7 Virginia Dale Rest Area
The Virginia Dale Rest Area is located about halfway between Laramie and Fort Collins, approximately 2 miles south of the Wyoming-Colorado border. The rest area has direct access from SH 287 and can be accessed from southbound 287 by an exclusive right-turn lane and from northbound 287 by a combined left through lane. Available amenities include restrooms, picnic areas, pet areas, and a point of interest. There are alternative passenger services 19 miles away and alternative truck services 26 miles away.
5.4.7.1 Utilization
This rest area has a predicted usage of 68 vehicles per hour. Actual usage statistics are unavailable; however, upon a recent visit, 4 of 21 passenger spaces, 0 of 2 accessible parking spaces, and no informal truck spaces were in use.

5.4.7.2 Specialized Maintenance Needed/Improvements Required
Built in 1965, the structures at this site are constructed of steel frames and received a grade F rating. Several upgrades are necessary to improve the functionality of this site, including paving and restriping.

5.4.7.3 Rest Area Policy Criteria Evaluation
The following policy criteria were applicable to the Virginia Dale Rest Area.

✓ Minimum Required Distance to Acceptable Alternatives (Safety/Comfort/Convenience): The nearest acceptable alternative service location to the south for trucks is located 60 miles from the Virginia Dale Rest Area.

✓ Interstate or Key Corridor: The Virginia Dale Rest Area is located on US 287, which is a Colorado critical freight corridor.

Figure 5-22. Virginia Dale Rest Area
5.4.8 Wiggins Rest Area

The Wiggins Rest Area is located on the south side of I-76 just outside of the town of Wiggins. It can be accessed by both eastbound and westbound I-76 via Exit 66A. Available amenities include restrooms, picnic areas, pet areas, and vending machines. There are alternative passenger and truck services available at Stub’s Gas and Oil directly next to the rest area.

5.4.8.1 Utilization

This rest area has a predicted usage of 230 vehicles per hour. Actual usage statistics are unavailable; however, upon a recent visit, 8 of 41 passenger spaces, 0 of 2 accessible parking spaces, and 3 of 20 truck spaces were in use.

5.4.8.2 Specialized Maintenance Needed/Improvements Required

Built in 2001, the structures at this site are built of steel frames and received a grade B rating. There are no specialized maintenance needs or required improvements at this time.

5.4.8.3 Rest Area Policy Criteria Evaluation

The following policy criteria were applicable to the Wiggins Rest Area.

- Interstate or Key Corridor: The Wiggins Rest Area is located on I-76, which is an interstate highway.
- Safety: LOSS measures near the Wiggins Rest Area exhibited a crash frequency above the statewide average for the facility type.

![Figure 5-23. Wiggins Rest Area](image)
5.5 Region 5 Rest Areas

CDOT currently maintains two rest areas in Region 5 (southwestern corner of the state):

- Cortez – Sleeping Ute Mountain Rest Area
- Shaw Creek Rest Area
Figure 5-24. Region 5 Rest Areas and Welcome Centers
5.5.1 Cortez – Sleeping Ute Mountain Rest Area

The Cortez – Sleeping Ute Mountain Rest Area is located 7 miles east of downtown Cortez off U.S. Route 160 (US 160). The rest area has direct access from the US 160 and can be accessed by an exclusive left-turn lane from US 160 eastbound and an exclusive right-turn lane from US 160 westbound. Available amenities include restrooms, and picnic areas. There are alternative passenger services 7 miles away in Cortez, and alternative truck services available 21 miles away.

5.5.1.1 Utilization

This rest area has a predicted usage of 135 vehicles per hour. Actual usage statistics are unavailable; however, upon a recent visit, 5 of 38 passenger spaces, 0 of 4 accessible parking spaces, and 1 of 6 truck spaces were in use.

5.5.1.2 Specialized Maintenance Needed/Improvements Required

Built in 1980, the structures at this site are constructed of masonry and received a grade C rating. This facility has a small footprint that could benefit from additional truck parking in the next 5 to 15 years. Sanitary sewer upgrades from leach field may be required. Better signing could be used to help increase awareness and use, while upgraded computer systems could increase efficiency.

5.5.1.3 Rest Area Policy Criteria Evaluation

The following policy criterion was applicable to the Cortez – Sleeping Ute Mountain Rest Area.

☑ Interstate or Key Corridor: The Cortez – Sleeping Ute Mountain Rest Area is located on US 160, which is a Colorado critical freight corridor.

Figure 5-25. Cortez-Sleeping Ute Mountain Rest Area
5.5.2  Shaw Creek Rest Area

The Shaw Creek Rest Area is located along US 160 at MM 191. The facility can be accessed by an exclusive left-turn lane from US 160 eastbound and an exclusive right-turn lane from US 160 westbound. Available amenities include restrooms, picnic areas, and visitor information. There are alternative passenger and truck services 39 miles away.

5.5.2.1  Utilization

This rest area has a predicted usage of 91 vehicles per hour. Actual usage statistics are unavailable; however, upon a recent visit, 7 of 22 passenger spaces, 0 of 3 accessible parking spaces, and 0 of 10 truck spaces were in use. There is an existing partnership with Veterans of Foreign Wars Auxiliary to provide annual coffee, doughnuts, and maps over the July Fourth and Labor Day weekends during which there are typically 700 to 800 rest area users. There is limited parking available in the adjacent town of South Fork when Wolf Creek Pass closes, which forces trucks to wait until the pass reopens.

5.5.2.2  Specialized Maintenance Needed/Improvements Required

Built in 1979, the structures at this site are constructed of masonry and received a grade C rating. There are a variety of updates that could be made to improve this facility, including lighting upgrades, water pump upgrades, addressing septic issues, improving information center/kiosk, and modernizing the surveillance system.

5.5.2.3  Rest Area Policy Criteria Evaluation

The following policy criteria were applicable to the Shaw Creek Rest Area.

✓ Minimum Required Distance to Acceptable Alternatives (Safety/Comfort/Convenience): The nearest acceptable alternative service location to the west for trucks and cars is located 89 miles from the Shaw Creek Rest Area.

✓ Interstate or Key Corridor: The Shaw Creek Rest Area is located on US 160, which is a Colorado critical freight corridor.

✓ Safety: LOSS measures near the Shaw Creek Rest Area exhibited a crash frequency above the statewide average for the facility type.
Figure 5-26. Shaw Creek Rest Area
Conclusion

CDOT currently owns and operates 27 rest areas throughout Colorado. These facilities provide safety amenities and comfort to thousands of travelers each year. Rest areas throughout the state vary widely in terms of available amenities, usage, and maintenance needs. The inventory and assessment presented in this report establishes a baseline for management decisions regarding statewide rest areas. System wide and area specific recommendations are included in the Phase II Report.
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Appendix A
Meeting Agendas and Notes
PMT Meetings
CDOT Rest Area Study Project Team Meeting
Thursday, June 18, 2015    8:13 AM

Meeting Date: 6/18/2015 8:30 AM
Link to Outlook Item: click here

Invitation Message
CH2M Hill – 9191 South Jamaica Street

From I-25 southbound take County Line Road exit, turn left at the end of the ramp, going east and then curving around to go south, stay on County Line to the tee intersection and turn left. Follow Jamaica around under E470 and see CH2M on the right. We are in the south building.

Mary Jo

Participants
- Vobejda, Mary Jo/DEN (Meeting Organizer)
- Fredell, Kelly/DEN
- Santangelo, Theresa
- Marcella Broussard

Notes
Agenda:
Understanding goals and outcomes
PLT
Work Tasks and Schedule
PMT

CDOTs goal is it ensure appropriate comfort safety and availability to the traveling public through the state of Colorado.

Apply framework first to I-70 East. Then to I-70 West. Future tasks orders will incorporate statewide rest area locations.

Also a study to look at truck parking. Federal Highway Requirement for truckers to drive a certain amount of time before they have a rest period. So beyond road closures, this also needs to be provided for.
Chain Stations. Not included as part of this study. DTD contact (chain station) can provide input to the limits of including chain stations in the study. If the road is closed, can trucks stay in the chain station area (Kyle Lester can answer this question).

In addition to proximity, also need adequacy of rest area.

Would like the guidelines AND evaluation of the existing system to be the "road map" for action plan for any modifications in the next phase. Include recommendations for what the updates could be. (utilities, sustainability, relocation, repaving, etc) Doesn’t need to be very detailed, but can make high level notes.

Trying to get the study done for East I-70 as quickly as possible. Deer trail rest area is currently shut down.

Members of PMT - Jason (DTD) and someone from maintenance (Jeff/Kyle)

Traffic Counts are available. Send a list of information of what CDOT could provide.

The leadership team will request draft versions prior to the PLT meetings so they have something to react to.

PLT #1 will be purpose, research summary. Outcome will be goals, criteria, and framework outline. PLT #2 review the framework plan, review test case, layout for future work. The test case should be more than a single location. Maybe all of I-70 east.

PLT should include Josh Lapely, Debra Perkins smith, Marcellas boss (Mike Lewis Exec Deputy Director?). FHWA (Bill?). Ryan Rice. CDOT will schedule this meeting. CH2M
will send drafted email for this invite. (Plan 1.5 hrs at HQ)

CMC should be included separately from the PLT group with only the PMT. This meeting should be scheduled in July. Forest Service can be engaged in the next phase (construction of rest areas)

Next PMT meeting July 16. Time/Location TBD
Rest Area and Truck Parking Study Project Team Meeting #2

ATTENDEES: Theresa Santangelo/CDOT Mike Goolsby/CDOT, Jason Wallis/CDOT, Marcella Broussard/CDOT, Mary Jo Vobejda/CH2M, Kelly Fredell/CH2M

COPY TO: Alfonso Martinez/CDOT, Tim Miles/CDOT, Kyle Lester/CDOT

PREPARED BY: Kelly Fredell

DATE: July 16, 2015

CH2M PROJECT: 663056

Objectives

This is the second Project Team Meeting scheduled for the CDOT Rest Area and Truck Parking Study project. The purpose of this meeting is to introduce new team meetings, confirm projects goals, and present proposed documentation.

Summary

Confirm CDOT Goals and Desired Outcomes

The working project goal for the project is to ensure appropriate comfort, safety, and availability of rest areas and truck parking to travelers throughout Colorado. Based on research completed, it was suggested that safety should be the primary goal. The group agreed that comfort and safety were closely related, but saw no issue revising the order listed in the goal statement.

Specific needs at individual rest areas in Region 3 were brought to the attention of the group.

**Hanging Lake Rest Area (I-70 Mile Marker 125.13)** is close in proximity to the Hanging Lake recreation center and sees an increased level of recreational users who are accessing the trail head. CDOT and the Forest Service (USFS) have to actively manage the volume of cars during the summer months. Currently, CDOT owns the property, USFS owns the parking lot and the recreational use, the trail head, is on Forest Service land. There are current ongoing discussions with the forest service regarding the recreational users in this FHWA designated Rest Area.

**Vail Pass Rest Area (I-70 Mile Marker 190)** experiences a similar influx of users during the winter months with snowmobilers, and during the summer months with bicyclists.

**Edwards Rest Area (I-70 Mile marker 160)** provides local user parking for the adjacent city park area.

**Dump Stations at I-70 Rest Areas including Rifle, Edwards, Ariba, and Burlington (I-70 Mile Marker 90, 160, 383.3, and 437.6) along with others statewide** should all be identified and a recommendation should be made for this amenity at rest area locations.

**Welcome Centers** are often combined with rest areas (Fruita, Rifle, Georgetown, others) and should also be considered as an amenity within the study.

Work Tasks and Schedule

Current Schedule (attached) was handed out to the team.
It was suggested that the team include superintendent interviews during site visits along the corridor to identify localized impacts and issues experiences at each rest area/truck parking area. They may also be able to provide information regarding utilization rates at the rest areas and if there is specific rest area traffic counts available. These meetings will be added to the schedule.

Project Team Meeting Schedule

Thursday meetings seem to work for most people, however the Leadership Team Meetings may conflict with commissioner meetings.

Framework Document Outline

The draft framework plan was presented (attached) with some minor comments to the formatting including changing the recommendations section to “process” and include a discussion on nearby private ownership availability. For the individual site assessments, a section of additional uses should also be documented.

FHWA has a requirement for the frequency of rest area availability along the interstate. This used to be every 40 miles with appropriate signage, however this may have recently been updated. A contact at FHWA will be identified to assist in answering these types of questions.

Current regulations regarding concessions and other regulatory prohibitions and requirements may limit recommendations. Additional research on these requirements should be considered.

Research - List of Reports/sites; Summary Database; Completed Documents

Kansas and New Mexico are in process of completing a similar study. They may be good resources in addition to the studies that have already been completed.

Also include the 2007 Truck Parking Guide completed by CDOT in the list of resources.

Mapping

Mapping will be presented at the next Team Meeting.

The intent of the mapping is to provide graphics for the framework document. It was suggested that this could also be posted at existing rest area locations to direct users to alternatives.

Action Items

Trucks are not allowed to stay parked in the chain station areas in the event of a road closure. Chain Up stations should not be included as additional available parking in the corridor.

PLT members have been preliminarily identified as Josh Laippy, Chief Engineer; Debra Perkins-Smith, Director of Transportation Development; Kyle Lester, Director of Highway Maintenance; Herman Stockinger, Director of Government Relations; David Eller, Region 3 RTD; and Ryan Rice, Director of Transportation Systems Management & Operations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Items</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Question: Can a truck stay in a chain station if the road is closed?</td>
<td>Theresa to ask Kyle Lester</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Identify PLT members</td>
<td>Theresa confirm</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Send Brief Description of the project for the PLT invitations</td>
<td>Mary Jo to send to Theresa</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task Description</td>
<td>Responsible Parties</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Set up a CMCA meeting prior to 1st PLT meeting</td>
<td>Mary Jo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>List of info CH2M needs from CDOT</td>
<td>Kelly and Mary Jo</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Schedule upcoming Project Team Meetings and Project Leadership Meetings</td>
<td>Theresa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Schedule Meetings with Local Maintenance Staff</td>
<td>Mary Jo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Contact information for other ongoing studies</td>
<td>Jason</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Include 2007 Report in list of reference Materials</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>FHWA Contact Identification</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The purpose of this study is develop a framework for analysis to determine:

1. Existing truck parking and rest areas for closure
2. Need for new truck parking and rest areas
3. Optimum locations for new truck parking and rest areas
4. Improvements needed at existing truck parking and rest areas
**Action/Decisions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question: Can a truck stay in a chain station if the road is closed?</td>
<td>Theresa to ask Kyle Lester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify PLT members</td>
<td>Theresa confirm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Send Brief Description of the project for the PLT invitations</td>
<td>Mary Jo to send to Theresa</td>
<td>done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set up a CMCA meeting prior to 1st PLT meeting</td>
<td>Mary Jo and Theresa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of info CH2M needs from CDOT</td>
<td>Kelly and Mary Jo</td>
<td>Waiting to confirm needs. This may be ongoing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ID | Task Name                                                                 | Duration  | Start       | Finish       | Predecessors
---|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-------------|--------------|----------------
1  | CDO T I-70 Truck Parking and Rest Area Assessment                          | 205 days  | Fri 5/29/15 | Thu 3/10/16  |                
2  | Notice to Proceed                                                         | 0 days    | Fri 5/29/15 | Fri 5/29/15  |                
3  | Project Management                                                        | 191 days  | Thu 6/18/15 | Thu 3/10/16  |                
4  | Project Schedule                                                          | 1 day     | Thu 6/18/15 | Thu 6/18/15  |                
5  | Submit Initial Schedule                                                    | 1 day     | Thu 6/18/15 | Thu 6/18/15  |                
6  | Status Updates                                                            | 175 days  | Fri 7/10/15 | Thu 3/10/16  |                
16 | Invoicing and Progress Reports                                            | 175 days  | Fri 7/10/15 | Thu 3/10/16  |                
25 | Project Team Meeting #1 - Identify Team, Goals, Info Requests             | 0 days    | Thu 6/18/15 | Thu 6/18/15  |                
27 | Review of Existing Conditions                                             | 34 days   | Fri 5/29/15 | Thu 7/16/15  |                
28 | Existing Goals (Truck Parking and Rest Areas)                             | 10 days   | Fri 5/29/15 | Thu 6/11/15  |                
29 | Map Existing Rest Areas and Truck Parking                                 | 6 days    | Fri 6/12/15 | Thu 6/18/15  |                
30 | Previous Studies and Definitions                                          | 15 days   | Fri 6/19/15 | Thu 7/9/15   |                
32 | Other States                                                              | 5 days    | Fri 6/19/15 | Thu 6/25/15  |                
33 | National Publications                                                     | 5 days    | Fri 6/26/15 | Thu 7/2/15   |                
34 | Laws, Regulations, and Initiatives                                       | 5 days    | Fri 7/3/15  | Thu 7/9/15   |                
35 | Site Visit                                                                | 1 day     | Thu 7/10/15 | Thu 7/13/15  |                
36 | Project Team Meeting #2 - Research Completed                             | 0 days    | Thu 7/16/15 | Thu 7/16/15  |                
37 | I-70 East Initial Site Assessment                                         | 40 days   | Mon 7/13/15 | Fri 8/14/15  |                
38 | Project Team Meeting #3 - Review PLT Agenda                               | 0 days    | Thu 7/30/15 | Thu 7/30/15  |                
39 | Develop Draft Framework                                                   | 40 days   | Mon 7/13/15 | Fri 8/14/15  |                
40 | I-70 East Site Visit                                                      | 10 days   | Thu 7/23/15 | Wed 8/5/15   | 3855+6 days    
41 | Apply Framework to I-70 East                                              | 10 days   | Thu 8/6/15  | Wed 8/18/15  |                
42 | Study Framework                                                           | 25 days   | Mon 9/7/15  | Fri 10/8/15  |                
43 | Project Team Meeting #4                                                   | 0 days    | Thu 9/10/15 | Thu 9/10/15  |                
44 | Finalize Framework                                                        | 25 days   | Mon 9/7/15  | Fri 10/9/15  |                
45 | CDO T Leadership Team Meeting #1 - Goal Setting (Schedule, Participants,  | 0 days    | Thu 8/20/15 | Thu 8/20/15  |                
46 | I-70 West Site Assessment                                                 | 45 days   | Thu 10/8/15 | Thu 12/10/15 |                
47 | I-70 West Site Visit                                                      | 25 days   | Thu 10/8/15 | Wed 11/12/15 |                
48 | Project Team Meeting #5                                                   | 0 days    | Thu 11/12/15| Thu 11/12/15 |                
49 | Apply Framework to I-70 West                                              | 20 days   | Thu 11/12/15| Wed 12/5/15  |                
50 | Project Team Meeting #6                                                   | 0 days    | Thu 12/10/15| Thu 12/10/15 |                
51 | Study Recommendations for I-70 Truck Parking and Rest Areas               | 25 days   | Thu 12/10/15| Thu 1/14/16  |                
52 | Prepare Recommendations                                                   | 25 days   | Thu 12/10/15| Wed 1/13/16  |                
53 | Project Team Meeting #7                                                   | 0 days    | Thu 1/14/16 | Thu 1/14/16  |                

**Project: CDO T Truck and Rest Area As**
Date: Fri 6/19/15

**Task** | **Rolled Up Progress** | **Inactive Milestone** | **Manual Summary** | **Progress** | **Deadline**
---|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|-------------|--------------------
Milestone | Split | Inactive Summary | Manual Task | Finish-only | External Tasks | External Milestone
Rest Area and Truck Parking Framework Plan

1. Goal and Objectives

2. Map of all the Rest Areas and Truck Parking locations

3. Minimum requirements and standard for facilities
   a. Type and quality of the amenities
   b. Proximity to alternatives
   c. Number of parking stalls (vehicles and trucks)
   d. Safety of the area, including sight lines from the highways and lighting
   e. Quality of access
   f. Availability of utilities services
   g. Usage and cost per user (a form of cost benefit analysis)

4. Recommendations
   a. Method and Criteria for analysis
   b. Recommendations for construction of new truck/rest areas
      i. Partnerships to be considered
      ii. Approvals needed
      iii. Stakeholders to be involved
   c. Steps to be taken to close truck/rest areas, such as
      i. Approvals needed
      ii. Close out procedures
      iii. Communications needed

5. Individual site assessments
   a. Deer Trail
      i. Photos
      ii. Amenities
      iii. Utilities
      iv. Specialized maintenance needed
      v. Overall rating or cost benefit
      vi. Guidelines and or improvements

   b. I-70 Dotsero
      i. Photos
      ii. Amenities
      iii. Utilities
      iv. Specialized maintenance needed
      v. Overall rating or cost benefit
      vi. Guidelines and or improvements
Appendix

Research Summaries

Meeting Agendas and Notes
The following is a list of national publications and similar studies completed by other states that have been consulted in the preparation of the CDOT Rest Area and Truck Parking Study.

**National Publications**
- AASHTO Guide for Development of Rest Areas on Major Arterials and Freeways
- Model Development for National Assessment of Commercial Vehicle Parking, FHWA
- Rest Area Forum: Summary of Proceedings. Publication No. FHWA-RD-00-034, FHWA
- Highway Performance Monitoring System Field Manual. Publication No. OMB 21250028, FHWA

**State Specific Rest Area Studies**
- North Jersey Truck Rest Stop Study (link)
- Connecticut (CT) Statewide Rest Area and Service Plaza Study (link)
- Florida DOT: Commercial Motor Vehicle Parking Trends at Rest Areas and Weigh Stations (link)
- New York Metropolitan Transportation Council: Multi-State Truck Stop Inventory and Assessment Study (link)
- Illinois Center for Transportation: Truckers’ Park/Rest Facility Study (link)
- CalTrans California’s Vision Safety Roadside Rest Area System (link)
- Iowa DOT, Commercial Vehicle Parking (link)
- Minnesota DOT, Truck Parking Availability Study
- Maryland DOT, Maryland Truck Parking Study (link)
- South Dakota DOT, The Interstate Rest Areas Study: Along the I-29 and I-90 Corridors (link)
- New York State Department of Transportation Region 8 (NYSDOT Region 8), I-84 Commercial Vehicle Parking/Rest Area Study (link)
- Washington State DOT, WSDOT Truck Parking Study (link)
- Pennsylvania State Transportation Advisory Committee, Truck Parking in Pennsylvania (link)
- NATSO, Rest Area Commercialization and Truck Parking Capacity,
- Shippensburg University, Preliminary Truck Parking Inventory of the Interstate 81 Corridor: A Cataloging of Commercial Truck Stops and Public Rest Areas

**Other Publications**
- Truck Parking at Night Along Interstate Highways—Tennessee Experience, Proceedings, Second International Truck and Bus Safety Symposium, University of Tennessee
- A Study of Highway Rest Area Characteristics and Fatigue Related Truck Crashes, Michigan Department of Transportation
- Truck Stop Directory, Interstate America
- Heavy Commercial Vehicle Flow Atlas of the United States National Highway System. Univ. of Manitoba
Goals
The NJTPA conducted this study as part of its comprehensive freight planning program. This report outlines the requirements, inventory, issues, and solutions to address the significant lack of truck parking spaces in the region.

Abstract
Truck parking facilities are an essential element of the region’s transportation infrastructure, accommodating fatigued drivers and enhancing safe travel. A 2000 National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) report indicated that driver fatigue may be a factor in as many as 30 to 40 percent of all heavy truck accidents in the U.S.
- Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and NJTPA surveys indicate that an overwhelming number of commercial truck drivers encounter a shortage of truck parking facilities, especially for longterm overnight parking. Most of the public rest areas and private truck stops in the NJTPA and surrounding regions are filled beyond capacity during these overnight periods. Truck traffic continues to grow, further straining capacity.
- Truck drivers often park on highway shoulders when there is insufficient space in parking facilities. Nearly 300 trucks were observed on the shoulders of major limited-access highways in the NJTPA region or on local roads in the port area, near rail yards, or adjacent to warehouse and distribution centers during one weekday night August 2006. These parked trucks represent a serious potential safety hazard to passing motorists.
- There are nearly 1,400 parking spaces in the NJTPA region at NJDOT Rest Areas, NJ Turnpike Service Areas, and private truck stops. On any given night there is a need for an additional 1,300 in those corridors with excess parking demand. Of the 34 regional truck parking facilities 82 percent were observed over capacity.
- Because most truck parking facilities in the region are currently operating over their design capacity during periods of peak activity, most of the future growth in truck parking demand will likely be accommodated through illegal parking on highway shoulders and on local streets. A 10 percent increase in peak parking demand could potentially result in a doubling of illegal truck parking activity on highway shoulders.
- Eighty-two percent of the region’s truck parking facilities were observed over capacity in the summer of 2006. Those that were underutilized are small private stops with a limited number of spaces, well off the regional highway system, in lower demand areas, or designated for tandem trailer drop-off/staging.
- The activity at facilities varies by locations but there are unique characteristics between short and long haul trucks and the impacts they have on the utilization of regional parking facilities. Drivers parked for the short term constitute the majority of truck traffic into and out of facilities, however the long-term drivers utilize most of the parking capacity.

Conclusions
Policy/Institutional
1. Secure sites as a necessary land use
2. Advance favorable federal legislation that promotes innovation and public-private partnerships
3. Pursue alternative fuels, energy and environmental opportunities
4. Advance complementary land use approaches
Planning and Finance
1. Provide incentives for private sector development of truck parking
2. Incorporate truck parking as a future design parameter for facility improvement planning and design
3. Integrate truck parking as an element of port and intermodal facility

Partnering
1. Promote public/private partnerships
2. Collaborate on a broader scale with neighboring DOTs, MPO regions, and local planning officials

New/Expanded Sites for Additional Parking Capacity

Data Collection Methods
- NJTPA Truck Parking Database
- Detailed Methodology for Calculating Truck Parking Demand
- Trucking Industry Telephone Interview Questionnaire
- Driver Interview Web Survey

Other Information / Findings

Federal Regulations
The hours truck drivers can be behind the wheel dictate, in large part, the demand for parking. The Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA) instituted revised hours-of-service regulations (49 CFR, Part 395) in August of 2005. Under these rules, long-haul truck operators are:
- Permitted to drive up to 11 hours in an on-duty window of 14 hours after they’ve been off-duty for a minimum of 10 consecutive hours.
- Limited to 60 on-duty hours in seven consecutive days, or 70 hours in eight consecutive days.
- Permitted to restart the seven and eight day windows once a driver is off duty for 34 consecutive hours.

The regulations also contain special short-haul provisions for truck drivers who operate within a 150-miles radius of their normal work location. These drivers:
- May operate their vehicles for a maximum of 11 hours after being off duty for at least 10 consecutive hours.
- Are limited to a total of 14 hours after five on-duty days in a week and a total of 16 hours after two on-duty days in a week.
- Are not required to keep detailed records of off-duty status (RODS).
- Must maintain accurate time records for a period of six months that show all on-duty start and end times and total on-duty hours each day.

Site Evaluation Criteria:
- Parcel Size
- Ownership
- Proximity to Interstate System
- Bi-Directional Accessibility
- Compatible Land Use
- Nearest Alternate Parking Site
- Utilization of Nearest Alternate Site
- Anticipated Level of Demand Satisfaction
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STRENGTHS

· TRUCK PARKING DEMAND MODEL
· SUMMARY OF OTHER STATE’S FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS
· NATIONAL TRUCK PARKING ASSESSMENT PROCESS

Goals

· Estimate the extent and geographic distribution of truck rest parking supply, demand, and shortages (current and projected) along the National Highway System (NHS) using existing national and State inventories and studies.
· Provide technical support to public-private partnerships in various States in carrying out their initiatives and preparing their plans of action.
· Determine how commercial vehicle drivers plan for and address their parking needs for both short-duration and Federal hours-of-service rest; how drivers select when, where, and at what facility they park; and how and why drivers decide to use public versus private parking facilities.

Abstract

The objective of this research was to estimate the extent and geographic distribution of truck rest parking supply and demand along the National Highway System in accordance with Section 4027 of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century. This report presents the development, calibration, validation, and application of the truck parking demand model used to meet the Section 4027 requirements.

The parking demand model developed for this study estimates parking demand for a highway segment (defined by the analyst) rather than a single parking facility. The model incorporates a variety of factors known to affect the demand for truck parking, which include: traffic engineering factors (e.g., annual average daily traffic, travel time, peak hour factors), truck driver behaviors (e.g., time spent loading/unloading, time spent at home, time spent resting at shipper/receiver), and Federal hours-of-service regulations (e.g., a maximum 70 hours on duty in eight days). A step-by-step method for selecting analysis segments and applying the model is presented. The first step in alleviating parking shortages is to identify the locations where shortages exist. The demand model is a good first step in achieving this goal. Overall, the model produces acceptable estimates of parking space demand. For 29 segments where parking counts were conducted, the model error was only –2 percent, an estimate within 269 spaces of the observed parked trucks. However, the model is not microscopic enough to always accurately predict segment-specific demand. This is because the model does not consider a number of factors that can affect the local distribution of demand (e.g., proximity to distribution centers that results in “staging,” proximity to other parking facilities that absorb demand, and factors that affect the short-haul/long-haul ratio). Because of these limitations, the model should be used as a guideline for identifying possible locations of parking shortages that can be evaluated more carefully through additional study and field observations.

Conclusions

In conclusion, one of the most powerful features of the truck parking demand model is its ability to estimate future demand so that long-range plans can be formulated. States could use this model to identify locations with possible parking shortages, then, based on local knowledge and field observations, refine the model to better reflect local conditions. The refined model could then be used to make projections of parking demand for long-range planning purposes.
Data Collection Methods

- Model parameters were calibrated using overnight field observations of parked trucks in eight States: Arkansas, Georgia, Idaho, Mississippi, Missouri, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and Virginia.
- Observational studies were performed on 29 segments of highway in these eight States representing four regions and ten corridors.
- Two model parameters were calibrated: the long-haul peak parking factor (PPFLH) and the short-haul to long-haul ratio (PSH/PLH) ratio.
- Survey responses from over 2,000 truck drivers.

Other Information / Findings

More than 90 percent of commercial drivers surveyed perceived that there was a shortage of truck parking, particularly for long-term or overnight parking. In addition, the survey results showed some important distinctions between public rest areas and private truck stops. The majority of drivers expressed a preference for public rest areas for short-term parking, while two-thirds indicated a preference for private truck stops for long-term rest needs, thus suggesting a distinction of the facility types in terms of the needs that they serve.

The results of the occupancy studies showed that the rest areas were overflowing with trucks at night, as evidenced by trucks parked along the shoulders of highway exit and entrance ramps, as well as on interchange ramps. While rest areas were overflowing, Model Development for National Assessment of Commercial Vehicle Parking Background 4 approximately 30 percent of the private truck parking spaces were not occupied, and the unoccupied private parking spaces outnumbered the trucks parked along the highways by nearly a three-to-one ratio. (Tennessee)

“To understand why some truck drivers park along the highway when there are available private parking spaces, in-depth interviews were held with five drivers. Opinions of the drivers interviewed were quite consistent. The findings were that private truck stops and public rest areas are not substitutes for each other because they meet different needs. While private truck stops are used when there is a need for fuel, a meal, or other amenities, drivers want to pull over as soon as possible when they feel sleepy. In such situations, they prefer to pull off at the nearest rest area or park wherever they can, even on the shoulders of ramps. In addition, drivers reported that it is difficult to find a convenient space in many private truck stops because the parking is not well designed, and there is a risk of minor accidents and damage when moving in and out of these parking lots (Tennessee)

- Approximately 14 percent of the commercial vehicles on eastbound I-94 utilized the rest areas.
- 20% of the commercial vehicles surveyed arrived before 11:00 p.m.
- 20% of the commercial vehicles surveyed departed after 7:00 a.m.
- Over the entire week for all rest areas, the oversized lots were at or over capacity 45 percent of the time.
- None of the rest areas were at capacity at 11:00 p.m.
- Almost 60 percent of the commercial vehicles arriving before 11:00 p.m. stayed for five hours or more.
Of the commercial vehicles arriving between 11:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., approximately 20 percent stayed in the rest area less than four minutes. One in three stayed eight minutes or less during the survey times.

The study conclusions were that commercial vehicle drivers who arrived at the rest areas before 11:00 p.m. tended to be able to find parking spaces. Once parked, they often stayed for most of the night. (Minnesota)

A key recommendation made by CTRE was that the State of Iowa should continue to be in the business of providing some overnight parking, as the Task Force believed that the State could not expect the private sector to meet all overnight parking demands. (Iowa)

The inventory included the number of parking spaces, facilities offered, distance from previous rest area and nearest city, operation time and parking time limits, average daily traffic and truck traffic, distance to the next interchange, and number of private parking spaces within ten miles. (Michigan)

National truck parking assessment process.
1 Identify major trucking corridors and select analysis segments
2 Inventory public and private parking space supply for each segment
3 Apply truck parking demand model for each segment and compare to supply

The Interstate America’s Truck Stop Directory is a comprehensive database with location and amenity information of private truck stop/travel plaza facilities.
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Objectives
This is the third Project Team Meeting scheduled for the CDOT Rest Area and Truck Parking Study project. The purpose of this meeting is to review existing mapping, discuss Deer Trail Field Visit, determine study goals for the truck parking aspect, and to review the agenda for the upcoming project leadership team meeting.

Summary
Existing Rest Areas and Truck Parking Location Maps
All of the existing rest areas and truck parking locations have been mapped using google earth. This exercise is handy for determining the existing separation between existing facilities. The Project Leadership Team (PLT) may have input on the final deliverable of the study, and if this type of electronic information would be beneficial for future use. A list of these locations will be provided to the team.

A good test to begin the discussion of the need for rest areas is to look at the implications of closing all of them, statewide, and looking at what the impacts are. One example is that the local surrounding municipalities may see an influx of trucks parking in town along main thoroughfares, which may or may not be deemed as beneficial. From there we can begin to formulate recommendations (including any necessary outreach pieces) for the final report.

Field Visit
CH2M Conducted the first field visit to Deer Trail Rest Area and gave a quick synopsis over the information collected. This led to a bigger discussion of what other information should also be collected including:

From CDOT Region Staff:
- Lessons learned on recently closed rest areas (Larkspur and Bennett for example)
- Existing Maintenance Cost
- Existing Maintenance Responsibilities (IGA like in Burlington?)
- MLOS Data
- How much do you see trucks using alternative parking areas?
- Are there concentrated locations of biohazards/litter and/or shoulder damage?
From Colorado State Patrol/Local Sheriff:

- Crime Statistics at the rest area
- Emergency Management Use of the rest area
- Security Cameras
- How much do you see trucks using alternative parking areas?

From CMCA:

- Utilization – Plan for 6 hour of heavy use or day usage?

A list of regional contacts should be compiled to identify the resource for directing each of these questions. Tim, Al and Theresa will work on compiling a list so that CH2M can begin setting up meetings either in the field, or at their offices during the field work phases of the study.

Truck Parking Study Goals

CDOT would like to update the results and conclusions made in the 2007 Truck Parking Issues at State Facilities in Colorado Report. Since the report has been published, major changes in regulations, such as the hours of service, have been updated and need to be reflected in the analysis to aid in the determination of the adequacy of existing truck parking facilities.

Project Leadership Team Meeting Agenda

A draft outline and presentation for the PLT meeting has been prepared, but the group didn’t have a chance to review in the meeting. The group agreed to review the Draft (attached) and provide comments to CH2M no later than August 7th. This will allow for enough time to make the updates, and distribute to the PLT members no later than Friday August 14th at noon.

In addition to asking the PLT about the final deliverable of this study, these additional questions should also be added to the agenda for the August 19th Meeting. A solid definition of what a rest area must entail to be classified as a rest area should be part of the discussion. This could be an FHWA definition, or if there is no formal definition, it may be a discussion for the PLT.
Action Items
The following tables describes completed and current action items based upon discussions held in the meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Items</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Question: Can a truck stay in a chain station if the road is closed?</td>
<td>Theresa to ask Kyle Lester</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Identify PLT members</td>
<td>Theresa confirm</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Send Brief Description of the project for the PLT invitations</td>
<td>Mary Jo to send to Theresa</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Set up a CMCA meeting prior to 1st PLT meeting</td>
<td>Mary Jo</td>
<td>Thursday August 6th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>List of info CH2M needs from CDOT</td>
<td>Kelly and Mary Jo</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Schedule upcoming Project Team Meetings and Project Leadership Meetings</td>
<td>Theresa</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Schedule Meetings with Local Maintenance Staff</td>
<td>Mary Jo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Contact information for other ongoing studies</td>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Include 2007 Report in list of reference Materials</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>FHWA Contact Identification</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW FROM THIS MEETING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>List of Existing Rest Areas and Truck Parking Locations</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Review DRAFT PLT Meeting Agenda</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Distribute PLT Meeting Materials</td>
<td>Kelly to Theresa / Theresa to PLT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>List of Regional Contacts to interview</td>
<td>Theresa, Tim, and Al</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CDOT’s goal is it ensure appropriate safety, comfort, and availability of rest areas and truck parking to travelers throughout Colorado.
### Action/Decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Question: Can a truck stay in a chain station if the road is closed?</td>
<td>Theresa to ask Kyle Lester</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Identify PLT members</td>
<td>Theresa confirm</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Send Brief Description of the project for the PLT invitations</td>
<td>Mary Jo to send to Theresa</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Set up a CMCA meeting prior to 1st PLT meeting</td>
<td>Mary Jo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 List of info CH2M needs from CDOT</td>
<td>Kelly and Mary Jo</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Schedule upcoming Project Team Meetings and Project Leadership Meetings</td>
<td>Theresa</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Schedule Meetings with Local Maintenance Staff</td>
<td>Mary Jo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Contact information for other ongoing studies</td>
<td>Jason</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Include 2007 Report in list of reference Materials</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 FHWA Contact Identification</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Check list for Rest Area and Truck Stop Observations

Prior to field observation print out a google map.

**Name and milepost of the Facility:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amenity</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background Information</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent Major Interstate or State Highway</td>
<td>1-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mileposts of next closest services</strong></td>
<td>324 (Downtown)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction of traffic served</td>
<td>WB &amp; EB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AADT for adjacent highway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed for adjacent highway</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe the access</td>
<td>Tight Diamond Interchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available As-Constructed Plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information gathered from region staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Condition and Required Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incident rate on adjacent highway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Data On site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe any safety issues or features</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utilization</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Truck Parking Spaces</td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Passenger Parking Spaces</td>
<td><strong>NA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Overall Condition</td>
<td><strong>NA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amenities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrooms (running water)</td>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of utilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vending Machines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic area/tables</td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog exercise area</td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phones</td>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor Information</td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps</td>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Pedestrian areas</td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food (restaurants or prepackaged)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes (not rest)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showers</td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overnight parking</td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell Service / Wifi Availability</td>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational components</td>
<td><strong>None</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General layout</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow of incoming and outgoing vehicles (internal area operations)</td>
<td><strong>NA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design of entrance and exit points on the highway (access operations)</td>
<td><strong>NA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separation between Truck Parking and Passenger Parking</td>
<td><strong>NA</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Check list for Rest Area and Truck Stop Observations

Prior to field observation print out a google map.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and milepost of the Facility:</th>
<th>Deer Trail MPM 332</th>
<th>Wed July 29 @ 10 am</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amenities</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Background Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent Major Interstate or State Highway</td>
<td>I-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mileposts of next closest services</td>
<td>328 (Deer Trail) 336 (No service) 340 (No service)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction of traffic served</td>
<td>WB only 339 (in service) 340 (no service)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AADT for adjacent highway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed for adjacent highway</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe the access</td>
<td>Direct for WB = EB access from 336</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Available As-Constructed Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information gathered from region staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Condition and Required Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incident rate on adjacent highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Data On site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe any safety issues or features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Truck Parking Spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Passenger Parking Spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Overall Condition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amenities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restrooms (running water)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vending Machines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic area/tables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog exercise area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Pedestrian areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food (restaurants or prepackaged)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overnight parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell Service / Wifi Availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational components</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General layout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flow of incoming and outgoing vehicles (internal area operations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design of entrance and exit points on the highway (access operations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separation between Truck Parking and Passenger Parking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Handicap Facilities
- Handicap Facilities
- 4 passenger spaces
- 4 bathrooms
- Historical Marker
- Interrp. Signs
- Other Storage Building
## Check list for Rest Area and Truck Stop Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and milepost of the Facility:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amenity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background Information</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent Major Interstate or State Highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mileposts of next closest services</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction of traffic served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AADT for adjacent highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed for adjacent highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe the access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Available As-Constructed Plans</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information gathered from region staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Condition and Required Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incident rate on adjacent highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Data On site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe any safety issues or features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utilization</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Truck Parking Spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Passenger Parking Spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Overall Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amenities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrooms (running water)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vending Machines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic area/tables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog exercise area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Pedestrian areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food (restaurants or prepackaged)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overnight parking</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell Service / Wifi Availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General layout</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow of incoming and outgoing vehicles (internal area operations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design of entrance and exit points on the highway (access operations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separation between Truck Parking and Passenger Parking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Checklist for Rest Areas and Truck Parking

Background Information:
Milepost of Closest Services:
Direction of Traffic Served:
AADT for Adjacent Highway
Speed for Adjacent Highway:
Describe the Access:

Infrastructure Information:
Number of Truck Parking Spaces/# in use
Number of Passenger Parking Spaces /# in use
Number of Handicapped Spaces
General Overall Condition

Amenities Provided:
☐ Restrooms (running water) ☐ Maps
☐ Availability of utilities ☐ Power
☐ Vending Machines ☐ Lighting
☐ Picnic area/tables ☐ Phones
☐ Dog exercise area ☐ Showers
☐ Visitor Information ☐ Trash
☐ Other Pedestrian areas ☐ Overnight parking
☐ Food (restaurants or prepackaged) ☐ Recreation
☐ Cell Service / Wifi Availability ☐ Other

General Layout:
Flow of incoming and outgoing vehicles (internal area operations)
Design of entrance and exit points on the highway (access operations)
Separation between Truck Parking and Passenger Parking

Other Comments/Observations:
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
Checklist for Alternative Service Locations

Colorado Dept. of Transportation
4201 E Arkansas Ave, Denver, CO 80222

<Date of Visit>

<Time of Visit>

Prepared for:

NAME OF FACILITY:
<ENTER NAME>

MILEPOST:
<ENTER NAME>

ADJACENT MAJOR INTERSTATE OR STATE HIGHWAY:
<ENTER NAME>

Background Information:
Milepost:
Direction of Traffic Served:
Describe the Access:

Describe Typical Services Provided:
☐ No Services (signed)
☐ No Services (not signed)

Amenities Provided:
☐ Restrooms (running water)
☐ Fuel
☐ Truck Parking
☐ Food (restaurants or prepackaged)
☐ Other

Other Comments/Observations:
General Condition:

Required Maintenance:

Incident Rate on Adjacent Highway:

On Site Crime Data:

Safety Issues or Features:

Utilization:

Other Comments/Observations:
## Rest Area Decision Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Measurement/Standard</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Used for System Planning (New; Close; Keep; Improve)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Closest Services</td>
<td>60 mile maximum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incident rate on adjacent highway</td>
<td>The same or less than state average for this highway type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crime Data On site</td>
<td>Crimes Reported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort</td>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>Consider volume and type of services provided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>Direction of traffic served</td>
<td>Both/one</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criteria used for Improvement decisions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Access from adjacent highway</td>
<td>Meets CDOT and FHWA standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safety issues</td>
<td>Concept cost to improve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flow of incoming and outgoing vehicles (internal area operations)</td>
<td>Concept cost to improve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design of entrance and exit points on the highway (access operations)</td>
<td>Concept cost to improve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Separation between Truck Parking and Passenger Parking</td>
<td>Concept cost to improve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort</td>
<td>General Condition and Required Maintenance</td>
<td>Above/at/below average</td>
<td>Concept cost will be used to consider the benefit based on utilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Truck Parking Spaces</td>
<td>In line with the demand calculations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Passenger Parking Spaces</td>
<td>In line with the demand calculations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>Concept cost to improve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amenities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Restrooms (running water)</td>
<td>Concept cost to add/improve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Concept cost to add/improve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vending Machines</td>
<td>Concept cost to add/improve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>Concept cost to add/improve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Picnic area/tables</td>
<td>Concept cost to add/improve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dog exercise area</td>
<td>Concept cost to add/improve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phones</td>
<td>Concept cost to add/improve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visitor Information</td>
<td>Concept cost to add/improve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maps</td>
<td>Concept cost to add/improve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Pedestrian areas</td>
<td>Concept cost to add/improve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overnight parking</td>
<td>Concept cost to add/improve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cell Service / Wifi Availability</td>
<td>Concept cost to add/improve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recreational components</td>
<td>Concept cost to add/improve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Truck Parking Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Measurement/Standard</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Used for System Planning (New; Close; Keep; Improve)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safety</strong></td>
<td>Closest Services</td>
<td>60 mile maximum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incident rate on adjacent highway</td>
<td>The same or less than state average for this highway type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crime Data On site</td>
<td>Crimes Reported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>Consider volume and type of services provided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Availability</strong></td>
<td>Direction of traffic served</td>
<td>Both/one</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criteria used for Improvement decisions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safety</strong></td>
<td>Access from adjacent highway</td>
<td>Meets CDOT and FHWA standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safety issues</td>
<td>Concept cost to improve</td>
<td>Concept cost will be used to consider the benefit based on utilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flow of incoming and outgoing vehicles (internal area operations)</td>
<td>Concept cost to improve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design of entrance and exit points on the highway (access operations)</td>
<td>Concept cost to improve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utilization</strong></td>
<td>Number of Truck Parking Spaces</td>
<td>In line with the demand calculations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comfort</strong></td>
<td>General Condition and Required Maintenance</td>
<td>Above/at/below average</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>Concept cost to improve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amenities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Restrooms (running water)</td>
<td>Concept cost to add/improve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Concept cost to add/improve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vending Machines</td>
<td>Concept cost to add/improve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>Concept cost to add/improve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Picnic area/tables</td>
<td>Concept cost to add/improve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dog exercise area</td>
<td>Concept cost to add/improve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phones</td>
<td>Concept cost to add/improve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visitor Information</td>
<td>Concept cost to add/improve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maps</td>
<td>Concept cost to add/improve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Pedestrian areas</td>
<td>Concept cost to add/improve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overnight parking</td>
<td>Concept cost to add/improve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cell Service / Wifi Availability</td>
<td>Concept cost to add/improve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statewide Rest Area and Truck Parking Study
Project Leadership Team Meeting #1
Agenda

• Introductions
• Rest Area and Truck Parking Study Background and Purpose
• Project Goals
• Framework Plan
• Next Steps
The Colorado Transportation Commission has requested a framework for assessing truck parking and rest areas for improvements or closure.

- CDOT is embarking on a *Statewide Truck Parking and Rest Area Study* to determine the sufficiency of the number of truck parking and rest areas throughout the state, the optimum locations for both existing and potential new locations, and the adequacy of amenities at existing areas.
Currently 28 rest areas and approximately 50 private truck parking areas exist within the State of Colorado.
  - Provided for traveler safety and comfort
  - Rest Areas are predominantly maintained by CDOT maintenance forces.
  - Emergency Truck parking areas (ramp shoulders) are not considered

What is an ideal ‘rest area’?

The development of the guidance will begin with research including:
  - Best practices used by other states.
  - AASHTO Guide for Development of Rest Areas on Major Arterials and Freeways
  - Regulatory requirements and operational strategies
  - Statewide Plan and Freight Plan goals and Asset Management Plan
• The results of this study will assist CDOT in:

  – Determine if existing truck parking and/or rest areas should be closed, upgraded or remain
  – Recommend changes to existing truck parking and/or rest areas,
  – Determine if there is a need to construct new truck parking and/or rest areas, and
  – Assess the optimum locations of both existing and potentially new truck parking and/or rest areas.
Study Process

- Goals
- Criteria
- Fieldwork
- Recommendations

Agenda | Introductions | Background | Goals | Framework | Next Steps
• Potential Criteria for Assessment
  – Type and quality of the amenities;
  – Distance to next like facility;
  – Proximity to alternatives;
  – Number of parking stalls (vehicles and trucks);
  – Safety of the area based on existing available safety data
  – Sight lines from the highways and lighting;
  – Quality of access;
  – Availability of utilities services;
  – Usage (existing and estimated future) and cost per user (a form of cost benefit analysis)
Framework Outline

1. Goal and Objectives
2. Map of all the Rest Areas and Truck Parking locations
3. Minimum requirements and standard for facilities
4. Recommendations
5. Individual site assessments
   a. Photos
   b. Utilization
   c. Amenities
   d. Utilities
   e. Specialized maintenance needed
   f. Overall rating or cost benefit
   g. Guidelines and or improvements
   h. Additional Uses
6. Appendix
   a. Research Summaries
   b. Meeting Agendas and Notes
Next Steps

- Apply Draft Framework to East I-70
- Apply, Evaluate, and Refine Framework
- Finalize Framework and Document East I-70
- Obtain concurrence from PLT
- Continue applying framework statewide
- Prepare Final Recommendations
Next Project Leadership Team Meeting

• Agenda
  – Review Final Framework
  – Discuss Results for I-70 East of Denver
  – Brainstorm Recommendations

• Schedule
  – October 13, 2015
Objectives
This is the fourth Project Team Meeting scheduled for the CDOT Rest Area and Truck Parking Study project. The purpose of this meeting is to review existing mapping, talk about FHWA’s release of the 2015 Jason’s Law Report, discuss I-70 East Field Visit, and to review the agenda for the upcoming project leadership team meeting.

Summary

Existing Rest Areas and Truck Parking Location Maps
The project team has defined the corridors entirely outside of the 470 loop outside of the Denver metro area. Most of the truck trips within the Denver Metro Area are local. There is some amount of truck traffic that stops within the metro area before making the haul into the mountains, necessitating additional capacity on the west side of town. Instead of getting into too much detail of the Denver network as part of this study, we could just make a recommendation to review this need in future phases of implementation of the plan.

Non Interstate Private Truck Stop Data
Does CDOT have information on privately owned truck locations where the off-interstate rest areas are located? Jason thinks that the data exists, it’s just not organized. Greg Fulton may have this information. There is also a private rest area trade group who could have this information. Since this work is not currently scoped, we have time to figure out this information.

Another potential source of data/information is the newly formed freight advisory council. The freight advisory council will begin meeting in the next few months. This group will include all modes of transportation, industry leaders, Dept. of Agriculture, CSP, etc.

How does CDOT want to manage the demand for emergency parking during storm events? Is there a Public/Private Partnership to rent out facilities such as the stock show location in emergency situations? This is worth a conversation. There would be environmental hurdles (spills), pavement section requirements, and weight/height restrictions that need to be considered.

Jason’s Law Information
The new report was just published in 2015. Jason will make the first contact at FHWA to request the raw data/interview responses from this report.
State Highway Rest Areas

How do the rest areas on state highways work into the system of statewide rest areas? The outliers on the state highway system are harder to get to when considering the spacing requirements as an overall system. It should be considered that if the corridor is not on a designated truck route, the rest areas may be needed for vehicles only.

Field Visit

CH2M conducted the field visit to I-70 East and gave a quick synopsis of the visit. In addition, there were three meetings during the day. The team stopped at every exit to inventory the existing services.

From CDOT Region Staff:
- Would like fewer rest areas
- Would like to spend maintenance dollars elsewhere. This could be addressed at the more executive level. Is the grading system currently used for the other buildings also used for the rest area buildings? There is a general feeling that there is no major plan to replace the buildings.

From Colorado State Patrol/Local Sheriff:
- Would like more rest areas to make the roads safer

From Maintenance:
- Would like improved rest areas

The MLOS reports have a different activity number for rest areas. Some of the pavements are captured in other areas (overhead, engineering, etc). The dollar amounts collected to date are not an accurate representation of the total number of dollars spent at each rest area, as they omit capital improvement costs.

Upcoming Meetings

The current plan for the PLT meeting is to talk about the analysis process. The process begins at the system level, looking at spacing statewide. Then the next level, you would look at relationships between available amenities from public and private sources. Then you would look at each rest area from an individual location analysis. Then the final most detailed level is at a user level with a cost and utilization analysis.

Currently there isn’t another meeting before the next PLT. Tuesday the 29th was agreed to be a good date for a brief conference call to discuss the PLT meeting agenda.
Action Items
The following tables describes completed and current action items based upon discussions held in the meeting.

### Action Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Question: Can a truck stay in a chain station if the road is closed?</td>
<td>Theresa to ask Kyle Lester</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Identify PLT members</td>
<td>Theresa confirm</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Send Brief Description of the project for the PLT invitations</td>
<td>Mary Jo to send to Theresa</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Set up a CMCA meeting prior to 1st PLT meeting</td>
<td>Mary Jo</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>List of info CH2M needs from CDOT</td>
<td>Kelly and Mary Jo</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Schedule upcoming Project Team Meetings and Project Leadership Meetings</td>
<td>Theresa</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Schedule Meetings with Local Maintenance Staff</td>
<td>Mary Jo</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Contact information for other ongoing studies</td>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Include 2007 Report in list of reference Materials</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>FHWA Contact Identification</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>List of Existing Rest Areas and Truck Parking Locations</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Review DRAFT PLT Meeting Agenda</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Distribute PLT Meeting Materials</td>
<td>Kelly → Theresa</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>List of Regional Contacts to interview</td>
<td>Theresa, Tim, Al</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### NEW FROM THIS MEETING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Add 470 to the statewide map. Add 287 from OK to I-70 (Limon) and 71 to Limon to Nebraska are Designated Freight Corridors</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Include Truck Parking on State Highways in future scope phases</td>
<td>Mary Jo and Theresa</td>
<td>Future Scoping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Contact FHWA for data from Jason’s Law</td>
<td>Jason</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Check the status of structural ratings/replacements for Rest Area structures</td>
<td>Theresa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Mary Jo to send Theresa a call in number and meeting invite for Tuesday the 29th</td>
<td>Mary Jo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Send out PLT Meeting Materials prior to next meeting</td>
<td>Mary Jo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rest Area and Truck Parking
Project Team Agenda
September 10, 2015

1. Existing Rest Areas and Truck Parking Location Maps
   a. Denver Metro Area
   b. Non Interstate Private Truck Stop Data

2. Jason’s Law Final Report

3. State Highway Rest Areas
   a. Utilization
   b. System Connectivity

4. Field Visit
   a. I-70 East
   b. Maintenance and CSP Meeting Recap

5. Upcoming Meetings
   a. Project Leadership Team Meeting October 13
   b. Next Team Meeting November 12

6. Next Steps
   a. System Level Analysis
   b. Public/Private Relationship on a corridor level
   c. Individual Location Analysis
   d. User Level (Cost/amenities)
## Action/Decisions

CDOT’s goal is it ensure appropriate safety, comfort, and availability of rest areas and truck parking to travelers throughout Colorado.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Items</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Question: Can a truck stay in a chain station if the road is closed?</td>
<td>Theresa to ask Kyle Lester</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Identify PLT members</td>
<td>Theresa confirm</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Send Brief Description of the project for the PLT invitations</td>
<td>Mary Jo to send to Theresa</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Set up a CMCA meeting prior to 1st PLT meeting</td>
<td>Mary Jo</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>List of info CH2M needs from CDOT</td>
<td>Kelly and Mary Jo</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Schedule upcoming Project Team Meetings and Project Leadership Meetings</td>
<td>Theresa</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Schedule Meetings with Local Maintenance Staff</td>
<td>Mary Jo</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Contact information for other ongoing studies</td>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Include 2007 Report in list of reference Materials</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>FHWA Contact Identification</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEW FROM THIS MEETING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>List of Existing Rest Areas and Truck Parking Locations</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Review DRAFT PLT Meeting Agenda</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Distribute PLT Meeting Materials</td>
<td>Kelly to Theresa / Theresa to PLT</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>List of Regional Contacts to interview</td>
<td>Theresa, Tim, and Al</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rest Area and Truck Parking Study Project Team Meeting #5

ATTENDEES: Theresa Santangelo/CDOT, Lisa Streisfeld/CDOT, Marcella Broussard/CDOT, Alfonso Martinez/CDOT, Kyle Lester/CDOT, Mike Goolsby/CDOT, Mary Jo Vobejda/CH2M, Kelly Fredell/CH2M

COPY TO: Tim Miles/CDOT, Jason Wallis/CDOT

PREPARED BY: Kelly Fredell

DATE: December 10, 2015

CH2M PROJECT: 663056

This is the fifth Project Team Meeting scheduled for the CDOT Rest Area and Truck Parking Study project. The purpose of this meeting is to review the outcomes of the last project leadership team meeting, present preliminary conclusions and recommendations, and discuss the next steps needed to complete the project.

Project Leadership Team (PLT) Meeting Recap

We presented preliminary results to the PLT that hinged around the idea that the research that has been done, and the site visits that have been completed, have led to a system-level approach for making recommendations. They are not simply a single rest area, it’s a system of rest areas.

We are recommending that there be a rest area at the entrance into the state in all five locations (Two on I-70, Two on I-25, and one on I-76). Other rest areas, unless they serve a multiple purpose, are not needed in the system. Vail Pass Rest Area is a joint recreation use, but it is also the only rest area that would be required to meet the minimum spacing requirement of 60 mile spacing between services.

The PLT expressed that there may be some local concern about closing down some rest areas. The system-wide concept of closures would be easy to agree to in principal, but that we need more information on individual needs at each rest area before a final recommendation can be made.

Resulting Change in Approach

Based on these PLT comments, we changed the order of completing the work such that the field work could be completed before making an overall recommendation. The field work (on I-25) has now been completed, and a full interstate recommendation can be made. Next steps include meeting with the Maintenance Superintendents and then the RTDs to determine their individual assessments and recommendations for rest areas in their regions.

Goals and Objectives

Originally, the study was charged with identifying the need for:

- Construction of new truck parking and/or rest areas
- Relocation to optimize locations of any existing truck parking and/or rest areas
- Closure of existing truck parking and rest areas
- Upgrades and maintenance needs for existing truck parking and rest areas
Additional recommendations developed through the study process including:

- **Characteristics for a Colorado - ‘best in class’ - sustainable rest area system:** The best in class rest areas are often in partnerships. There have been no complaints about crime at the ones that are staffed.

- **Partnership needs, benefits, and opportunities:** Because the rest areas currently viewed as the best are maintained by partnerships between CDOT and municipalities or chambers-of-commerce, it is recommended that a partnership that benefits the interstate travelers and the local economy be formed for rest areas that remain open.

- **Possible re-designation for some rest areas to Recreational Destination Areas:** The Glenwood Canyon rest areas were a mitigation agreement that CDOT agreed to in the Environmental Documents for the Glenwood Canyon reconstruction. They are destinations. They are close together, they are all trailheads, and they are located adjacent to forest service trailheads or land. These areas would be best served by building a partnership with the forest service that supports the rest area and the forest destination. There is a potential concern that classifying them as a trailhead will result in them becoming a 4(f) resource.

- **Possible re-use for rest areas recommended for closure:** Each rest area planned for closure should be reviewed for possible re-use, such as, emergency truck parking, equipment storage, or CSP offices.

- **Emergency truck parking considerations:** Due to the consistent concern regarding the need for emergency truck parking when the interstates are closed due to weather, these issues should be comprehensively studied statewide.

The project team has been tasked with discussions with the Forest Service to begin discussing opportunities for possible partnerships around responsibilities in the rest areas adjacent to forest service land, as well as, all of the CDOT facilities that are located in forest service land. There are additional facilities (i.e. Rabbit Ears Pass, Wolf Creek Pass) with forest service leases that should be included in the partnership discussion. A list of these will be provided to the project team.

Other issues discussed:

- If a rest area is closed, they could be designated as emergency parking areas. Sufficient notification with signage should be placed to notify users of the availability.

- CDOT is looking for a new chain station SB I-25. The Larkspur Rest Area is right on a hill, so it’s not a good location. A proposal to put one at Tomah Road was rejected in approximately 2009. There is not a lot of room for widening adjacent to I-25 in that stretch because of the environmental concern of the Preble Jumping Mouse habitat.

- Another suggested use for closed rest areas in the future was park-and-ride locations.

- An environmental benefit of rest area facilities for the forest service is that toilets are seen as mitigation for water quality.

- Central Federal Lands manages a grant (Central Federal Lands Access Program Grant - due in May) for access to all federal lands. Colorado Parks and Wildlife could be another partner to be involved in the discussion with the Forest Service.

**Preliminary Conclusions and Recommendations**

The system recommendation, based on national literature research and an inventory of existing privately owned services and the rest areas. Looked at the needs for new facilities, unnecessary facilities within the system, and relocation of existing facilities for optimum spacing. The following are specific recommendations for a Colorado rest area system.
Welcome Centers should be provided at state boundaries
Rest areas should be multi use
Strive to maintain Rest Areas with partnerships

Recommendations by individual rest areas will be completed.

Next Steps for Recommendation Distribution

- Meeting with the Maintenance Superintendents to review the preliminary recommendations.
- Meeting with RTDs for individual recommendations/requests:
  - At RTD meetings, there should be a statewide representative at each meeting. The goal of these meetings is to get individual recommendations for the future of each rest area.
  - The project team should present at the superintendents meeting before going to the RTDs. Collectively hear their concerns, then go meet with their RTD section by section.

- Another PLT
- Project Team Review of Draft Framework
- Transportation Commission

Upcoming Meetings

Theresa and Mary Jo will pull together meeting materials for an upcoming superintendents meeting on January 5th.

Action Items

The following tables describes completed and current action items based upon discussions held in the meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Items</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Question: Can a truck stay in a chain station if the road is closed?</td>
<td>Theresa to ask Kyle</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Identify PLT members</td>
<td>Theresa confirm</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Send Brief Description of the project for the PLT invitations</td>
<td>Mary Jo to send to</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Theresa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Set up a CMCA meeting prior to 1st PLT meeting</td>
<td>Mary Jo</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>List of info CH2M needs from CDOT</td>
<td>Kelly and Mary Jo</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Schedule upcoming Project Team Meetings and Project Leadership Meetings</td>
<td>Theresa</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Schedule Meetings with Local Maintenance Staff</td>
<td>Mary Jo</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Contact information for other ongoing studies</td>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Include 2007 Report in list of reference Materials</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>FHWA Contact Identification</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>List of Existing Rest Areas and Truck Parking Locations</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Review DRAFT PLT Meeting Agenda</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task Description</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Distribute PLT Meeting Materials</td>
<td>Kelly → Theresa</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>List of Regional Contacts to interview</td>
<td>Theresa, Tim, Al</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Add 470 to the statewide map. Add 287 from OK to I-70 (Limon) and 71 to Limon to Nebraska are Designated Freight Corridors</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Include Truck Parking on State Highways in future scope phases</td>
<td>Mary Jo and Theresa</td>
<td>Future Scoping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Contact FHWA for data from Jason’s Law</td>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Check the status of structural ratings/replacements for Rest Area structures</td>
<td>Theresa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Mary Jo to send Theresa a call in number and meeting invite for Tuesday the 29th</td>
<td>Mary Jo</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Send out PLT Meeting Materials prior to next meeting</td>
<td>Mary Jo</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEW FROM THIS MEETING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>There are additional facilities (rabbit ears pass, wolf creek pass) that have forest service leases that should be included in the partnership discussion. A list of these will be provided to the project team.</td>
<td>Alfonso</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Develop Agenda and meeting materials for the supervisor meetings</td>
<td>Theresa and Mary Jo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Get our presentation on the Superintendents Meeting Agenda</td>
<td>Alfonso</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rest Area and Truck Parking
Project Team Agenda
December 10, 2015

1. PLT Recap

2. Resulting Change in Approach
   a. Additional Field Work
   b. Postponed drafting the framework

3. Status
   a. Completed interstate field work
   b. Goals and Objectives

4. Preliminary Conclusions and Recommendations

5. Next Steps for recommendation distribution
   a. Meeting with RTDs for individual recommendations/requests
   b. Another PLT
   c. Project Team Review of Draft Framework
   d. Transportation Commission

**Action/Decisions**

CDOT’s goal is to ensure appropriate safety, comfort, and availability of rest areas and truck parking to travelers throughout Colorado.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Question: Can a truck stay in a chain station if the road is closed?</td>
<td>Theresa to ask Kyle Lester</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Identify PLT members</td>
<td>Theresa confirm</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Send Brief Description of the project for the PLT invitations</td>
<td>Mary Jo to send to Theresa</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Set up a CMCA meeting prior to 1st PLT meeting</td>
<td>Mary Jo</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>List of info CH2M needs from CDOT</td>
<td>Kelly and Mary Jo</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Schedule upcoming Project Team Meetings and Project Leadership Meetings</td>
<td>Theresa</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Schedule Meetings with Local Maintenance Staff</td>
<td>Mary Jo</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Contact information for other ongoing studies</td>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Include 2007 Report in list of reference Materials</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>FHWA Contact Identification</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>List of Existing Rest Areas and Truck Parking Locations</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Review DRAFT PLT Meeting Agenda</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Distribute PLT Meeting Materials</td>
<td>Kelly to Theresa / Theresa to PLT</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>List of Regional Contacts to interview</td>
<td>Theresa, Tim, and Al</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NEW FROM THIS MEETING
Goals and Objectives

The study was charged with identifying the need for:

– Construction of new truck parking and/or rest areas
– Relocation to optimum locations of any existing truck parking and/or rest areas
– Closure of existing truck parking and rest areas
– Upgrades and maintenance needs for existing truck parking and rest areas

Additional recommendations developed through the study process include:

– Characteristics for a Colorado - ‘best in class’ - sustainable rest area system
– Partnership needs, benefits, and opportunities
– Possible re-designation for some rest areas to Recreational Destination Areas
– Possible re-use for rest areas recommended for closure
– Emergency truck parking considerations
The results of the study are a recommended statewide system of truck parking and rest areas that complement the existing privately owned services, to ensure travelers have amenities available within a reasonable travel distance as they traverse the State.

- No new rest areas are needed
- No relocations of existing facilities are advised.
The system recommendation, based on an inventory of existing privately owned services, identifies needs for new facilities, unnecessary facilities within the system, relocation of existing facilities for optimum spacing, and then, specific recommendations for each remaining rest area.

- Welcome Centers provided at state boundaries
- Rest areas should be multi use
- Strive to maintain rest areas through partnerships
Welcome Centers/Rest Areas
I-25 El Morro Welcome Center- MM 17.72
I-25 Poudre Welcome Center- - MM 268
I-70 (SH340) Fruita Welcome Center- MM 0.3
I-70 Burlington Welcome Center- - MM 437.6
I-76 Julesburg Welcome Center- - MM 180

Rest Areas needed for 60 mile spacing
I-70 Vail Pass Rest Area – MM190

Ownership Change
I-70 Rifle Rest Area - MM 90
I-76 Sterling Rest Area - MM 125

Revised Designations
I-70 No Name Trailhead - MM 119
I-70 Grizzly Creek Trailhead - MM 121.02
I-70 Hanging Lake Trailhead - MM 125.13
I-70 Bair Ranch Trailhead - MM 128.5

Closures
I-70 Edwards Rest Area - MM 163
I-70 Deer Trail Rest Area - MM 332.01
I-70 Arriba Exit Rest Area - MM 383
I-76 Wiggins Rest Area - MM 66
I-25 Cuerno Verde Rest Area- MM 74.39
I-25 Pueblo SB Rest Area - MM 111.69
I-25 Pueblo NB Rest Area - MM 114.99
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ATTENDEES: Theresa Santangelo/CDOT, Marcella Broussard/CDOT, Alfonso Martinez/CDOT, Keith Sheaffer/CDOT, Travis Miller/CDOT, Mike Goolsby/CDOT, Mary Jo Vobejda/CH2M, Kelly Fredell/CH2M
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This is the seventh Project Team Meeting scheduled for the CDOT Rest Area and Truck Parking Study project. The purpose of this meeting is to review the status of the project and discuss the new direction given to provide an implementation plan for rest areas in the future.

Project Recap

Mary Jo presented to the new participants the work that has been completed to date and preliminary recommendations. While the preliminary recommendations included some closures, the current direction is more along the lines of “re-use” for all of the existing rest areas.

I-70 East

Deer Trail Rest Area is currently in need of a $4 million dollar upgrade in order to meet compliance requirements. The current question on the table is, what would need to be added to the scenario to make this $4 million upgrade a good investment. This leads to a larger question of all the rest areas to determine the future of all of the existing rest areas.

The RTD in the Deer Trail Rest Area is concerned about the messaging to the elected officials if they want to keep the rest area open if the recommendation is to close them. Keith would like to better understand this report, the compliance requirements, and the future action plan in order to educate the eastern Transportation Planning Region (TPR). Truck parking continues to be the conversation driver, since the Deer Trail Rest area is in a Ports to Plains route. Keith and Travis will continue to be involved in the discussions moving forward. Kelly will provide the maps to Theresa to forward on.

Preliminary Conclusions and Recommendations

The purpose of the study was to inventory the existing rest area, and make recommendations based on national guidance. There is a new request to provide a transition plan for the rest areas as opposed to a closure plan. The plan for each rest area is very individual based on location. For example, Deer Trail is within interstate ROW, and Arriba is not.

In order to complete this last piece, we need to redefine the goals. This will be accomplished with a detailed meeting with Lisa, Peter, and Jason to go over the existing conditions and define the goals for each one. With that information, the project team will take the inventory of the existing rest areas and merge it with the goals. This will allow us to develop one or more RFP’s. This RFP will be able to share the inventory, the limits, and the goals. Then private industry can make the decision on what the ultimate use is. Mary Jo will send the cost and scope proposal of this work to Theresa for review.
Upcoming Meetings

Freight Advisory Council Meeting will be held on Thursday, February 11. The project team will present a project update. Jason will contact Theresa to coordinate the presentation prior to the meeting. Dan Smith may be able to provide some mapping that is currently available from this study.

There is not another meeting scheduled for the Project Team. Theresa will set up the first meeting to discuss goals for the RFP the end of January/early February.

Action Items

The following tables describes completed and current action items based upon discussions held in the meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Question: Can a truck stay in a chain station if the road is closed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Identify PLT members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Send Brief Description of the project for the PLT invitations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Set up a CMCA meeting prior to 1st PLT meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 List of info CH2M needs from CDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Schedule upcoming Project Team Meetings and Project Leadership Meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Schedule Meetings with Local Maintenance Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Contact information for other ongoing studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Include 2007 Report in list of reference Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 FHWA Contact Identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 List of Existing Rest Areas and Truck Parking Locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Review DRAFT PLT Meeting Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Distribute PLT Meeting Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 List of Regional Contacts to interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Add 470 to the statewide map. Add 287 from OK to I-70 (Limon) and 71 to Limon to Nebraska are Designated Freight Corridors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Include Truck Parking on State Highways in future scope phases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Contact FHWA for data from Jason’s Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Check the status of structural ratings/replacements for Rest Area structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rest Area and Truck Parking Study Project Team Meeting #8

This is the eighth Project Team Meeting scheduled for the CDOT Rest Area and Truck Parking Study project. The purpose of this meeting is to review the status of the project and discuss the items needed to move forward with the final recommendations.

Project Recap

Since the last meeting, we have contacted Kyle Lester, who hasn’t made any additional progress since the previous discussions in regards to the negotiations with the Forest Service. The Forest Service rest area locations have been mapped (attached). Moving forward, if this coordination gets completed prior to the completion of the Rest Area Study, we will capture the findings as part of the final report. However, if this doesn’t get completed, it won’t hold up the finalization of the report.

Transportation Commission Meeting

Initially it was anticipated that the team would present to the Transportation Commission at the conclusion of the study. At the last PLT meeting, Debra felt strongly about having a visioning meeting with the Transportation Commission. The following key items could be on the agenda for a visioning meeting: Review of background information (federal requirements, safety, and facility quality) and then have them weigh in on what their desired “level of service”. In other words, allow them to make a policy decision on their preference among: 1) to spend more money on fewer rest areas, 2) spend more money on all rest areas, 3) spend less money on fewer areas, etc. We could use the work that has been done as examples, but could not immediately provide detailed statewide information.

The other option would be to take the next step and put together “staff recommendations” before presenting to the Transportation Commission. In order to have that conversation, we need to develop the skeleton plan. The first step in accomplishing that is to meet with the regional offices and confirm the plan with each region. The approach to these meetings would be to present what we are currently thinking, ask them for their input to assist with developing these plans based on their knowledge and needs, and any other questions needed to finalize the plans. Commission may request cost data for any proposed recommendations.

Regional Meetings

These meetings will invite the RTD, superintendent, superintendent deputy, traffic engineer and the region property manager or region ROW manager. Prior to each meeting, we will prepare preliminary recommendations for existing rest areas and get their input on any additions or omissions. This will
provide the skeleton framework of recommendations that could be presented to the Transportation Commission.

CDOT has chosen the ladder approach and will initiate the scheduling of these meetings. Truck Parking Study

At this point, we don't have enough information about truck parking data statewide to make recommendations on quantity or location for truck parking. This study is limited to recommendations regarding truck parking at rest areas, for example “this rest area could be used for future truck parking” etc. Mary Jo to connect with Jason to see if there is any information available prior to the regional meetings that could aid in the discussion.

Other Rest Area Notes

- Theresa will coordinate with CDOT to see if their maintenance crews can take photos for the state highway rest areas if the decision is made to do google investigations only. Kelly to send Theresa a list of the rest areas on the state highways.
- Deer Trail Rest Area is closed for the summer due to adjacent roadway work.
- Trucks are skipping Fruita more and more to go to the truck stop in Grand Junction.
- Virginia Dale (seasonal – after Memorial Day) has water quality issues as well. Pumping and testing have recently been revamped to meet with current environmental requirements.

Colorado Tourism Board

The tourism board has a specific set of criteria that they use for Welcome Centers. The big difference from CDOT rest areas is that truck parking is NOT a requirement for Colorado Tourism Board Welcome Centers. In Trinidad, for example, the Welcome Center is located in downtown Trinidad. There is NO truck access to this center. 10 miles north is the CDOT rest area El Morro. The question discussed was, would designating this rest area as a Welcome Center be duplicating efforts? Additionally, can the Welcome Center be regional or does it need statewide travel data? The Welcome Center in Trinidad is really just focus on the local area. Fruita is the same way. The decision was made that Welcome Centers do not need to provide for truck parking. Welcome Centers should have both local and statewide travel and destination data. This would result in the El Morro rest area not being designated as a Welcome Center.

Upcoming Meetings

Prior to the next Project Team meeting, we will have met with all of the regions and drafted a skeleton plan of recommendations. As a group we will tweak the plan as needed in preparation for the Transportation Commission meeting. Region 3 would be a good first region meeting (Theresa will schedule).

There is also an Eastern TPR meeting scheduled the second week in May. The message should be that the transition plan will not be completed until the truck parking is completed. Deer Trail is currently closed and will remained closed until we either determine permanent closure or transition to truck parking.

Action Items

The following tables describes completed and current action items based upon discussions held in the meeting.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Items</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Question: Can a truck stay in a chain station if the road is closed?</td>
<td>Theresa to ask Kyle</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Identify PLT members</td>
<td>Theresa confirm</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Send Brief Description of the project for the PLT invitations</td>
<td>Mary Jo to send to</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Theresa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Set up a CMCA meeting prior to 1st PLT meeting</td>
<td>Mary Jo</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>List of info CH2M needs from CDOT</td>
<td>Kelly and Mary Jo</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Schedule upcoming Project Team Meetings and</td>
<td>Theresa</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Leadership Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Schedule Meetings with Local Maintenance Staff</td>
<td>Mary Jo</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Contact information for other ongoing studies</td>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Include 2007 Report in list of reference Materials</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>FHWA Contact Identification</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>List of Existing Rest Areas and Truck Parking Locations</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Review DRAFT PLT Meeting Agenda</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Distribute PLT Meeting Materials</td>
<td>Kelly ➔ Theresa</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>List of Regional Contacts to interview</td>
<td>Theresa, Tim, Al</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Add 470 to the statewide map. Add 287 from OK to I-70 (Limon) and</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71 to Limon to Nebraska are Designated Freight Corridors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Include Rest Areas on State Highways in future scope phases</td>
<td>Mary Jo and Theresa</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Contact FHWA for data from Jason’s Law</td>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Check the status of structural ratings/replacements for Rest Area</td>
<td>Theresa</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Mary Jo to send Theresa a call in number and meeting invite for</td>
<td>Mary Jo</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tuesday the 29th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Send out PLT Meeting Materials prior to next meeting</td>
<td>Mary Jo</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>There are additional facilities (rabbit ears pass, wolf creek pass)</td>
<td>Alfonso</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>that have forest service leases that should be included in the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>partnership discussion. A list of these will be provided to the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>project team.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Develop Agenda and meeting materials for the supervisor meetings</td>
<td>Theresa and Mary Jo</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All entries are marked as complete unless otherwise specified.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Assignee(s)</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Keith and Travis will continue to be involved in the discussions moving forward. Send them a map of the current recommendations</td>
<td>Kelly/Theresa</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Dan Smith may be able to provide some mapping that is currently available from this study.</td>
<td>Theresa</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Send the cost and scope proposal of this work to Theresa for review.</td>
<td>Mary Jo</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Set up the first meeting to discuss goals and objectives for the RFP the end of January/early February.</td>
<td>Theresa</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NEW FROM THIS MEETING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Assignee(s)</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Mary Jo to connect with Jason to see if there is any information available prior to the regional meetings that could aid in the discussion.</td>
<td>Mary Jo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Kelly to send Theresa a list of the rest areas on state highways.</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Theresa can coordinate with CDOT to see if their maintenance crews can take photos for the SH rest areas</td>
<td>Theresa</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rest Area and Truck Parking

Project Team Agenda

May 5, 2016

• Forest Service meetings
• Transportation Commission Meeting(s)
  – Vision Setting
  – Presentation of the plan
  – Required prep
• Steps to finish the Rest Area Study
  – Plan for Regional Meetings to discuss the Rest Area Transition Planning
  – Truck Parking versus Rest Area transition plans clarification
  – Off-interstate rest area data collection
  – Tourism Board Information regarding Welcome Centers
• Re-designation of Rest Areas in Glenwood Canyon
• Next Meeting

To promote the safety and comfort of Colorado travelers.
Transportation Commission

Potential Points of Discussion

Policy Areas

• Meet Federal Requirements and Obligations
  — i.e. 1 hour spacing, EIS mitigation commitments, etc.

• Safety

• Facility Quality

• Customer Service
  — minimum or more - how do we want out-of-state travelers to view CO, CO travelers, etc.

• Support Truck Parking

• Financially Sustainable
  — cost-effective
PLT Meetings
Rest Area and Truck Parking Study
Project Leadership Team #2

Objectives
This is the second Project Leadership Team Meeting scheduled for the CDOT Rest Area and Truck Parking Study project. The purpose of this meeting is to update the project to the members of the Project Leadership Team (PLT), present preliminary recommendations and review next steps.

Summary
Completed work
The Statewide maps have been updated to include surrounding state rest area information, weigh stations, and direction of travel served as requested in the previous PLT meeting.

User costs have been collected from the MLOS that shows maintenance related costs at each rest area. However major renovations or improvements to the rest areas are not included in MLOS. The information gives a relative idea of how much is spent, but is not all inclusive. The project team is working on how to get the rest of the information. Marcella offered if a project was set up through property management since 2007, this information could be pulled without going through SAP.

There are no clusters of crash patterns suggestive of need for rest areas. The predicted number of crashes is much higher than the anecdotal usage, measured by number of “flushes”, or water used at the rest area.

Stakeholders along the corridor have been interviewed, including Colorado Motor Carriers Association, maintenance supervisors, maintenance staff, and the Colorado State Patrol. In general, those responsible for the actual maintenance and cost of maintain the rest area would support closure. Those who use the rest areas (truck drivers) and those who support them (CSP, CDOT Staff) would support maintaining the existing, even expanding.

Preliminary Recommendations
The project team review a statewide system level assessment including two alternatives: Alternative A, Adding Additional Rest Areas; and Alternative B, Closing All Rest Areas.
The data does not indicate locations where crash numbers and types indicate tired drivers. Closing all interstate rest areas in the state would leave stretches of interstate in violation of the distance to services criteria. Some rest areas serve multiple purposes and, although they could be closed as rest areas, the access and parking is needed for other uses. No Rest Areas are clustered too closely together (except at trailhead and recreation areas). Rest areas that have agreements for cleaning and/or staffing the rest areas are the best ambassadors of Colorado to travelers.

The project team is proposing the following preliminary recommendations:

- No new rest areas are recommended on the interstate system.
- Maintain a ‘best in class’ rest area at the entrances to the state: i.e. I-70 Westbound at Burlington (Welcome Center); I-70 Eastbound at Fruita (Fruita Welcome Center); I-25 Northbound at Trinidad (El Morro); I-25 Southbound at Fort Collins (Poudre Rest Area); and I-76 at Sterling.
- Work toward closure of all other rest areas except those with alternative uses, such as trailheads.
- Replace truck parking spaces lost with rest area closures through partnerships with private rest areas.
- Review all other rest areas individually to identify alternative uses, determine closure, timing of the closure should be based on public/private overlaps; inadequate and unnecessary amenities; existing and needed maintenance burden; cost per user.
- Develop an Emergency truck Parking standard of practice that includes a focus on technology solutions.

Next Steps

The project team will finalize the recommendations and will develop a suggested plan for implementation of the recommendations.

CDOT director and the transportation commission need to be included in the discussion. Also the CMCA and the Freight Advisory Commission group. A key message should be that money won’t actually be saved by closing rest areas. The money will simply be reallocated to the remaining “best in class” rest areas. Another key message is that there is no safety need for the rest area, particularly at Deer Trail. The message could be that the rest area is not closing, but just changing the use (level of service classification).

Consider changing the name from “rest area” to trailhead. That could open new opportunities in regulations and partnerships.

There are no additional PLT meetings scheduled.
Statewide Rest Area and Truck Parking Study
Project Leadership Team Meeting #2

**Agenda**

- Completed Work
  - Maps
  - Cost
  - Traffic and Safety on I-70 East
    - I-70 East Stakeholder input
- Preliminary Recommendations
- Next Steps
### User Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denver West Area</td>
<td>$84,546.71</td>
<td>$83,751.25</td>
<td>$82,965.79</td>
<td>$82,180.33</td>
<td>$81,394.87</td>
<td>$80,609.40</td>
<td>$79,823.93</td>
<td>$79,038.46</td>
<td>$78,253.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Kiosk East Area</td>
<td>$10,322.50</td>
<td>$9,932.36</td>
<td>$9,542.22</td>
<td>$9,152.08</td>
<td>$8,762.08</td>
<td>$8,372.08</td>
<td>$8,022.08</td>
<td>$7,572.08</td>
<td>$7,122.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver West Area</td>
<td>$12,350.00</td>
<td>$11,960.33</td>
<td>$11,570.66</td>
<td>$11,181.00</td>
<td>$10,791.33</td>
<td>$10,401.66</td>
<td>$10,012.00</td>
<td>$9,622.33</td>
<td>$9,232.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Kiosk West Area</td>
<td>$14,400.00</td>
<td>$13,910.33</td>
<td>$13,420.66</td>
<td>$12,931.00</td>
<td>$12,441.33</td>
<td>$11,951.66</td>
<td>$11,462.00</td>
<td>$10,972.33</td>
<td>$10,482.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver West Area</td>
<td>$16,450.00</td>
<td>$15,960.33</td>
<td>$15,470.66</td>
<td>$14,981.00</td>
<td>$14,491.33</td>
<td>$13,991.66</td>
<td>$13,492.00</td>
<td>$12,992.33</td>
<td>$12,492.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Kiosk West Area</td>
<td>$18,500.00</td>
<td>$17,910.33</td>
<td>$17,420.66</td>
<td>$16,931.00</td>
<td>$16,441.33</td>
<td>$15,951.66</td>
<td>$15,462.00</td>
<td>$14,972.33</td>
<td>$14,482.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver West Area</td>
<td>$20,550.00</td>
<td>$19,960.33</td>
<td>$19,470.66</td>
<td>$18,981.00</td>
<td>$18,491.33</td>
<td>$17,991.66</td>
<td>$17,492.00</td>
<td>$16,992.33</td>
<td>$16,492.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Kiosk West Area</td>
<td>$22,600.00</td>
<td>$21,910.33</td>
<td>$21,420.66</td>
<td>$20,931.00</td>
<td>$20,441.33</td>
<td>$19,951.66</td>
<td>$19,462.00</td>
<td>$18,972.33</td>
<td>$18,482.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver West Area</td>
<td>$24,650.00</td>
<td>$23,960.33</td>
<td>$23,470.66</td>
<td>$22,981.00</td>
<td>$22,491.33</td>
<td>$21,991.66</td>
<td>$21,492.00</td>
<td>$20,992.33</td>
<td>$20,492.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Kiosk West Area</td>
<td>$26,700.00</td>
<td>$25,910.33</td>
<td>$25,420.66</td>
<td>$24,931.00</td>
<td>$24,441.33</td>
<td>$23,951.66</td>
<td>$23,462.00</td>
<td>$22,972.33</td>
<td>$22,482.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver West Area</td>
<td>$28,750.00</td>
<td>$27,960.33</td>
<td>$27,470.66</td>
<td>$26,981.00</td>
<td>$26,491.33</td>
<td>$25,991.66</td>
<td>$25,492.00</td>
<td>$24,992.33</td>
<td>$24,492.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Kiosk West Area</td>
<td>$30,800.00</td>
<td>$29,910.33</td>
<td>$29,420.66</td>
<td>$28,931.00</td>
<td>$28,441.33</td>
<td>$27,951.66</td>
<td>$27,462.00</td>
<td>$26,972.33</td>
<td>$26,482.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver West Area</td>
<td>$32,850.00</td>
<td>$31,960.33</td>
<td>$31,470.66</td>
<td>$30,981.00</td>
<td>$30,491.33</td>
<td>$29,991.66</td>
<td>$29,492.00</td>
<td>$28,992.33</td>
<td>$28,492.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Kiosk West Area</td>
<td>$34,900.00</td>
<td>$33,910.33</td>
<td>$33,420.66</td>
<td>$32,931.00</td>
<td>$32,441.33</td>
<td>$31,951.66</td>
<td>$31,462.00</td>
<td>$30,972.33</td>
<td>$30,482.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver West Area</td>
<td>$36,950.00</td>
<td>$35,960.33</td>
<td>$35,470.66</td>
<td>$34,981.00</td>
<td>$34,491.33</td>
<td>$33,991.66</td>
<td>$33,492.00</td>
<td>$32,992.33</td>
<td>$32,492.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Kiosk West Area</td>
<td>$38,950.00</td>
<td>$37,960.33</td>
<td>$37,470.66</td>
<td>$36,981.00</td>
<td>$36,491.33</td>
<td>$35,991.66</td>
<td>$35,492.00</td>
<td>$34,992.33</td>
<td>$34,492.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver West Area</td>
<td>$40,950.00</td>
<td>$39,960.33</td>
<td>$39,470.66</td>
<td>$38,981.00</td>
<td>$38,491.33</td>
<td>$37,991.66</td>
<td>$37,492.00</td>
<td>$36,992.33</td>
<td>$36,492.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Kiosk West Area</td>
<td>$42,950.00</td>
<td>$41,960.33</td>
<td>$41,470.66</td>
<td>$40,981.00</td>
<td>$40,491.33</td>
<td>$39,991.66</td>
<td>$39,492.00</td>
<td>$38,992.33</td>
<td>$38,492.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver West Area</td>
<td>$44,950.00</td>
<td>$43,960.33</td>
<td>$43,470.66</td>
<td>$42,981.00</td>
<td>$42,491.33</td>
<td>$41,991.66</td>
<td>$41,492.00</td>
<td>$40,992.33</td>
<td>$40,492.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Kiosk West Area</td>
<td>$46,950.00</td>
<td>$45,960.33</td>
<td>$45,470.66</td>
<td>$44,981.00</td>
<td>$44,491.33</td>
<td>$43,991.66</td>
<td>$43,492.00</td>
<td>$42,992.33</td>
<td>$42,492.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver West Area</td>
<td>$48,950.00</td>
<td>$47,960.33</td>
<td>$47,470.66</td>
<td>$46,981.00</td>
<td>$46,491.33</td>
<td>$45,991.66</td>
<td>$45,492.00</td>
<td>$44,992.33</td>
<td>$44,492.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Kiosk West Area</td>
<td>$50,950.00</td>
<td>$49,960.33</td>
<td>$49,470.66</td>
<td>$48,981.00</td>
<td>$48,491.33</td>
<td>$47,991.66</td>
<td>$47,492.00</td>
<td>$46,992.33</td>
<td>$46,492.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Statewide Map

- **Statewide Map**
  - Road Area and Truck Parking Study
  - Preliminary Recommendations
  - Next Steps
  - County
  - Preliminary
  - Next Steps

### Agenda

- **User Cost**
  - Completed Work
  - Preliminary Recommendations
  - Next Steps
Safety on I-70 East

- Crash Statistics
  - 955 total crashes (36% severe)
  - 32% single vehicle
  - 15% driver fatigue/asleep at wheel
  - Time of day
    - 18% total crashes 6:00am - 9:00am
    - 23% fatigue/asleep at wheel crashes 3:00am – 6:00am

- Preliminary Findings
  - No clusters of crash patterns suggestive of need for rest areas

Traffic Data on I-70 East

- AADT Ranges between 8,900 and 11,000
- Estimated number of rest area users
  - 12% Cars (approximately 120 cars/hour)
  - 15% Trucks (approximately 25 trucks/hour)
- Anecdotal usage based on number of “flushes” for Arriba and Deer Trail Rest Areas is approximately 60 people per hour
### Stakeholder Input on I-70 East

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Closest Services</td>
<td>Need more truck parking spaces; spend more on existing rest areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incident rate on adjacent highway</td>
<td>Exits and entrance ramps are adequate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crane Data On site</td>
<td>Install cameras.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort</td>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>Needed for truck driver safety and comfort. However, most drivers will use private truck stops for their long rest periods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>Direction of traffic served</td>
<td>Trucks will park anywhere if rest areas are closed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Those responsible for the actual maintenance and cost of maintaining the rest areas would support closure.
- Those who use the rest areas (truck drivers) and those who support them (CSP, CDOT Staff) would support maintaining the existing, even expanding.

### Statewide System Assessment

- Consider system level alternatives
  - Alternative A: Open new Rest Areas
  - Alternative B: Close all existing Rest Areas

Public/Private Relationships at the corridor level

Detailed Location Specific Analysis

User Level (Cost/Amenities)
### Alternative A: Add Additional Rest Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Measurement/Standard</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criteria for System Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Closest Services</td>
<td>60 mile maximum or 1 hour travel time</td>
<td>≥ 70% East – no new rest areas needed; ≥ 70% West – no new rest areas needed; ≥ 25% south – no new rest areas needed; ≥ 25% north – no new rest areas needed; ≥ 75% – no new rest areas needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incident rate on adjacent highway</td>
<td>The same or less than state average for this highway type</td>
<td>Total crash rate approximately half the state average for interstate, indicating a better than expected safety performance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Data</td>
<td>Crime Rate</td>
<td>Crimes Reported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort</td>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>Consider volume and type of services provided</td>
<td>Rest areas do not reach full capacity for passenger cars. Truck parking spaces are regularly and consistently used. A pressing issue is adequate emergency parking for cars and trucks during closures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>Direction of traffic served</td>
<td>Both/one</td>
<td>CDOT maintenance staff are not supportive of new rest areas. They would prefer that their current maintenance budgets could directly support other maintenance needs such as pothole repairs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

☑ Data does not indicate locations where crash numbers and types indicate tired drivers.

---

### Alternative B: Close All Rest Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Measurement/Standard</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criteria for System Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Closest Services</td>
<td>60 mile maximum or 1 hour travel time</td>
<td>≥ 70% East – no rest areas needed; ≥ 70% West – above town to Showdown Spruce-needle to highway 40% hour travel time ≥ 25% south – no rest areas needed; ≥ 25% north – no rest areas needed; ≥ 75% – no rest areas needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incident rate on adjacent highway</td>
<td>The same or less than state average for this highway type</td>
<td>Total crash rate approximately half the state average for interstates, indicating a better than expected safety performance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Data</td>
<td>Crime Rate</td>
<td>Crimes Reported</td>
<td>CSP reports crime at rest areas is not a significant problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort</td>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>Consider volume and type of services provided</td>
<td>Rest areas do not reach full capacity for passenger cars. Truck parking spaces are regularly and consistently used. A pressing issue is adequate emergency parking for cars and trucks during closures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>Direction of traffic served</td>
<td>Both/one</td>
<td>≥ 70% – both east and west lanes are served adequately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts to local entities/facilities</td>
<td>Consider local parking, CSP concerns, local law enforcement concerns, emergency parking</td>
<td>Record concerns, consider mitigations, balance with cost</td>
<td>Record concerns, consider mitigations, balance with cost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

☑ Closing all interstate rest areas in the state would leave stretches of interstate in violation of the distance to services criteria.

☑ Some rest areas serve multiple purposes and, although they could be closed as rest areas, the access and parking is needed for other uses.

☑ No Rest Areas are clustered too closely together (except at trailhead and recreation areas)

☑ Rest areas that have agreements for cleaning and/or staffing the rest areas are the best ambassadors of Colorado to travelers.
**Preliminary Interstate Recommendations**

- No new rest areas are recommended on the interstate system.
- Maintain a ‘best in class’ rest area at the entrances to the state: i.e. I-70 Westbound at Burlington (Welcome Center); I-70 Eastbound at Fruita (Fruita Welcome Center); I-25 Northbound at Trinidad (El Morro); I-25 Southbound at Fort Collins (Poudre Rest Area); and I-76 at Sterling.
- Work toward closure of all other rest areas except those with alternative uses, such as trailheads.
- Replace truck parking spaces lost with rest area closures through partnerships with private rest areas.
- Review all other rest areas individually to identify alternative uses, determine closure, timing of the closure should be based on public/private overlaps; inadequate and unnecessary amenities; existing and needed maintenance burden; cost per user.
- Develop an Emergency truck Parking standard of practice that includes a focus on technology solutions.

**Statewide System Assessment**

- Consider system level alternatives
  - Open new Rest Areas
  - Close all existing Rest Areas
- Public/Private Relationships at the corridor level
- Detailed Location Specific Analysis
- User Level (Cost/Amenities)
Other Meetings for 2016 Study
Objectives

The objective of this meeting was to gather input from members of the Colorado Motor Carriers Association (CMCA). CMCA has the most current and relevant information on the truck use of the Rest Areas and Truck Parking areas in the state, as well as changes in the industry since the last Truck Parking Study in 2007.

Summary

Goals for the Rest Areas and for the Assessment

The Colorado Transportation Commission has requested a framework for assessing truck parking and rest areas for improvements or closure. To address this, CDOT is embarking on a Statewide Truck Parking and Rest Area Study to determine the sufficiency of the number of truck parking and rest areas throughout the state, the optimum locations for both existing and potential new locations, and the adequacy of amenities at existing areas.

The results of this study will assist CDOT in:
- Determining if existing truck parking and/or rest areas should be closed, upgraded or remain
- Recommending upgrades to existing truck parking and/or rest areas,
- Determining if there is a need to construct new truck parking and/or rest areas, and
- Assessing the optimum locations of both existing and potentially new truck parking and/or rest areas.

As part of this effort, CDOT is conducting various interviews with stakeholders including CMCA (this meeting), CSP, CDOT Maintenance, and Private Truck Stop Owners. The purpose of these interviews is to help understand how the rest areas are being used, and any perceived short comings of these existing facilities.

Review of Existing Information

Currently 28 rest areas and approximately 50 truck parking areas exist within the State of Colorado. These rest areas are provided for traveler safety and comfort and are predominantly maintained by CDOT maintenance forces. Truck parking areas are identified parking areas for normal and emergency conditions in the event of a closure of the interstate highway.
Other Questions
The following questions were posed to the group:

**Do you think there is a truck parking shortage in the state?** Previous studies have shown I-25 North and I-70 West as the worst locations. The truck parking spaces in both of these stretches have almost doubled since 2007. Yes. While the amount of available parking has increased by 44%, the truck volume has also increased. I-70 is still the biggest need, but due to the topography, parking is limited. Expansion at Dotsero is a possibility.

**Are there specific locations where truck parking is inadequate?**
I-70 West of Vail Pass is difficult to find short term parking. Officer’s Gulch was intended to be used for overflow, however that is no longer adequate.
If the Eisenhower Johnson tunnel gets closed, trucks are required to wait until after rush hour before using the tunnel. There is not a lot of parking for this situation.
Most private truck stops are full by 6-8 pm every night.

**Do drivers complain about not having emergency parking available?**
Emergency Parking is intended for road closures only. Truckers may call it an emergency if they have an hour of availability issue. Typically, local law enforcement will patrol emergency parking. CSP won’t typically get involved unless the truck is blocking the thru-lane or if the location is specifically posted as a no parking area.
It was suggested that some of these emergency parking location could be classified and signed as truck parking areas if certain conditions are met (wide shoulder, adequate road base, etc). Trucks are no longer idling and creating the noise issue that they once did. And trucks have cleaner emissions than they once had.
Could the term “emergency” be redefined? Would that create a liability issue? As long as trucks aren’t blocking lanes, maybe it can be an allowable use.

**Literature shows truck drivers prefer Truck stops for overnight and rest areas for daytime use. Is this still a fair assumption?**
Yes, in general that is true.

**What amenities are most important for overnight parking? What about for short stops?**
Drivers want to feel safe: locations where the rest area can be easily seen or share land with the CSP feel safer.
Showers, food, and fuel are desired for longer stops.
For the shorter stops at rest areas most drivers know what to expect at a rest area, so they aren’t looking for food, fuel, etc. Drivers run their business from their truck, so to have a place to spread out and do that would be nice.

**Do your drivers have complaints about the rest areas?**
Generally no.
Edwards is signed as “no Overnight Parking”. The general agreement is that is intended for the general public and is not intended to apply to trucks. Maybe this signage could be updated.
Does Just in Time delivery require more staging and is this resulting in problems or complaints?

Not really. This is usually planned for before starting the trip. It was noted that sometimes the destinations will not allow for long term parking, so the trucks are forced to park at nearby facilities while waiting to offload.

In some areas (Vail, Aspen, Boulder) the amount of storage available is a bigger issue,

What impacts do the new drive time regulations have on the drivers as far as rest area spacing and availability? Current regulations dictate a “34 hour restart”, meaning that 34 hours of consecutive break time is required. Congress has put a hold on a secondary regulation that would require a break between midnight and 5am. This requirement, when in place, caused an increase in accidents because of the concentration of trips made in the morning and early afternoon.

Because of these regulations, there is a constant need for available parking/resting areas. Truck parking locations fill up with truckers fulfilling the 34-hour requirement. Rest Areas are more apt to be used during the required 30 minutes break requirements.

What would be the impact if all the rest areas were closed? Currently, rest area parking accounts for 7.4% of available parking (257 spaces)

Trucks will park everywhere.

Nine out of ten times, truckers are only using the rest area to use the bathroom. They may use the roadside if the rest areas are closed; and

Private truck stops may start charging for use (like they do in California)

What else should we know?

Johnsons Corner Truck Stop has recently been sold. Acorn has plans to sell their three locations, and Tomahawk has sold some of their locations in the last year. The Grand Junction Acorn will be expanded. Walsenburg and Brush (Acorn Locations) have no plans to expand. Luvs is adding a stop on South I-25. Pilot Truck Stop will also be lost.

Currently, parking is not allowed in chain up stations. Perhaps these areas could be used for longer term parking in the summer/when chain laws are not in effect.

Many truckers will not drive during the day time hours in the mountains on the weekends.

Look into Public/Private Partnerships such as the TA on the west side. Maybe CDOT could pave more parking and TA could maintain it or some sort of agreement.

Action Items

The following tables describes completed and current action items based upon discussions held in the meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Items</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question: Can a list of CSP contacts be provided</td>
<td>Mary Jo to follow up with Ray Fisher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I-70 Rest Area Assessment

CMCA Agenda

August 6, 2015

1. Introductions

2. Goals for the Rest Areas and for the Assessment

3. Review of Existing Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rest Area Parking (Percent of Total)</th>
<th>Private Parking</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>% Change of total</th>
<th>Emergency Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I-25 N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>23 (6.8%)</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>+43%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>25 (5.2%)</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>485</td>
<td></td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I-25 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>94 (18.8%)</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>-14%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>68 (15.8%)</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>430</td>
<td></td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I-70 W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>43 (14.6%)</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>+97%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>56 (9.7%)</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>579</td>
<td></td>
<td>975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I-70 E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>53 (6.4%)</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>+69%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>39 (2.8%)</td>
<td>1372</td>
<td>1411</td>
<td></td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I-76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>81 (18.7%)</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>+29%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>69 (12.3%)</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>559</td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>294 (12.3%)</td>
<td>2106</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>+44%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>257 (7.4%)</td>
<td>3207</td>
<td>3464</td>
<td></td>
<td>1778</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Other Questions

a. Do you think there is a truck parking shortage in the state? Previous studies have shown I-25 North and I-70 West as the worst locations. These have both almost doubled since 2007.

b. Are there specific locations where truck parking is inadequate?

c. Do drivers complain about not having emergency parking available?

d. Literature shows truck drivers prefer Truck stops for overnight and rest areas for daytime use. Is this still a fair assumption?

e. What amenities are most important for overnight parking? What about for short stops?

f. Do your drivers have complaints about the rest areas?

g. Does Just in Time delivery require more staging and is this resulting in problems or complaints?

h. What impacts do the new drive time regulations have on the drivers as far as rest area spacing and availability?

i. What would be the impact if all the rest areas were closed? Currently, rest area parking accounts for 7.4% of available parking (257 spaces)

j. What else should we know?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tracy Sakaguchi</td>
<td>CMCA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tracy@cmca.com">tracy@cmca.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Caylor</td>
<td>Wodeh Sys.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Scott@wodehsys.com">Scott@wodehsys.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Fisher</td>
<td>CO. STATE PATROL</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Raymond.Fisher@State.CO.Us">Raymond.Fisher@State.CO.Us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Wallis</td>
<td>CDOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jason.wallis@state.co.us">jason.wallis@state.co.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theresa Santamalo-Dreiling</td>
<td>CDOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Theresa.Santamalo-Dreiling@State.Co.Us">Theresa.Santamalo-Dreiling@State.Co.Us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Harrison</td>
<td>Werner Enterprises</td>
<td><a href="mailto:THARRISON@WERNER.COM">THARRISON@WERNER.COM</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Fredell</td>
<td>CH2M</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kfredell@ch2m.com">kfredell@ch2m.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Jo Vobeyda</td>
<td>CH2M</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mvobeyda@ch2m.com">mvobeyda@ch2m.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Fulton</td>
<td>CMCA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:greg@cmca.com">greg@cmca.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objectives

The objective of this meeting was to gather input from CDOT Region Maintenance Staff at the individual rest areas. I-70 East in is CDOT Region 4. This specific meeting was held at the Arriba Rest Area.

Meeting Highlights

- Arriba is staffed M-F from 6-3 by a CDOT maintenance worker.
- Overnight parking is allowed at the rest area.
- The rest area has a large footprint, so more truck parking could be installed. Feels as if the existing amenities are adequate for the utilization that it gets, and could possibly sustain additional usage.
- The utilization is estimated at about one person per minute that uses the facilities.
- Daily maintenance activities include watering the lawn, fixing things that are broken, pulling weeds, emptying the trash as needed, and shoveling as necessary. The cleaning in contracted out to a private company who comes twice a day. If an issue with cleanliness comes up, it either falls on the CDOT maintenance staff to address, or goes unresolved for the duration of the day.
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Objectives
The objective of this meeting was to gather input from CDOT Region Maintenance Staff at the individual rest areas. I-70 East in is CDOT Region 4. This specific meeting was held at the Deer Trail Rest Area.

Meeting Highlights

• Deer Trail Rest Area is possibly the oldest rest area in the system, and has never had a major upgrade. The pipes are old, the mechanical system is constantly breaking down, and the septic system requires a major overhaul.

• Overnight parking is allowed at the rest area.

• The length of the deceleration lane is a little short, and could be lengthened.

• The rest area has a large footprint, so more truck parking could be installed, however more facilities would be required. Feels as if the existing amenities are undersized for the utilization that it gets.

• Because there is no access from the eastbound direction, people have been observed pulling over in the westbound lanes, and crossing the interstate on foot to reach the rest area.

• Maintenance crews have begun installing trash barrels at each exit along the corridor to help combat littering along the shoulders.

• A moderate amount of re-shouldering work is required where truck frequently park along ramps.

• During a typical week, at any given time there are 5-6 cars and a dozen trucks using the Deer Trail Rest Area

• The utilization drops when the school year begins,, however winter is the busiest season, especially for trucks. Overnight and during storms, the lot usually fills up. Greyhound buses typically will make a stop at this rest area location.

• Daily maintenance activities include checking the water/wastewater, emptying the trash, and shoveling as necessary. The cleaning in contracted out to a private company who comes twice a day, however the rest area sits un-staffed during the day. So if an issue with cleanliness comes up, it either falls on the CDOT maintenance staff to address, or goes unresolved for the duration of the day.
Rest Area and Truck Parking Study
CMCA Meeting

Objectives
The objective of this meeting was to gather input from CDOT Region Maintenance Supervisor Staff in each region. I-70 East is CDOT Region 4. This specific meeting was held at the Limon offices.

Meeting Highlights

- Closing rest areas would free up maintenance crews and funding to focus on road problems, allowing them to be better stewards of public dollars.

- The Burlington Rest Area is privately operated, and CDOT pays a fixed amount for them to maintain. This joint use rest area and welcome center is a model of how rest areas should look and operate. CDOT owns the land, and does the major upkeep. They also will run their road plows through the lot.

- Private truck stops can serve the same purpose that the Deer Trail and Arriba rest areas serve, at a fraction of the cost to the state.

- Truck do use the ramps shoulders for parking mostly between E-470 and Deer Trail. There is less of a parking shortage east of Limon.

- Trailer dump stations are really hard to maintain, as users will come specifically to use the dump station from surrounding areas. The trailer dump at Arriba has recently been removed.

- The Burlington Rest Area does not fill up overnight, as the other rest areas commonly do. Alternative activities co-located at the rest are provide other daytime use that promotes parking during the daytime.

- A new Loves truck stop is being built in Burlington.

- Opportunities for revenue generation should be investigated. One of these could be the unti plugs for trucks to run their power and A/C instead of running their engines. It was noted that the state cannot compete with free enterprise.

- It is estimated that Deer Trail goes through approximately 18,000 gal of waste per week.

- Is there space to locate a rest are in the median, so that access can be provided from both directions?
• Neither the town of Bennett nor the town of Limon would care if the Deer Trail Rest Area was
closed. The Bennett rest area was closed recently in part because of the dollar amount required
to upgrade the sanitary system. Similar to the problem Deer Trail currently faces. However, the
Bennet Rest Area provided better access to both directions of travel.

• CDOT Property Management as no Reset Area Replacement Plan

• There is a log kept of user complaints that can document the types of complaints, and the
number of closures that the rest areas experience over a given time period.

Along I-76:

• Julesburg rest area is contracted similar to Burlington, with the cleaning left to an outside
company.

• There is a lot of redundancy between private truck parking services and the rest areas.

• The county/city run the rest area in Sterling. There have been preliminary discussions about
turning that rest area over to the local municipalities, but no action has been taken.

• The Agate Rest Area has trouble locating water to serve the property.

• The Prospect Rest Area has bad crime/homeless people problems. CDOT is currently installing
video cameras to help combat the crimes. Further east (Sterling and Julesburg) there are no
major problems with crime. This seems to be the trend the further away you get from the
metro area.
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Objectives
The objective of this meeting was to gather input from members of the Colorado State Patrol (CSP). CSP regularly patrols the rest areas along interstate 70 east of Denver. The coverage area of the 8 officers in Limon Troop 3D spans from Aurora to the Kansas border, in Elbert, Lincoln, and Kit Carson Counties.

Meeting Highlights
- Would like to see additional rest areas and/or expanded rest areas for when roads are closed due to weather events. Parking areas without facilities are not preferred due to littering and improper waste disposal.
- Private parking areas along the corridor typically fill up on Sunday afternoon/evenings. Arriba and Deer Trail regularly fill up at night. Deer Trail Rest Area will fill to capacity during storms.
- Even though ramp shoulders are designated as emergency parking, the CSP would prefer that they not stay there due to the blowing snow and drifting experienced in the eastern plains. In addition, snow plows have trouble navigating around these stopped vehicles. However, being off the roads and not driving if tired or in inclement weather, is preferred over the alternative.
- Busiest travel days of the year are the Sat/Sun after Thanksgiving. Other increases are seen in March for Spring Break, and during hunting seasons.
- CDOT has been more proactive in closing roads which has helped the CSP concentrate the truck parking at larger towns where hotels may be available before they get stranded on the highway because of an accident closure.
- 287 is part of the Ports to Plains route from Texas through Colorado and is seeing an increase in truck traffic. Highways 42/87 have long stretches with no rest areas, due to the closure of Big Sandy and Lady Bird Rest Areas.
- There is typical crime activity such as vandalism at the three rest areas on the corridor. Lincoln County Patrols the Arriba Rest Area regularly. There is some level of human trafficking that occurs at the private truck areas.
- There are no clusters of accidents that could be attributed to sleepiness in any particular area of the corridor.
- Deer Trail and Burlington Rest Areas are only accessible from the westbound direction.
OBJECTIVES

CDOT is embarking on a Statewide Truck Parking and Rest Area Study to determine the sufficiency of the number of truck parking and rest areas throughout the state, the optimum locations for both existing and potential new locations, and the adequacy of amenities at existing areas.

The development of the guidance will include research into best practices used by other states, conversations with Colorado State Patrol officers patrolling the rest area, and detailed interviews with the CDOT staff working to maintain the rest areas.

The study will review each rest area in categories such as:

- Type and quality of the amenities; Distance to next like facility; Proximity to alternatives; Number of parking stalls (vehicles and trucks); Safety of the area based on existing available safety data; Sight lines from the highways and lighting; Quality of access; Availability of utilities services; Usage and costs

SUMMARY

Minor capital fixes come from the control maintenance budget and are not reflected in the MLOS.

The region could use another person to help with maintenance on the existing rest areas. There is pride in ownership that is evident in the rest areas that have full time staff.

VAIL PASS REST AREA:

Has two areas. An upper area for recreational parking, and a lower area that is the rest area. More truck parking is needed. There are always trucks parked there. The configuration with the uphill to exit is tricky if there is heavy snow. Trucks often get caught here and block all access.

The rest area is aging but several upgrades including water filtration upgrades have occurs in the past 2 years. However during this project, the water spigot was removed, so truckers requiring water for an overheating engine can no longer directly access water through this spigot.

It is estimated that there are 1,000 users per day in the winter, and over 3,000 users per day in the summer time. 2 Full Time CDOT employees are responsible for cleaning, maintenance, and snow removal.
Need more snow storage areas.

There is a big hall used for community events at the rest area.

There is no family restroom. This makes it difficult to phase the cleaning of the women’s bathroom during the day. The alternate closest locations are either Copper Mountain (5 miles east) or truck parking one mile to the west.

**Canyon Rest Areas:**

All rest areas in the Canyon are on wells so there are well fees and discharge permits required. The testing for compliance with CDPHE is contracted out, however all cleaning and maintenance is done in house.

Many private businesses use the rest areas for parking (buses will pick people up from the rest area locations and bus them to recreation areas)

**Western Rest Areas:**

Rifle and Fruita both operate the same as a welcome center.

All three are on sewer; Trailer Dumps are located at Fruita, Rifle, and Edwards. Whenever the dump stations are closed, there is a big spike in customer complaints.

**Action Items**

SAP (Ann Feerer/CDOT HQ) would be able to provide Year of Construction Data for rest area buildings.

CH2M to check if the rest areas in Glenwood Canyon are actually mitigation in the Glenwood Canyon EIS.
Objectives

CDOT is embarking on a Statewide Truck Parking and Rest Area Study to determine the sufficiency of the number of truck parking and rest areas throughout the state, the optimum locations for both existing and potential new locations, and the adequacy of amenities at existing areas.

The development of the guidance will include research into best practices used by other states, conversations with Colorado State Patrol officers patrolling the rest area, and detailed interviews with the CDOT staff working to maintain the rest areas.

The study will review each rest area in categories such as:

- Safety of the rest area
- Safety of the access from the highways and lighting
- Utilization
- Costs to maintain

Summary

Key Elements discussed:

In general, rest areas are a good thing, however the rest areas in Colorado are “weak” in comparison with surrounding states.

Rest areas in the canyon are good because they serve a dual purpose with the trailheads.

If the road is closed for more than 8-12 hours, the CSP will contact the Red Cross to help with food for the stranded truck drivers.

Rest Areas are not specifically patrolled by the CSP, unless there has been a call. Typical calls involve vagrants, and campers.

Rest Areas are used as a staging areas for large 20 car pile-up accidents. Tow truck drivers will tow the cars to a nearby rest area to remove them from traffic, and the follow up paperwork can be completed there.

In the event of a closure at Vail Pass, the parking area at Dotsero will be the first to fill up. Followed then by the frontage roads to glenwood canyon, the along highway 6 from Gypsum to Dotsero. Wolcott is the furthest east that trucks can really park in this scenario.
There are no safety problems at the entrances/exits to the rest areas in the region.

The Glenwood Rest Area at Mile Marker 115 has closed within the last year. It would be nice if this could still be used for emergency truck parking. In addition, the Tomahawk Truck Stop at Mile Marker 114 has also closed recently.

Bottom Line – If the rest Areas were cleaned up and users felt safer/more comfortable, more people would use them, and the users would get more benefit (i.e. rest) while using them. CSP could provide Public relations information/brochures at the rest area locations.

**Action Items**

The number of times per year that the road is closed can be judged by the number of times the Dotsero parking area is opened. This information can be obtained from the TOC at the EJMT.
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Objectives
The objective of this meeting was to gather input from members of the Colorado State Patrol (CSP). CSP regularly patrols the rest areas along interstate 70 west of Denver. The coverage area spans from Sheridan to the Eisenhower Johnson Memorial Tunnels within Clear Creek County.

Meeting Highlights

• There are no formal rest areas in the district patrolled by Troop 1A. The Genesee and Georgetown Overlook areas are both in the district.
• In the mountain corridor there is little land available for a new rest area to be added.
• The towns in the corridor are close together, making a rest area not as beneficial in this stretch of interstate.
• Floyd Hill Eastbound thru the Twin Tunnels is a problem area for congestion and accidents.
• At the overlook locations, there is maybe only one or two cars using the overlooks at any given time. There are no recurring safety problems at the overlooks. The only time they are called to assist is for break downs.
• Additional amenities that could be included at rest areas in general: overnight parking so the user can get actual rest, sewer dumps, a lot of light to maintain visibility.
• The mountain corridor has a lot of chain stations. At these chain stations, there is a 30 minute limit on parking. The biggest problem is with capacity. When the chain law goes into effect, there are too many truck and not enough spaces. Trucks then double park and back up into the through roadway. CSP does man the chain stations when the chain law is in effect. These chain stations could potentially be used for rest areas when the chain law is not in effect.
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Objectives

The objective of this meeting was to gather input from members of the Colorado State Patrol (CSP). CSP regularly patrols the rest areas along interstate 76 and interstate 25 north of Denver. The coverage area spans from Denver to the Wyoming border, in Weld, Adams, and Boulder Counties.

Meeting Highlights

- Captain Rob Marone/CSP, patrols Larimer County (Poudre Rest Area) was unavailable for today’s call.
- Sterling and Julesburg Rest Areas are in another district.
- The Wiggins Rest Area is the only rest area in the district covered by this call. The rest area is often used as a staging area for the CSP and for general interactions with the public and each other. There are no major accidents or other personal safety problems associated with the rest area.
- Rest Areas are generally used as a place to safely stop vehicles. Truckers can run to a “safe location” even after their hours have been completed, so the longer this gap, the longer a tired driver may be on the road.
- Cpt. Eyer spoke in general terms about Rest Areas, noting that a true benefit to the rest areas would be if they could provide up to the minute weather and road condition information to travelers.
- There is a new truck stop planned for Hwy 56 in Berthoud in the near future.
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Objectives
The objective of this meeting was to gather input from members of the Colorado State Patrol (CSP). CSP regularly patrols the rest areas along interstate 25 south of Denver. The coverage area of the officers in Troop 2D spans from Pueblo to the New Mexico border, in Pueblo, Huerfano, and Las Animas Counties.

Meeting Highlights

• MEETING NOT HELD
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Objectives
The objective of this meeting was to gather input from members of the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) maintenance staff. CDOT Region 4 covers the northeast part of the state, and includes I-25 north, I-76, and I-70 East.

Meeting Highlights
- There is no perceived problem with availability of parking and rest areas currently in the region.
- Sterling, Wiggins and Poudre Rest Areas are all in good condition. The Julesburg rest area is starting to show it’s age, and is in need of $75-80K of improvements to the HVAC system. The boiler at the Poudre Rest area (built in 2007/2008) is a constant problem, however CDOT has now contracted the maintenance and repair to a local HVAC repair companies. The boiler in Sterling was replaced in 2004/2005.
- Poudre Rest Area has 11 trach compactors that are solar powered with battery backup.
- Trucks parking is almost always full in sterling. There is available truck parking roughly a block away from the Sterling rest area when it has reached capacity. Use goes up on the weekends and on holidays.
- Typically repairs needed are covered within the maintenance budgets. Major repairs requiring funding outside of the maintenance budgets will require approval from the commission. One suggestion is to separate the maintenance pool of money into roadway maintenance and rest area maintenance, so that decisions for repairs to the rest areas don’t need to be made at the expense of the road repairs, and vice versa.
- The Virginia Dale Rest area on 287 is really old and still on septic. This rest area draws a lot of maintenance attention.
- CDOT has had conversations with the City of Sterling to close the rest area due to the proximity of adjacent resources, however a deal was never finalized.
- Wiggins is right next to the Stubbs rest Area.
- Poudre Rest area moved from its old location off I-25 (collocated with CSP) because it required two locations to serve both NB and SB traffic. Moving to the new location allowed it to be accessed from both directions. The old NB rest area is a CDOT liquid containment yard now.

- The Poudre Rest area cleaning is contracted to an outside company, however users have a lot of complaints about the condition. The rest area gets cleaned 2 times a day, and CDOT does the grounds and maintenance.

- Recently, CDOT has installed $25,000 in security cameras for the transients who will lock themselves in the coed bathroom for the night. The City of Fort Collins Police and the CSP will respond to calls, but neither regularly patrol.

- Adjacent to the Poudre Rest area is a building owned by CSU. There is currently no partnership agreement, and the only coordination is if they call CDOT to report an issue that they happen to observe, or if someone reported it to them.

- Would prefer if there were no public dumps areas in the rest areas. There is a dump area at the Sterling rest area.

- If one FTE could be onsite at each rest area, that would work better.

- I-76 rest areas are spaced appropriately.
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This is the first Project Team Meeting scheduled for the CDOT Rest Area and Truck Parking Study enhancements. The purpose of this meeting is to brainstorm potential additional goals and objectives for the project.

Project Goals and Objectives

Mary Jo presented the current goals and objectives of the rest area study. Currently, the rest area study goal is to promote the Safety and Comfort of Colorado Travelers. To achieve this goal, the project team looked at safety, comfort, and amenities. It was suggested that this change slightly to: “promote the safety and comfort of drivers in Colorado by providing amenities”

The study is examining the following existing elements of the statewide rest area system including types of amenities provided, number of spaces available, and number of users predicted. From this information, the project team has categorized the rest areas into four distinct types of rest area.

- Welcome Centers – At the entrances of the state. Locations to promote tourism. These should be setup in partnerships to promote local opportunities.
- Interstate Rest Areas – All others, including Rifle and Sterling.
- Other Rest Areas – State Highway Rest Areas

Other Considerations

Other factors that could influence the future uses of an existing rest area:

- Emergency/Temporary Truck Parking
- Private public partnerships
- Innovative financing to provide amenities
- Alternative Fuels and Sustainability (including life cycle costs for redevelopment in the future)
- Tourism (could include new money sources like Colorado Energy Office)
Funding

From a funding standpoint, the goal for the rest area system is to work within an environment where CDOT can maintain what is required (from an FHWA/national perspective), and also free up funds that are currently being spent on rest area maintenance and redirecting that money towards other maintenance needs.

State Parks has a business model where a handful of the parks in the system become the “money-makers” which subsidize all of the other less populated parks. This kind of set-up may be worth considering for the rest areas.

There is also a political component to the rest area system. For example, Deer Trail Rest Area was recently voted by members of the Eastern TBR, 11-0 to keep it open, largely due to the concern over the availability of overnight truck parking. But the viability of a rest area also needs to be cost effective as well and overnight truck parking is not currently a large use. Emergency truck parking is another need, but the use would be better supported with other amenities, more in line with the occasional use. The group agreed to move forward with system wide transition planning for all rest areas with future recommendations for proposed uses.

Categories of RFP

This transition planning may include the development of one or more RFP’s for private industry to respond to. This leads to a continuum of the range of RFPs, ranging from:

- Full Ownership Transfer and/or Long Term Lease (10 year)
- Partnerships in ownership/maintenance/service
- Passive Enhancements

The individual RFP should give a base level of guidance and a listing of ‘must-haves’. These ‘must-haves’ could include things like tourism components (e.g. maps, sunscreen, and staff) or amenities like weather stations or electric charging stations. The RFP would also include specific policy level elements for things like advertising and vendors.

Internal Process

Before any recommendations are made, the Executive Management Team and the Transportation Commission need to provide input on the process. The project team will prepare an executive summary memo summarizing the key amenities and including a map highlighting the category of each existing rest area (welcome center, recreational destination, etc.). Then a recommendation that an RFP is prepared to ask industry to develop a business model that would allow the rest areas to remain viable.

Next Meeting

The next meeting we will go into more details on each of the individual rest areas.

The following tables describes completed and current action items based upon discussions held in the meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Items</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>High Speed Interconnectivity Alignment – Do any the existing rest areas coincide with existing rest areas</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task Description</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Provide and Executive Summary to get a decision on the idea of moving forward attempting to form partnerships and issuing RFPs.</td>
<td>Mary Jo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Provide the group with summary of tiers and recommended amenities to the team prior to the next meeting.</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Update the mapping to show rest areas as “transitional”</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statewide Rest Area and Truck Parking Enhancement

Team Meeting #1
Agenda

• Review the Rest Area Goal and measurements for objectives
• Discuss additional objectives and measurements of success
• Categories of Rest Areas
  – Welcome Centers
  – Recreational Destinations
  – Interstate Rest Areas
  – Other Rest Areas
• Categories of RFP
  – Full Ownership transfer
  – Partnerships in ownership/maintenance/service
  – Passive enhancements
• Next Meeting
Statewide Map (Interstates)
Welcome Centers/Rest Areas
I-25 El Morro Welcome Center - MM 17.72
I-25 Poudre Welcome Center - MM 268
I-70 (SH340) Fruita Welcome Center - MM 0.3
I-70 Burlington Welcome Center - MM 437.6
I-76 Julesburg Welcome Center - MM 180

Interstate Rest Areas
I-70 Rifle Rest Area - MM 90
I-76 Sterling Rest Area - MM 125
I-70 Edwards Rest Area - MM 163
I-70 Deer Trail Rest Area - MM 332.01
I-70 Arriba Exit Rest Area - MM 383
I-76 Wiggins Rest Area - MM 66
I-25 Cuerno Verde Rest Area - MM 74.39
I-25 Pueblo SB Rest Area - MM 111.69
I-25 Pueblo NB Rest Area - MM 114.99

Recreational Destinations
I-70 No Name Trailhead - MM 119
I-70 Grizzly Creek Trailhead - MM 121.02
I-70 Hanging Lake Trailhead - MM 125.13
I-70 Bair Ranch Trailhead - MM 128.5
I-70 Vail Pass Rest Area – MM 190

Other Rest Areas
US40 Hayden Rest Area - MM 101
US50 Holly Rest Area - MM 467.39
SH 139 Rangely (BLM) Rest Area - MM 56
US160 Cortez Rest Area - MM 46.42
US160 Shaw Creek Rest Area - MM 191.39
SH 287 Gobblers Knob Rest Area - MM 55.2
SH 287 Virginia Dale Rest Area - MM 383.5
CDOT Statewide Rest Area Study
Region 1

Objectives
Meeting with CDOT Region 1 staff to discuss Statewide Rest Area Study.

Summary
Introductions around the room.

Goals for the Rest Areas and for the Assessment:
Theresa gave background on purpose of project – to look at statewide (interstates first), need, replication, closures, and upgrades for rest areas. Goal is to promote safety and comfort of travelers. Looked at crash history, criminal activity, rest area comfort, federal guidelines (FHWA) that say there must be an amenity within 60 miles (one hour) of travel time. An amenity means any public or private facility where a traveler would be able to pull over and go to the restroom or use other services. Reviewed statewide facilities map, compiled from Colorado motor carriers associations and CDOT/USFS data.

Results of study are that no new or relocated facilities are needed. General system recommendations include: welcome center provided at state boundaries, rest areas should be multi-use (e.g. local chamber co-locations, state patrol), strive to maintain rest areas through partnerships. Revenue cannot be generated within interstate ROW which limits multi-use options. Excluding the Vail Rest Area and the ones in Glenwood Canyon all of the rest areas along the interstate could be closed and federal regulations would still be met.

Revisited original reason for rest areas. Originally called safety rest areas and were designed to give travelers a rest from driving and access to facilities when there weren’t any for significant stretches of time. Development, particularly along interstates, has rendered many of them unnecessary as have changing travel patterns.

General discussion:
Discussed the phasing of the statewide recommended transitions. The goal is to create a solid plan that makes sense that everyone agrees with. All stakeholders will continue to be involved in the process before any final action is taken.
State statute currently limits the ability for CDOT to use the rest areas for revenue generating activities. Based on this, the study team did not further pursue ideas related to public/private partnerships, however the group suggested that it’s always possible to put a revision to the state statute legislations to allow for the privatization of other rest areas, as is done in other states. The team will include this as a possibility for next steps in the recommendation report.

**Georgetown Rest Area and Welcome Center:** Initial recommendation to keep this location an active rest stop and welcome center, and maintain the partnership with nearby municipality for operations.

Based on discussion: This facility was built by Region 1, and is currently supported with approximately $75,000 a year of funding by CDOT. The rest area was a result of local pressure to provide the facility after the 9/11 security changes closed the restrooms at the Eisenhower Johnson Memorial Tunnel.

Conclusion: No proposed changes or upgrades are required at this location. CDOT will continue to monitor the success and cost of the partnership as each contact ends its term limit, and the Georgetown Rest Area and Welcome Center will continue in the future.

**Herman Gulch Rest Area:** Currently a USFS maintained and operated rest area.

Based on discussion: CDOT currently uses this rest area to park equipment when not in use.

Conclusion: The region is currently in conversations with the forest service to formalize agreements to upgrade the facility.
CDOT Statewide Rest Area Study
Region 2

ATTENDEES: See attached sign-in sheet
PREPARED BY: Chelsea Adkisson/CH2M
DATE: 7/25/2016
PROJECT: CDOT Statewide Rest Area Study

Objectives
Meeting with CDOT Region 2 staff to discuss Statewide Rest Area Study and transition plan for CDOT R2 rest areas.

Summary
Introductions around the room.

Goals for the Rest Areas and for the Assessment:
Theresa gave background on purpose of project – to look at statewide (interstates first), need, replication, closures, and upgrades for rest areas. Goal is to promote safety and comfort of travelers. Looked at crash history, criminal activity, rest area comfort, federal guidelines (FHWA) that say there must be an amenity within 60 miles (one hour) of travel time. An amenity means any public or private facility where a traveler would be able to pull over and go to the restroom or use other services typically offered by the safety rest area. Reviewed statewide facilities map, compiled from Colorado motor carriers associations and CDOT/USFS data.

Results of study are that no new or relocated facilities are needed. General system recommendations include: welcome center provided at state boundaries; rest areas should be multi-use (e.g. local chamber co-locations, state patrol); strive to maintain rest areas through partnerships. Revenue cannot be generated within interstate ROW which limits multi-use options. Excluding the Vail rest area and the ones in Glenwood Canyon all of the rest areas along the interstates (I-70, I-25, and I-76) could be closed and federal regulations would still be met.

Revisited original reason for rest areas. Originally called safety rest areas and were designed to give travelers a rest from driving and access to facilities when there weren’t any for significant stretches of time. Development, particularly along interstates, has rendered many of them unnecessary as have changing travel patterns.

Clarified, access is full means you can get to the rest area from both directions. Anything in highway ROW cannot have commerce according to Colorado law.
General discussion:
Region 2 wanted to be sure any property sales would consider revenue people could be getting from outdoor billboard signs. Confirmed the land would have to be sold for fair market value based on highest and best use.

Could eventually try to make all these sites SSTs (sweet smelling toilets) similar to what they have at Gobblers Knob. SSTs could allow CDOT to shut off lots of utilities and limit expenses, particularly if these are transitioned to emergency only facilities. Things do deteriorate if they aren’t managed which can be a concern if facilities are only occasionally open for emergencies. Dropping maintenance/cleaning contracts and limiting utilities will cut costs significantly, going the extra step of SSTs might not save much more money.

The trucking industry would prefer more rest areas not less. Their fear is that if rest areas are closed other facilities will start to charge since there are no other options for truckers. CSP wants more because they believe truckers will pull over on the side of the road if facilities are unavailable and create unsafe/unsanitary conditions. There is a potential that there may be more human waste left at the side of the road. Pointed out that truckers already do that now so closing rest areas may not cause a significant increase.

Discussed the phasing of the transition process. The goal is to create a solid plan that makes sense that everyone agrees with. The path of least resistance may be to keep rest areas open.

CDOT pays $10,000 a year for the City of Eads to keep open and manage the rest area there. There is a new Loves private truck stop going in in this area so now might be a great time to have that conversation with Eads and close the rest area.

Pueblo (Southbound) Rest Area: Initial recommendation to close rest area and reuse the land for another purpose.

Based on discussion: This is a well-used rest area. The current composting system isn’t working and will require $200,000 to clean it out. This money will be required regardless of determined best course of action. Could consider truck parking/ emergency truck parking. Wouldn’t want to keep it open and used for regular truck parking. Would keep it locked and unlock only in emergencies when it is deemed necessary. Would want to come up with specific rules for use. Could consider not having restrooms if it is purely an emergency facility, however, it has been found that is a problem and people still will go to the bathroom even if there aren’t appropriate facilities which causes many issues. Right now it gets a lot of use, but facilities and restroom would last longer if used only in emergencies.

Conclusion: CDOT Region 2 wants to keep this property and recommend emergency truck parking as use. Need to clean out facility, purchase gates, fence, and signage, estimated at $250,000. CDOT would be able to finance this in 0-5 years. Certainly the $50,000 for the closure and could keep pumping it off if necessary until cleaning it is feasible.

Pueblo (Northbound) Rest Area: Initial recommendation to hold onto this property in the short term if it’s not a problem facility and then change use or close in the future.
Based on discussion: This facility is on septic and is fairly new, built in approximately 2005. Federal funds may have been used in construction and if so they may require reimbursement if it is closed. Currently this and the other facilities in this region are all under contract for maintenance/cleaning. If the use is changed and lessened CDOT may be able to handle the maintenance. Discussed 5-15 year time frame to turn into emergency truck parking. Thought a 0-5 year time frame might actually be better as CDOT is tight on budget and there doesn’t seem to be a lot of benefit to having it open. At this point it would just be emergency truck parking, but there are possible future rail opportunities at this location. Either way we should hold onto it.

Conclusion: CDOT Region 2 wants to turn this facility into emergency truck parking in 0-5 years. In order to close, this location only requires fencing and gates so would cost an estimated $50,000 (doesn’t have a frontage road behind it so requires minimal fencing). Could mount cameras to limit break ins and signs saying there are cameras. CDOT would be able to finance this in 0-5 years.

Holly Rest Area: Initial recommendation to consider selling this property because of its proximity to Holly and Lamar.

Based on discussion: This facility is only about 5 miles from Holly, 20 miles from Lamar, and 20 miles into Kansas until a facility a truck could get to. There are only parking spaces for 4 or 5 trucks at this location. ADT in this area is only 1900. Doesn’t have other CDOT uses for sand storage or anything else. All in agreement that it could be gotten rid of it. Could sell to port of entry. CDOT would demo, seed, and sell. Port of entry would pay fair market value

Conclusion: CDOT Region 2 wants to explore selling this property in a 0-5 year time frame. Theresa can do asbestos and hazardous waste, CDOT can handle demo, funding is available. (They don’t believe a similar location that they demoed had any asbestos.)

Gobblers Knob Rest Area: Initial recommendation to keep this location an active rest stop.

Based on discussion: This seems like a good place to stop during storm events. It is about 46 miles between facilities without this stop. Federally it could be closed, but not sure if that is a good idea. Lots of vehicles traveling this corridor are truckers could give them a place to rest. 287 in this area is two lanes. There is a sandshed at this facility. If there is a storm travelers might just pull off where they are. This facility costs about $30,000 a year to operate and is cleaned every day. They do close it when they clean it. Port of entry would use for portable scales, CDOT would keep it as a maintenance facility and just let them use it. Truckers probably stop in the surrounding towns where there are places for them to get gas and food.

Conclusion: CDOT would prefer to keep the land but, demo building, reseed, and close the rest area in a 0-5 year timeframe. Would just gate not tear up concrete. The gate needs to be in far enough in to still provide for safe access to maintenance barn. If there is kickback on all the ones they want to close this one would be ok to keep open since it is relatively easy and cheap to maintain.

El Morro Welcome Center: Initial recommendation to keep open and resign this as truck parking, no longer display rest area signs.

Based on discussion: The Trinidad facility serves the welcome center purpose but is not accessible for trucks. That makes this kind of a second welcome center/truck parking. At the least, CDOT wants to keep this as emergency truck parking. Discussed if it was possible to sell the land and require the new owner to provide truck parking, determined it would not be. So if there is a need for tucks CDOT would need to keep it. The facility is really close to Trinidad so trucks may be stopping there and
passenger vehicles probably would, especially with the welcome center. Discussed that the cost to keep it open for emergencies would be less than keeping it open for regular truck parking because CDOT could drop the maintenance/cleaning contract and minimize utilities. Discussed removing restroom and going to SSTs as a long term possibility. If it were to be kept open the only necessary improvements would be the picnic tables. There may be some resistance to closing it. The Scenic Byways Local Public Agency (LPA) may have recently made improvements at this location, including telescopes and bike racks at this Amber will do some more research on that and will look at what they gave clearance to.

    Conclusion: CDOT Region 2 wants to a 0-5 year time frame to turn this into emergency truck parking.

**Cuerno Verde/ Colorado City Rest Area:** Initial recommendation to sell this property.

    Based on discussion: Right next door and right across the street are adjacent private services. This site has complicated ownership that Amber will look into. It appears to be half owned by a private land owner. CDOT is paying tap fees on 4 various lots within the facility. The ownership issue may just be an error at the assessor. There is other truck parking on the east side of I-25. A better use of space would be to remove green space and turn it all into truck parking.

    Conclusion: CDOT should explore selling this site if possible in a 0-5 year time frame. Consider possibility of selling as is without any demo. Could just gate front and not fence the whole thing. Amber will research ownership of all these sites and any sales will go through her.
CDOT Statewide Rest Area Study
Region 3

Objectives
Meeting with CDOT Region 3 staff to discuss Statewide Rest Area Study and transition plan for CDOT R3 rest areas.

Summary
Introductions around the room
Theresa gave background on purpose of project – to look at statewide (interstates first), need, replication, closures, and upgrades for rest areas. Goal is to promote safety and comfort of travelers. Looked at crash history, criminal activity, rest area comfort, federal guidelines that say there must be an amenity within 60 miles (one hour) of travel time.

Reviewed statewide facilities map, compiled from Colorado motor carriers associations and CDOT/USFS data.

Results of study are that no new or relocated facilities is needed. General system recommendations include: welcome center provided at state boundaries, rest areas should be multi-use (e.g. local chamber co-locations, state patrol), strive to maintain rest areas through partnerships. Revenue cannot be generated within interstate ROW which limits multi-use options. Data available from Volpe with usage information. XXXX will provide to the team. Elk Springs is on 40 at (52?). SH 13 at MM 27. Forest Service bathrooms service and purpose vary, but not same mission as CDOT rest areas. Some on CDOT land, some maintenance shared (e.g. plowing), some not. Discussed challenges of working with various ranger districts as it relates to management of each of the USFS sites. Kyle (?) has been investigating the trade of maintenance of SST facilities in exchange for land of CDOT facilities (lease or land grant) on USFS land – program level not district level (Rabbit Ears, Wolf Creek, Winter Park, one more). Hanging Lake/Glenwood Canyon would also be separate.

Reviewed data table for each rest area (accident, usage, ADT, maintenance costs etc). Recommend 6 interstate welcome centers at each of the borders – they are staffed with books, tourist information, etc. CDOT helps in variety of ways with these (cash, maintenance, etc.). Re-designation in Glenwood Canyon to recreation away from Safety Rest Areas. Initial Glenwood Canyon EIS was reviewed to determine if rest areas were mitigation. Mike stated that they were for that purpose (even if not clear in EIS). Vail Pass designated a national recreational trail. Bike pass in canyon ties to rest areas, suggestion by R3 is to include it as part of a recreational system rather than separately. Mike pointed out that the highway is historically significant and thus there are already enough complicating factors that he wouldn’t shy away from designating it recreation within the canyon.
Reviewed transition action worksheet: suggest treating all Glenwood Canyon rest areas as a system, review general recommendations, in study note that use is high, infrastructure improvements are needed, moving forward a separate study and partnerships.

Bair Ranch – BLM land, private driveway access. Improvements to water pumps needed. Transition in 5-15 year driveway.

Edwards – R3 noted that this important emergency stuck storage/parking for Vail Pass closures. Community uses facility as a party, provides good river access for recreation (could support partnerships and transferring ownership). Needs new lighting. Dump station closure will get pushback. State Land Board wants to swap it for Dowd (offer has come in). Challenges with on-site City recycling facility and onsite housing.

Fruita – new sidewalk has been put in through fence to adjacent restaurants. Removal of grass or getting irrigation water an area for improvement.

Grizzly Creek – lump in with Bair Ranch. Has a boat ramp that USFS gets compensation for through rafting company permits and rangers at ramp. Good access, poor parking. Waste water facility is over-utilized and undersized. Challenged by summer usage. 0-5 needs for improvement. Grizzly Creek and No Name are catching overflow parking from Hanging Lake. Public service access (see map) forest service property, and CDOT property

Hanging Lake – lump with other Glenwood sites. WW treatment needs improvement. Permanent traffic control/gates.

Hayden – have not toured yet. R3 thinks there probably are not truck facilities in Craig and Hayden nearby. Repaving needed, non-potable well for water (currently pulling from collection box), funding is available for desired improvements. Seasonal usage only (gated). 0-5 year timeline. Closing wouldn’t be a large impact although hunters might question the closure.

No Name – not heavily used by trucks (bad egress when snowing in truck because of grade and curve), access is also access into No Name residential area.

Rangely – doesn’t exist

Rifle – R3 doesn’t desire to keep this one open, but it is in interstate ROW. Difficult to access, recommend selling/transfer.

Vail Pass – needs to be completely replaced. Heavy pressure on this one from year-round recreational use. Approx $5-8 mil. Unreliable utilities that could be largely be fixed by upgrades. Nationally significant historic interstate segment. EA process being started from MM 180-190 which could possibly encompass this facility – slow moving vehicle facilities. Potential for revenue from USFS on this one.

13/40 – no improvements, possibly lighting. Keep both.

**Action Items**
CDOT Statewide Rest Area Study Region 4

Objectives
Meeting with CDOT Region 4 staff to discuss Statewide Rest Area Study and transition plan for CDOT R4 rest areas.

Summary
Introductions around the room.

Goals for the Rest Areas and for the Assessment:
Theresa gave background on purpose of project – to look at statewide (interstates first), need, replication, closures, and upgrades for rest areas. Goal is to promote safety and comfort of travelers. Looked at crash history, criminal activity, rest area comfort, federal guidelines (FHWA) that say there must be an amenity within 60 miles (one hour) of travel time. An amenity means any public or private facility where a traveler would be able to pull over and go to the restroom or use other services. Reviewed statewide facilities map, compiled from Colorado motor carriers associations and CDOT/USFS data.

Results of study are that no new or relocated facilities are needed. General system recommendations include: welcome center provided at state boundaries, rest areas should be multi-use (e.g. local chamber co-locations, state patrol), strive to maintain rest areas through partnerships. Revenue cannot be generated within interstate ROW which limits multi-use options. Excluding the Vail Rest Area and the ones in Glenwood Canyon all of the rest areas along the interstate could be closed and federal regulations would still be met.

Revisited original reason for rest areas. Originally called safety rest areas and were designed to give travelers a rest from driving and access to facilities when there weren’t any for significant stretches of time. Development, particularly along interstates, has rendered many of them unnecessary as have changing travel patterns.
General discussion:
Theresa shared with the group the current operating expense for the rest areas in the region. That data for the amount allocated for this function was not immediately available.

The Eastern TPR’s concerns revolve around the abrupt and complete closure of the rest area. The belief is that vehicular and freight should be combined as one study, so that the recommendations factor the needs of both. The rest area study team has met with CMCA. Their fear is that if rest areas are closed other facilities will start to charge since there are no other options for truckers. There is a potential that there may be more human waste left at the side of the road. Pointed out that this is already occurring, so closing rest areas may not cause a significant increase.

Discussed the phasing of the recommended transitions. The goal is to create a solid plan that makes sense that everyone agrees with. All stakeholders will continue to be involved in the process before any final action is taken.

Burlington Rest Area and Welcome Center: Initial recommendation to keep this location an active rest stop and welcome center, and form a partnership with nearby municipality for operations.

Based on discussion: This facility is currently on a 5-year contract with the City of Burlington for maintenance and capital improvements. This rest area is a model for how welcome center Partnerships statewide should be implemented at other welcome center locations.

Conclusion: No proposed changes or upgrades are required at this location. CDOT will continue to monitor the success and cost of the partnership as each contact ends its term limit, and the Burlington Rest Area and Welcome Center will continue in the future.

Julesburg Rest Area: Initial recommendation to keep this location an active rest stop and welcome center, and form a partnership with nearby municipality for operations.

Based on discussion: Sedgwick County has shown interest in the past to purchase the facility to promote tourism in the area. Recent sewer work has provided a temporary fix to the Cast Iron sewer, but additional work is required to the sewer (both internal and external to the building). Estimated improvements run in the $30-40K range for this work. In addition, Property Management is currently working on an $80K HVAC improvement project. There is no regional maintenance funds available for this work at this time.

Conclusion: Julesburg is recommended to remain open as a rest area and welcome center. CDOT could enter into a partnership agreement (terms to be discussed) with Sedgwick County, who has shown past interest in the facility within the next 0-5 years.

Poudre Rest Area and Welcome Center: Initial recommendation to keep this location an active rest stop and welcome center, and form a partnership with nearby municipality for operations.

Based on discussion: The Poudre facility was relocated approximately 9 years ago due to the deterioration and one-way access to the previous facility. This location is currently sited near the CSU Environmental Learning Center which functions much like a local welcome center. Currently, there is no shared maintenance or operations agreements between the two. Safety and security of the site continues to be a concern and potential liability for the use of the rest area by transient populations. In addition, because of the location, plowing of the facility detracts the plows from the interstate over to the rest area.
Conclusion: The recommendation should be to close and demolish the rest area in 5-15 years, leaving the CSU facility to provide the welcome center type services to CSU.

**Arriba Rest Area:** Initial recommendation to sell this property.

Based on discussion: The Arriba Rest Area accommodates both directions of travel, and averages 700-1800 vehicles/day. Buses use it as layover locations for long trips. It is estimated that major improvements will be required for this facility in the next 5-15 year time frame, at which point, the transition into closing the facility should be investigated.

Conclusion: Maintain the rest area as is until major repairs or renovations are required, then demolish and sell the property.

**Deer Trail Rest Area:** Initial recommendation to sell this property.

Based on discussion: Deer Trail only serves westbound traffic. It is currently closed to the adjacent construction. If the rest area re-opens when construction is complete (scheduled for October 2016) there will be some amount of rehab required, in addition to the ongoing pumping activities that are taking place to stay in compliance with the CDPHE discharge permit requirements.

Conclusion: It is recommended to never reopen this facility from the current closure due to adjacent construction activities.

**Sterling Rest Area:** Initial recommendation to sell this property.

Based on discussion: There is no informal conversations currently happening in regards to transferring ownership of this facility to the town of Sterling. Over the next 5-15 years, these conversations should re-commence, before the decision to demolish and reseed the property.

Conclusion: CDOT should explore selling this site if possible in a 5-15 year time frame. Consider first a transfer of ownership to Sterling, and then possibility of selling as is without any demo.

**Wiggins Rest Area:** Initial recommendation to sell this property.

Based on discussion: This rest area is functioning fine, and should be considered for transition in the next 5-15 years, when major issues are identified. As with all of the transitions for the rest areas, a re-evaluation of the current needs, and a public information process should be included prior to any changes to the existing use.

Conclusion: Sell the land when major improvements become needed.

**Virginia Dale Rest Area:** Initial recommendation to keep this location an active rest stop.

Based on discussion: This facility is about halfway between Laramie and Ft. Collins (just over the 60 mile spacing between truck amenities). Based on this spacing, it is recommended to keep this facility to meet the federal spacing requirement.

Conclusion: It is estimated that approximately $50K in upgrades could be redirected to this rest area if funds are available for paving, restriping, etc.
CDOT Statewide Rest Area Study
Region 5

Objectives
Meeting with CDOT Region 5 staff to discuss Statewide Rest Area Study and transition plan for CDOT R5 rest areas.

Summary
Introductions around the room

Theresa gave background on purpose of project – to look at statewide (interstates first), need, replication, closures, and upgrades for rest areas. Goal is to promote safety and comfort of travelers. Looked at crash history, criminal activity, rest area comfort, FHWA guidelines that say there must be an amenity within 60 miles (one hour) of travel time.

Prelim results based on interstate FHWA requirements – only one required would be Vail Pass. SH and forest service are only rest areas in Region 5. Recently have started looking at USFS locations, will be looking at those as well in Statewide Plan recommendations.

Presented plan for rest areas: no new rest areas are proposed in the state based on criteria.

Recommendation in R5 is to keep both Shaw Creek and Sleeping Ute open. Discussion:

Sleeping Ute/Cortez – tight facility, needs additional truck parking. Limited parking in South Fork for parking when pass closes. Study recommendation is to upgrade, potential for partnership. Noted that the 16 for 2016 trail system (Cortez, Montezuma County, Mancos, Mesa Verde) will likely connect through this area. Better signing would help increase awareness and usage per R5. Water (public) from Montezuma Valley Water (verify this), don’t believe that upgrades are required from leech field. Current employee lives offsite, housing remains. Upgrade of computer system a potential need. Upgrade of Toyoc facility has removed major need for emergency truck parking, however it wouldn’t hurt. Potential for ROW purchase or reallocating day picnic area to accommodate upgrades may be required to implement upgrades. Thoughts regarding timeline: emergency parking 5-15 years, partnerships in 0-5 years (to tie into trail initiative), sanitary sewer upgrade from leech field.

Shaw Creek – More availability for trucks, onsite is CSP. Lighting could use upgrades, water pumps have gone out, septic issues, all could use upgrading. Info center/kiosk could use upgrading/updating. Theft is a problem, surveillance system (24/7) needs upgrading/addition. Well pump recently replaced. New wire from meter to pump also recently replaced. Building replacement, tie into welcome center. Remove some of the park area to make for truck parking. More lighting (perimeter and outside edge). Existing partnership with VFW Auxiliary for annual coffee and donuts (July 4th and Labor Day) and maps. (700-800 users those weekends). Facility improvements 0-5 years. 0-5 years for emergency parking.
Availability of funding: No current funding identified for projects, unless there is something that becomes available in 16 for 16.

Forest service locations:
Looking at how we partner/cost share/treat USFS rest areas. With the potential for closure it could create water quality concerns or other issues (like Treasure Falls). Both Molas and Coalbank are heavily used summer and winter, USFS looking to have partners or someone take over. Both are difficult to maintain in winter. R5 doesn’t think pay per use would be effective given other backcountry options (will go elsewhere). Could look at vendor partnerships like Aramark. Existing funds don’t exist to take over facilities. USFS wants Red Mountain Facility. R5 doesn’t want to set the precedent unless there is a higher (e.g. statewide recommendation). Study will look at these facilities to see how they compare to the CDOT prioritized studies. Priority List: 4 – Cochetope, 3 – Lizard Head tied for 1 – Molas and Coalbank. Staffing also a constraint.

Shaw Creek $1-2m likely for improvements, Sleeping Ute $0.5-1

Poncha and Blanca both have visitor’s centers that were handed over in an agreement to be managed locally. Mike will provide info if possible.

Theresa thanks the group and closed the meeting.

Action Items
Summarize or list action items.
Rest Area Policy Statement Planning Meetings
Rest Area Policy Work Group Meeting #1

April 27, 2017 at 3:30pm
HQ Room 159 and Zoom

I. Background
   - FHWA Regulations and AASHTO Policy
   - CDOT Background with Rest Areas
   - Other states (Fact Sheet)

II. Draft policy statement
   - What should be included?
   - What do terms mean?

III. Private alternatives
   - When/where are they sufficient?

IV. Innovative ideas from other states

Other meetings –

May 18
- Review/revise draft policy statement

June 8
- Material to present to RTD meeting and STAC in June

July
- Refine policy based on comments
- Recommendations
CDOT Rest Area Policy Guidance  
Meeting # 1  
April 27, 2017 – 3:15 pm – 5:00 pm  
CDOT HQ AV Room 159

Attendees - CDOT: Marissa Gaugan, Project Manager; JoAnn Mattson, Region 1; Allison Bejarano, IMB GIS Support; Lenore Bates, Bike/Pedestrian Planning; Michael Snow, Division of Transit and Rail; Michael King, Statewide Planning; Kathleen Collins, Statewide Planning; Greg Martinez, Civil Rights; Jason Wallis, Systems Planning; Gail Hoffman, Statewide Planning, Bob Wilson, Communications; Federal Highway Administration (FHWA): Bill Haas; and Via Telephone: Karen Schneider, CDOT Region 4, Kathy Seelhoff, CDOT Region 4, Mark Rogers, CDOT Region 3; and Wendy Pettit, CDOT Region 2.

Purpose:
Establish a vision and policy guidance for rest areas in Colorado. Start the discussion to determine - What does CDOT want and need of their rest areas? (Serve as a state attraction, or serve the bare minimum – as a stopping opportunity – or somewhere in between?) What partnerships should be considered for leveraging maintenance and improvement costs?

Background
- The Project Manager described the purpose of the project – to establish policy guidance for CDOT’s rest areas.
- Handouts included: Agenda, A Rest Area Fact Sheet with information regarding what other state DOTs are doing with their rest areas.
- A presentation with a draft vision and factors for determining – safety, comfort, convenience and information – terms outlined in the draft vision.
- A map of CDOT rest areas along with other facilities including: U.S. Forest Service (USFS) facilities that are essentially trail heads and Colorado Tourism Board Welcome Centers.
- An inventory of Rest Areas have been documented by the Property Management team.
- In addition, the Civil Rights office did an assessment of the Rest Areas including grading system for Rest Areas for compliance with American with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and rating the quality of access.
- CDOT has a budget of $2.2 million annually to maintain (not improve) these rest areas.
- How to maintain and improve these facilities is not just an issue in Colorado but is a national issue.
- Rest Areas are not mandated to be provided by FHWA, but once they exist certain restrictions apply. A Federal Act in 1956 mandated that standards for rest areas be developed.
- These regulations apply for all rest areas built in highway right-of-way – those not in ROW are not restricted.
- Commercialized use at rest areas is restricted by FHWA regulations with the intent to not compete with private businesses. Those existing before regulations established are grandfathered in.
- Glenwood Canyon EIS included a rest area within its build alternative.
- There is AASTHO guidance. There was an AASHTO policy on rest areas established in 1958. Latest publication is dated 2001.
- Per FHWA, no statewide assessment has been conducted; only at the region level currently.
Rest Area Attributes

- AASHTO guidance requires a stopping opportunity every 60 miles.
- Guidance developed should consider potential partnerships to help pay for costs with maintaining and improvement of rest areas including but not limited to: industry, government entities, CDOT-owned or someone else owns.
- Standards relate to types of bathrooms.
- Consider evaluation of where voids in privately-owned facilities exists as part of needs assessment.
- On the interstate system CDOT owns and maintains facilities that attract the public/traffic and CDOT is responsible to address the needs of traffic on their facilities.
- Some rest areas provide RV trailer dumps.
- Uses of rest areas could include providing information and amenities to assist with:
  - Local events
  - Travel Advisories
  - Emergencies
  - Freight

Issues and Concerns:

- A few rest Areas in Colorado have been closed due to environmental issues and/or crime.
- No funding specifically for these facilities is available now.
- Rest areas provide a place to walk pets, which is important - Issue arises when rest area closes and then private entities, like McDonald’s post signs to not walk pets on their property – where do travelers walk their pets?
- Rest areas provide a haven for distracted driving and are needed.
- Discussed both hours of operation and concept of staffing and their hours that are appropriate; physical location is a factor for these facilities.
- Bad weather is a key reason to use rest areas – to wait out storms and shelter in place.
- Prostitution is an issue at a couple of rest areas (Prospect and Larkspur).
- Travelers having a bad experience at a rest area – even in another state – can stop folks from stopping – perception plays a role in use of rest areas.
- Some rest areas restrict parking limits to only two hours – this is not long enough for some travelers and users – most have at least 4 hour limits.
- Google maps rates rest areas; also on CoTrip.
- Colorado has unique rest areas with amazing views like Vail Pass where travelers stop to take pictures. Glenwood is another example of this.
- Some rest areas can’t be seen from the road, during extreme weather events like fog.
- Often, with limited funding at CDOT, Regions are confronted with choosing to fix the road, or to fix/maintain the rest area.

Other State Rest Areas

- Virginia DOT obtained sponsorship from GEICO to finance a safe phone zone.
- Iowa and Minnesota have truck parking only facilities designated as primitive with signage that indicates no services available – do not leave vehicle – often maintenance teams find bottles of urine at these types of facilities to clean up.
- Minnesota has tiered their rest areas – focus is comfort and cell phone service is provided – emergency phone hot spot.
• Florida provides free wifi at their rest areas.
• Wyoming has rest areas that are new and showcase the state – they are like a mini museum. Invite travelers to examine what is nearby and identifies proximity to attractions.
• Iowa sees rest areas as visitors’ first impression, provide a wind energy production story, and use the rest areas as an attraction to the state.

Driver Behavior
• People drive 24/7 now, not as it was in yester years.
• Need more studies done to understand driver behavior related to rest areas needs and use – also market research is needed.

Suggestions:
• Consider rest areas as assets as part of asset management at CDOT.
• Partnerships with local communities, law enforcement, etc. are important.
• Tiering rest areas was discussed and various options are possible including but not limited to: welcome centers, freight services, tourism, etc. all with different amenities.
• Base amenities could be trash collection, toilet, and information.
• Need to consider a facility that is accessible versus open.
• Consider sections of highway that are closed regularly due to weather when identifying rest area needs – e.g. space to shelter in place.
• Opportunity for Park-n-Ride/Rest Area partnership
• Colorado State Patrol (CSP) Partnership – provide signing indicating reserved parking for police to deter criminal activity.
• Need to involve other local law enforcement (local sheriffs) as partners, not just CSP.
• Use newer surveillance technology (drones) or cameras to keep eyes on rest areas.
• Rest area caretakers were discussed – caretaker quarters could be provided in some instances.
• Travelers can use Yelp and Trip Advisor to find rest areas with coffee, good lighting, and close to home.
• Kiosks at rest areas that invite travelers into nearby communities - could potentially form partnership to share rest area expenses with the host community.
• Interactive maps at kiosks is a possibility.
• Have communities take over information maintenance if partnership is formed with Kiosks/information posts.
• Branding rest areas was discussed as a concept for Colorado – align with the Tourism Office’s Welcome Center branding.

Next Steps:
• Need more information and details on what other states are doing and the resulting impacts both beneficial and negative.
• Obtain available data from NHSTA on statistics related to rest areas nationally.
• Homework requested from attendees was to review the vision, and provide comments.
What are we trying to accomplish?

- **Phase 1: Data Collection and Needs Analysis**
  - Property Management led a rest area study to assess the condition, function, and needs of CDOT rest areas.
  - ADA Accessibility Evaluation
- **Phase 2: Development of Policy Guidance**
  - Vision for the CDOT Rest Area Program.
- **Phase 3: Policy Implementation**
  - Development of site specific recommendations based on data and needs analysis from Phase 1, and policy guidance from Phase 2.
  - Findings from parallel Truck Parking Study will also be considered.

The purpose of Phase 2 is to:
- Set the high-level vision
- Provide strategic direction on what we want to accomplish with the CDOT Rest Area Program
Rest Area Regulations and Guidance

**FHWA Regulations:**
- FHWA does not have any regulation that makes having rest stops mandatory, however, does have rules for rest areas in the public right of way.
- Safety rest area: A roadside facility safely removed from the traveled way with parking and such facilities for the motorist deemed necessary for his rest, relaxation, comfort and information needs. The term is synonymous with “rest and recreation areas.”
- Safety rest areas should provide facilities reasonably necessary for the comfort, convenience, relaxation, and information needs of the motorist. Caretakers' quarters may be provided in conjunction with a safety rest area at such locations where accommodations are deemed necessary. All facilities within the rest area are to provide full consideration and accommodation for the handicapped.
- No charge to the public may be made for goods and services at safety rest areas except for telephone and articles dispensed by vending machines.

**AASHTO Guidance:**
- "Stopping Opportunity" every 60 miles or 1 hour of drive time (Public Rest Area or Commercial Service close to an interchange)
“CDOT should ensure that public rest area facilities are available with reasonable spacing along interstates and key freight corridors within the state for the safety, comfort, convenience, and information needs of motorists. Rest area parking and comfort stations should be free of charge and open at all hours.”

Let’s discuss what these terms might mean...
“CDOT should ensure that public rest area facilities are available with reasonable spacing along interstates and key freight corridors within the state for the safety, comfort, convenience, and information needs of motorists. Rest area parking and comfort stations should be free of charge and open at all hours.”

Factors:
- Prevent driver fatigue – Place to rest, nap, change drivers
- Open 24/7
- Emergency Parking – Storms or Road Closures
- Alternative to road side or shoulder stopping
- Phone Zone – Promote RAs as a safe location for texting, calling, e-mail
- Lighting
- Security
Safety Considerations

The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration estimates that nationally:

- About 1.5 percent of all crashes involve drowsiness or fatigue as a principal factor.
- Fatigue-related crashes result in 1,500 fatalities and 71,000 injuries each year.
- In 2010, 3,092 people were killed in crashes involving a distracted driver— an estimated additional 416,000 were injured.
“CDOT should ensure that public rest area facilities are available with reasonable spacing along interstates and key freight corridors within the state for the safety, comfort, convenience, and information needs of motorists. Rest area parking and comfort stations should be free of charge and open at all hours.”

**Reasonable Spacing & Comfort**

Factors:
- Spacing
  - AASHTO Guidance 60 miles or 1 hour maximum
  - Some states – 30 to 45 miles for freight routes
  - Locations at potential road closures
- Comfort Stations
- Amenities (Picnic Area, Pet Area, etc.)
  - Some State DOTs, such as MnDOT and Florida DOT, tier their RAs to provide different amenities based on the type of rest area.
Reasonable Spacing & Comfort Considerations

- Security personnel during nighttime hours
- 45 minutes travel time apart
- Free Wi-Fi
- Combined transit park-n-rides with some rest area facilities
“CDOT should ensure that public rest area facilities are available with reasonable spacing along interstates and key freight corridors within the state for the safety, comfort, convenience, and information needs of motorists. Rest area parking and comfort stations should be free of charge and open at all hours.”

**Factors:**
- Easy on/off
- Free of Charge
- Open 24/7
- Good directional signage
- Shown on travel maps
- Parking space for cars, RVs, and trucks
Convenience Considerations

The advantage that REST AREA facilities have over other services is their convenience/ease of access and egress. No need to exit the highway, no traffic signal, no struggle to find parking, no getting lost or confused getting back on the highway.

In/out Fast Convenient

-2012 National Safety Rest Area Conference, Salt Lake City Utah
“CDOT should ensure that public rest area facilities are available with reasonable spacing along interstates and key freight corridors within the state for the safety, comfort, convenience, and needs of motorists. Rest area parking and comfort stations should be free of charge and open at all hours.”

Factors:
- Static Map Display
- Take away maps and brochures
- Staffing (Welcome Centers are currently staffed)
- Various levels of the above (Tiering)
Information Considerations

IOWA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

- Rest Area in Adair County
- “Windfarming: The Story of Wind Energy Production in Iowa”
- RAs as an opportunity to make “our best first impression”
“CDOT should ensure that public rest area facilities are available with reasonable spacing along interstates and key freight corridors within the state for the safety, comfort, convenience, and information needs of motorists. Rest area parking and comfort stations should be free of charge and open at all hours.”

Factors:
- CDOT Provided or Private Alternatives?
- Can private alternatives meet the criteria for safety, comfort, convenience and information?
“Rest areas at key entrances to the state should be provided to help promote tourism and economic vitality. CDOT should pursue partnerships at rest areas to maximize both effectiveness and cost containment, and to promote safety and sustainability.”

Let’s discuss what these terms might mean...
“Rest areas at key entrances to the state should be provided to help promote tourism and economic vitality. CDOT should pursue partnerships at rest areas to maximize both effectiveness and cost containment, and to promote safety and sustainability.”

Factors
- Welcome center partnerships
- CDOT and Forest Service partnerships
  - Forest Service rest areas may fall more into a “trailhead” category (or tier), but still serve an important role for safety, tourism, and economic vitality
- Other partnership /innovative ideas from other states
  - What might work in CO?
Timeline

- **May 18**
  - Review/revise draft policy statement
- **June 7**
  - Material to present to RTD meeting and STAC in June
- **July**
  - Refine policy based on comments
  - Recommendations

Fruita Rest Area / Welcome Center
Contact Information

Marissa Gaughan
CDOT MPO and Regional Planning
303-512-4235
Marissa.Gaughan@state.co.us

Thank you!

El Morro Rest Area
1. Tiering Ideas for RAs (page 2)
   a. Levels
   b. Terminology
   c. Maintenance standards
   d. More partnerships?
   e. Web page information/mobile app info

2. Draft Policy (page 4)
   a. Additional language?
   b. Identify future work needed

3. Forest Service
   a. Identify locations that are key for CDOT
   b. Discussion of partnership opportunities
   c. MOA for Glenwood Canyon locations?
CDOT Rest Area Policy Guidance
Meeting #2
May 18, 2017 – 2:15 pm – 4:30 pm
CDOT HQ AV Room 159

Attendees - CDOT: Marissa Gaughan, Project Manager; Michelle Scheuerman, Statewide Planning, Charles Meyer, Traffic Safety; Tim Kirby, MPO and Regional Planning; JoAnn Mattson, Region 1; Sarah Mitchell, Environmental Programs; Michael King, Statewide Planning; Kathleen Collins, Statewide Planning; Greg Martinez, Civil Rights; Jason Wallis, Systems Planning; Bob Wilson, Communications; Federal Highway Administration (FHWA): Bill Haas; and Via Telephone: Danny Herrmann, Region 1; Karen Schneiders, CDOT Region 4, Kathy Seelhoff, CDOT Region 4, and Mark Rogers, CDOT Region 3.

Purpose:
Establish a vision and policy guidance for rest areas (RAs) in Colorado. Continue the discussion to determine - What does CDOT want and need of their rest areas? (Serve as a state attraction, or serve the bare minimum – as a stopping opportunity – or somewhere in between?) Today’s meeting will focus on tiering ideas, draft policy statement revisions, and U.S. Forest Service facilities.

Background
• Attendees introduced themselves.
• Handouts included: an Agenda, and a handout of Ideas for Rest Area Tiering – including 5 levels of tiering, along with Other Partnership and Other Trucking facilities.

Previous Meeting #1
• Discussed the concept of matching up tiers with draft policy statement and the need to identify more partnership opportunities.
• There is a need a high level vision for CDOT’s Rest Area Program – the policy statement is what is anticipated to use for establishing this vision.
• A map of CDOT Rest Areas, USFS trailheads, and Welcome Centers served as a resource for discussion.
• Federal Highway Administration guidance pertaining to RAs was reviewed with the group last time.
• Michelle noted that is project is perfect timing for collaboration with Tourism Board’s Welcome Centers, who are working on assessing their Welcome Center locations with recommendations to go to their Board at the end of the year.
• A tour of the Cheyenne, Wyoming Welcome Center is scheduled as part of Colorado Welcome Center analysis; Wyoming invested $17 million into the Cheyenne center.
• Marissa is scheduled to provide a presentation regarding CDOT’s Rest Areas to Mateo Henderson, Director of Visitor Services with the Colorado Tourism Office, and discuss potential opportunities for a partnership.

Tier 1 – RA/ Welcome Center (draft policy description provided in meeting handout)
These locations should be fully developed rest areas with kiosk information, indoor information racks with maps and brochures, paved parking, flush toilets, hot and cold potable water, heating and air conditioning, picnic tables, cell phone service, wifi, lighting, and are staffed for some portion of the day. These are located at key entrance points to the state and serve to support tourism for the state or the

Drafted 5-19-2017
local region. These are owned by CDOT but often operated in partnership with the Colorado Tourism Board or with a local tourism office. Not every RA/Welcome center will have truck parking.

**Tier 1 – RA/ Welcome Center Discussion**

- Welcome Centers are owned by the Tourism Office not CDOT.
- Need to confirm proper terms for toilets.
- Truck parking is optional at these facilities
- Some Colorado RAs have no potable water supplied.
- Need criteria established for Tiers
- Marissa noted team members should feel free to review and provide additional comments on the handouts.
- Consider dog parks as a qualifier – could be a future amenities discussion.

**Revised Policy Statement (draft policy description provided in meeting handout)**

“CDOT should ensure that public rest area facilities are available with reasonable spacing along interstates and key corridors within the state for the safety, comfort, convenience, and information needs of motorists. Rest area parking and comfort stations should be free of charge and accessible at all hours. Rest areas at key entrances to the state should be provided to help promote tourism and economic vitality. CDOT should pursue partnerships at rest areas to maximize both effectiveness and cost containment, and to promote safety and sustainability.”

**Policy Statement Comments**

- Take out entrance from/policy statement replace with locations.
- Add/or support tourism
- Need to clearly define what operational tasks are included in RA partnerships.
- Concept is to identify needs of RAs first, and then figure out how to deliver these needs.
- Part of operations is determining how to divide responsibilities among partnering agencies or areas within CDOT.

**Tier 2 – Standard RA (draft policy description provided in meeting handout)**

- These locations should have both auto and truck paved parking, indoor flush or vault toilets, heating, picnic tables, kiosk information, cell phone service, and lighting. They may or may not have potable water. Some may have indoor information racks with maps and brochures if supplied and maintained in partnership with a local organization.
- Should heating be in the list of amenities provided?

**Tier 2 Discussion:**

- For areas where cell phone service is not available, consider providing pay phones.
- Utah has some RAs with no electricity.
- Consider visitor experience is the policy statement. The Roadmap of the Tourism Office aligns with visitor experience.

**Tier 3 – Basic RA (draft policy description provided in meeting handout)**

- These facilities should have parking space (paved or gravel) for autos and trucks, vault or pit toilets, no potable water, minimal kiosk information, and basic lighting. They may or may not have cell phone service. They may or may not have picnic tables.
• If there is no running water, heating could be optional or minimal.

Other Tiers:

Tier 4 – Seasonal RA (draft policy description provided in meeting handout)
• These locations will be closed in winter. They should have vault or pit toilets, parking space (paved or gravel) for autos and trucks, kiosk information and lighting. They may or may not have potable water (summer only), cell phone service, or picnic tables.

Tier 5 – RA / Recreational Facility (draft policy description provided in meeting handout)
• These are locations that have been designated as joint RA and recreational locations. There are four of these in Colorado located in Glenwood Canyon. They were established as part of the environmental mitigation measures for the interstate development through the Canyon. They serve as rest areas, river access and trailhead access. They have flush or vault toilets, potable water and paved auto parking. They do not have truck parking.

Tier 5 Discussion:
• Whether facility is mainly a recreational facility is a consideration; there are 4 in Colorado with Glenwood Canyon being one of them – No truck parking at these facilities.
• Consider within all tiers to provide some type of recreational amenities and call them out.
• RV dump stations are an amenity at Fruita and Edwards – consider for Tier 1 and 2 only?

Other Tiering Ideas (draft policy description provided in meeting handout)

Other – Partnership Facilities
• These locations would be privately owned facilities, but in partnership with CDOT agree to be accessible 24/7 and provide free restroom facilities and allow temporary parking for rest purposes.
• Forest Service Facilities along state highways
  o These locations are not CDOT RAs but are primarily for the purpose of trailhead parking or in some cases for camping. Generally they include parking (gravel) for autos and vault toilets (some camping locations may have flush toilets). Some locations may have potable water. These are not CDOT facilities, but some travelers may use them as a rest area.
• The potential to use State Land Board land for RAs was mentioned.

Other – Truck Parking
• These are not RAs but rather truck parking locations with no facilities.

Other Tiering Discussion

Existing Conditions Review for Tiering
• Need to identify types of existing RAs and what amenities each has (this has been done by the Property Management report). Then see if proposed tiers match up with existing conditions.
Refine the existing facilities matrix – consider leaving some RAs as is if they are working and compare to aspirational desires.
See each tier requiring core elements/a check list for each tier with functional requirements.
Consider if the size of a RA also relates to the tier level.
See this tiering as a hierarchy of amenities to provide.
Need a requirements vs. amenities table.
ADT and travel patterns could be a factor to consider for needs of RA.
Identify the needs of each RA and if the RA is meeting the needs.
Then determine how to deliver the needs of RAs.
Vision is what we would like to achieve; need to set standards that are somewhat feasible with current funding constraints.
Consider integrating visions of other potential partners in guidance.

**USFS RAs**
- USFS facilities are essentially trailheads to hiking and camping areas.
- The question was asked if any existing agreements between CDOT and the USFS are on file - The answer was this concept is aspirational currently.

**Partnerships**
- A good example of a partnership is the Burlington Rest Area/Welcome Center that is situated outside of CDOT ROW; town owns the facility, but CDOT maintains it.
- Burlington RA would be a good RA to visit to evaluate as a good example of partnership.
- The concept of a partnership could be/has been if CDOT snow plows the RA, they can let their customers use the RA facilities.
- Per FHWA - Focus on one strategy in the policy statement could be partnering; with CDOT still in control of the RA Program.

**Rest Area Closures**
- Issue arises when USFS RAs close or other RA close; travelers still use as a rest stop and area becomes an unpleasant and odoriferous health hazard area; for example in Region 5 USFS facilities are either shutting down and taking out facilities – then people still use; nearby towns then ask CDOT for money to maintain – and it is a time sensitive issue – needs to be addressed quickly.
- When Hadley RA along US 50 closed – heard no comments; but when Larkspur RA closed CDOT received lots of complaints.

**Safety**
- A study of RA and where crashes occur do not indicate that crashes are more likely to occur near or far from RAs. No link established to driver fatigue and proximity to RAs at this point, per the consultant – crashes are spread out.
- Some locations are safety-based in terms of place to hold out during extreme weather events.
- Wildlife crossings are another safety concern.

**Definitions**
- Terms that require definition include (examples of how to define these terms was presented):
  - Reasonable spacing – which can be different in different topographies or when other private facilities are available – concept if near a small town (small urbanized area) –
could be a factor to extend reasonable spacing; issue arises when one well- situated private business closes and then reasonable space may need to be closer (CDOT has no control over private businesses staying open).

- Key Corridors – is not the entire Colorado State Highway System needed? Are parts of the system not needed? Could be those below a certain ADT may not need RAs.
- No specific discussion occurred for the following terms after proposed definitions being presented:
  - Acceptable alternative
  - Accessible
  - Convenience
  - Comfort
  - Safety

**Legal Requirements**

- FHWA noted that by law, CDOT does not need to provide much at Rest Areas; According to Kelly the consultant only one location has specific requirements regarding what to provide (Glenwood Canyon RA?)
- May want two separate policy guidance established – 1) Interstates and 2) State Highways.
- There is more flexibility in what may be provided at RAs that are not in state highway system right-of-way.
- Interstates are the main focus of requirements per FHWA.
- How to fit all these RA types into the policy statement needs to be determined.
- Need to identify (eventually) a minimum standard for each tier.
- Chain up areas are not for public use, only truck parking.
- Need to ensure policy guidance requires all RAs to be ADA accessible.
- Signage in proximity to RAs may be a good resource and indication of tier types too – Tourism-Oriented Directional Signs (TODS) - the blue signs. Concept of tie together sign criteria with RA criteria was mentioned.
- Need to consider a statewide perspective of RAs in the policy guidance, not just from a regional perspective.

**User Experience and Needs**

- If user experience is a vision goal, the closure of facilities leads to compromising visitor experience and not the best impressions of Colorado.
- Best first impressions through RAs is a potential need.
- USFS RA users at RAs vary – three general types: 1) stop to use bathroom; 2) use to stretch legs and take photos; or 3) Trailhead user.
- Need to decide terms to define a safety RA vs. a recreational RA – sometimes they are the same.
- Each RA needs a purpose – what needs are they meant for? Recreational, safety, rest, other residual benefits, welcome, give CDOT a good reputation – determine the needs required of each RA and then determine if needs are being met.
- If need for an RA includes comfort – consider accommodations for RVs.
- Facilities (toilets) are always a need at a RA.
- There needs to be a clear distinction between truck parking and RVs.
- In Eagle the RA is being reconstructed as a park and no longer as a RA.
- On-site caretakers are another need to consider.
- US 24 is a long recreational corridor with no RAs, where potential consideration for new RAs could be evaluated.
• Other considerations for RA use include: picnic tables, bike paths, and dog walking areas.
• In West Virginia food trucks along bicycle paths have been very successful.
• Very important to identify a parking lot list of needs and tasks for the future Phase 3 of RA assessment.

New Technology and Location

• Consider electric charging stations at RAs.
• FHWA noted considering new technologies may be attributes of Tier 1 and 2 only RAs.
• RA needs may vary depending on location and proximity to other amenities; that is the rationale for “may or may not” language in the proposed tiering.
• Sustainability – reduce energy costs with renewable energy sources, re-landscaping, truck electric charging, etc. – Innovation could be a theme of the state partnering with business communities.

Next Steps/Timeline:

• June 7, 2017 Rest Area Working Group Meeting #3, AV Room 159
  o Material to present to RTD meeting and STAC in June
• June 28, 2017
  o Tentative Date for Rest Area Webinar
    ▪ External stakeholder engagement
    ▪ Notify Communications Office to announce webinar at June Telephone Town Halls, once date confirmed.
    ▪ Audience will be: TPRs, Scenic Byway Contacts, Special Interest Groups (e.g., Bicycle Colorado)
    ▪ Colorado Motor Carriers Association, Freight Advisory Council (FAC) distribution list, etc.
    ▪ Share results of Tourism Survey/ Multimodal Freight Plan Surveys too.
• June (TBD)
  o CDOT Maintenance Staff engagement (Circle back with maintenance staff)
• July
  o Refine policy based on comments
  o Recommendations
Ideas for RA Tiering

(Note: may need some help with appropriate toilet type terminology)

Tier 1 – RA/Welcome Center

These locations should be fully developed rest areas with kiosk information, indoor information racks with maps and brochures, paved parking, flush toilets, hot and cold potable water, heating and air conditioning, picnic tables, cell phone service, wifi, lighting, and are staffed for some portion of the day. These are located at key entrance points to the state and serve to support tourism for the state or the local region. These are owned by CDOT but often operated in partnership with the Colorado Tourism Board or with a local tourism office. Not every RA/Welcome center will have truck parking.

Tier 2 - Standard RA

These locations should have both auto and truck paved parking, indoor flush or vault toilets, heating, picnic tables, kiosk information, cell phone service, and lighting. They may or may not have potable water. Some may have indoor information racks with maps and brochures if supplied and maintained in partnership with a local organization.

Tier 3 – Basic RA

These facilities should have parking space (paved or gravel) for autos and trucks, vault or pit toilets, no potable water, minimal kiosk information, and basic lighting. They may or may not have cell phone service. They may or may not have picnic tables. (Do these all have heating?)

Tier 4 – Seasonal RA

These locations will be closed in winter. They should have vault or pit toilets, parking space (paved or gravel) for autos and trucks, kiosk information and lighting. They may or may not have potable water (summer only), cell phone service, or picnic tables.

Tier 5 – RA/Recreational facility

These are locations that have been designated as joint RA and recreational locations. There are four of these in Colorado located in Glenwood Canyon. They were established as part of the environmental mitigation measures for the interstate development through the Canyon. They serve as rest areas, river access and trailhead access. They have flush or vault toilets, potable water and paved auto parking. They do not have truck parking. (check on exact amenities)

Other – Partnership

These locations would be privately owned facilities, but in partnership with CDOT agree to be accessible 24/7 and provide free restroom facilities and allow temporary parking for rest purposes.

- Forest Service facilities along State Highways
  - These locations are not CDOT RAs but are primarily for the purpose of trailhead parking or in some cases for camping. Generally they include parking (gravel) for autos and vault toilets (some camping locations may have flush toilets). Some locations may have
potable water. These are not CDOT facilities, but some travelers may use them as a rest area.

**Other - Truck parking**

These are not RAs but rather truck parking locations with no facilities.
Draft Rest Area Policy Statement  
(With revisions from 1st Work Group Meeting)

CDOT should ensure that public rest area facilities are available with reasonable spacing along interstates and key freight corridors within the state for the safety, comfort, convenience, and information needs of motorists. Rest area parking and comfort stations should be free of charge and open accessible at all hours. Rest areas at key entrances to the state should be provided to help promote tourism and economic vitality. CDOT should pursue partnerships at rest areas to maximize both effectiveness and cost containment, and to promote safety and sustainability.
CDOT Rest Area Policy Guidance

Work Group Meeting #2 May 2017
What are we trying to accomplish?

- **Phase 1: Data Collection and Needs Analysis**
  - Property Management led a rest area study to assess the condition, function, and needs of CDOT rest areas.
  - ADA Accessibility Evaluation

- **Phase 2: Development of Policy Guidance**
  - **Vision for the CDOT Rest Area Program.**

- **Phase 3: Policy Implementation**
  - Development of site specific recommendations based on data and needs analysis from Phase 1, and policy guidance from Phase 2.
  - Findings from parallel Truck Parking Study will also be considered.

The purpose of Phase 2 is to:
- Set the high-level vision
- Provide strategic direction on what we want to accomplish with the CDOT Rest Area Program
Rest Area Regulations and Guidance

**FHWA Regulations:**
- FHWA does not have any regulation that makes having rest stops mandatory, however, does have rules for rest areas in the public right of way.
- Safety rest area: A roadside facility safely removed from the traveled way with parking and such facilities for the motorist deemed necessary for his rest, relaxation, comfort and information needs. The term is synonymous with “rest and recreation areas.”
- Safety rest areas should provide facilities reasonably necessary for the comfort, convenience, relaxation, and information needs of the motorist. Caretakers' quarters may be provided in conjunction with a safety rest area at such locations where accommodations are deemed necessary. All facilities within the rest area are to provide full consideration and accommodation for the handicapped.
- No charge to the public may be made for goods and services at safety rest areas except for telephone and articles dispensed by vending machines.

**AASHTO Guidance:**
- “Stopping Opportunity” every 60 miles or 1 hour of drive time (Public Rest Area or Commercial Service close to an interchange)
These locations should be fully developed rest areas with kiosk information, indoor information racks with maps and brochures, paved parking, flush toilets, hot and cold potable water, heating and air conditioning, picnic tables, cell phone service, wifi, lighting, and are staffed for some portion of the day. These are located at key entrance points to the state and serve to support tourism for the state or the local region. These are owned by CDOT but often operated in partnership with the Colorado Tourism Board or with a local tourism office. Not every RA/Welcome center will have truck parking.
Tiering Ideas

Tier 2 – Standard RA

These locations should have both auto and truck paved parking, indoor flush or vault toilets, heating, picnic tables, kiosk information, cell phone service, and lighting. They may or may not have potable water. Some may have indoor information racks with maps and brochures if supplied and maintained in partnership with a local organization.

- Should heating be in the list of amenities provided?
Tiering Ideas

**Tier 3 – Basic RA**

These facilities should have parking space (paved or gravel) for autos and trucks, vault or pit toilets, no potable water, minimal kiosk information, and basic lighting. They may or may not have cell phone service. They may or may not have picnic tables.

- If there is no running water, heating could be optional or minimal.
Tier 4 – Seasonal RA

These locations will be closed in winter. They should have vault or pit toilets, parking space (paved or gravel) for autos and trucks, kiosk information and lighting. They may or may not have potable water (summer only), cell phone service, or picnic tables.
These are locations that have been designated as joint RA and recreational locations. There are four of these in Colorado located in Glenwood Canyon. They were established as part of the environmental mitigation measures for the interstate development through the Canyon. They serve as rest areas, river access and trailhead access. They have flush or vault toilets, potable water and paved auto parking. They do not have truck parking.
Tiering Ideas

**Other – Partnership Facilities**

- These locations would be privately owned facilities, but in partnership with CDOT agree to be accessible 24/7 and provide free restroom facilities and allow temporary parking for rest purposes.

- Forest Service Facilities along state highways
  - These locations are not CDOT RAs but are primarily for the purpose of trailhead parking or in some cases for camping. Generally they include parking (gravel) for autos and vault toilets (some camping locations may have flush toilets). Some locations may have potable water. These are not CDOT facilities, but some travelers may use them as a rest area.

**Other – Truck Parking**

These are not RAs but rather truck parking locations with no facilities.
"CDOT should ensure that public rest area facilities are available with reasonable spacing along interstates and key corridors within the state for the safety, comfort, convenience, and information needs of motorists. Rest area parking and comfort stations should be free of charge and accessible at all hours."

Let's discuss what these terms might mean...
“CDOT should ensure that public rest area facilities are available with reasonable spacing along interstates and key corridors within the state for the safety, comfort, convenience, and information needs of motorists. Rest area parking and comfort stations should be free of charge and accessible at all hours.”

**Safety**

Factors:
- Accessible 24/7 (All tiers, but some may be seasonal)
- Prevent driver fatigue – Place to rest, nap, change drivers (All tiers)
- Emergency Parking – Storms or Road Closures (All tiers)
- Alternative to roadside or shoulder stopping (All tiers)
- Prevent distracted driving – “Phone Zone”
Safety Considerations

- RAs were originally called “Safety Rest Areas” in recognition of their primary purpose. Perhaps this name should be re-emphasized in the policy discussion / tiering.
- Additional consideration should be given to rest areas on sections of highway that are closed regularly due to weather.
- Phone Zone – Promote RAs as a safe location for texting, calling, e-mail (may vary by tier).
- Caretakers quarters at RAs improve safety and cleanliness.
“CDOT should ensure that public rest area facilities are available with reasonable spacing along interstates and key corridors within the state for the safety, comfort, convenience, and information needs of motorists. Rest area parking and comfort stations should be free of charge and accessible at all hours.”

Reasonable Spacing & Comfort

Factors:
- Spacing
  - AASHTO Guidance 60 miles or 1 hour maximum
  - Should this be for both interstates and state highways?
- Comfort Stations - Amenities will vary by tier
Reasonable Spacing & Comfort Considerations

- Policy statement may need to be 2 part – Interstates and State Highways
  - On state highways, the main drivers for location and spacing will be freight and tourism. Tourists may be able to stop in towns along the SH, freight will not.
  - Need truck parking study to see if some locations are key for trucks and thus need to be open or if some might be converted to be better location for trucks, or if some might be closed along SH routes that are not key freight and where other options exist.
  - Truck parking stops with comfort stations may be sufficient for tourists in RVs.
“CDOT should ensure that public rest area facilities are available with reasonable spacing along interstates and key corridors within the state for the safety, comfort, convenience, and information needs of motorists. Rest area parking and comfort stations should be free of charge and accessible at all hours.”

Factors:
- Easy on/off
- Free of Charge
- Open 24/7
- Good directional signage
- Shown on travel maps
- Parking space for cars, RVs, and trucks
Convenience Considerations

- Policy statement may need to be 2 part – Interstates and State Highways
  - Different driver expectations, and different access design (interchange vs. direct access to businesses)
  - On interstates, RAs are more expected by the traveling public and offer a quick and easy off/on access point for rest, comfort and information. Development at interchanges is frequent but may be closed during night hours, facility may be harder to find, and have more difficult off/on. At private locations, a purchase may be expected for use of a rest room.
“CDOT should ensure that public rest area facilities are available with reasonable spacing along interstates and key corridors within the state for the safety, comfort, convenience, and needs of motorists. Rest area parking and comfort stations should be free of charge and accessible at all hours.”

Factors:
- Static Map Display
- Take away maps and brochures
- Staffing (Welcome Centers are currently staffed)
- Levels of information will vary by tier
Information Considerations

- “Best DOT” / “Best First Impression”
- Kiosks at rest areas that invite travelers into nearby communities - could potentially form partnerships to share rest area expenses with the host community.
- Align with Tourism Office and Welcome Center “Branding”
- Do we want rest areas to make a statement about Colorado?
“CDOT should ensure that public rest area facilities are available with reasonable spacing along interstates and key corridors within the state for the safety, comfort, convenience, and information needs of motorists. Rest area parking and comfort stations should be free of charge and accessible at all hours.”

Factors:
- CDOT Provided or Private Alternatives?
- Can private alternatives meet the criteria for safety, comfort, convenience and information?
- On state highways that are not key freight corridors or primary recreation corridors, RAs might be closed if a local partnership can be developed to serve as a rest stop. Traffic volumes should be examined and distance between easily accessible locations.
“Rest areas at key entrances to the state should be provided to help promote tourism and economic vitality. CDOT should pursue partnerships at rest areas to maximize both effectiveness and cost containment, and to promote safety and sustainability.”

Let’s discuss what these terms might mean...
Policy Statement, Part 2 - DRAFT
(Based on federal terms)

**Partnership Considerations**
- Welcome center partnerships
- Forest Service partnerships
- Local Communities
- Law Enforcement - Colorado State Patrol and local law enforcement
- Transit (Park-n-Rides)
- Biking community - Bike routes should be considered in looking at RA locations and potential closures.

**Sustainability Considerations**
- Look for ways to reduce energy costs and water usage, such as solar, wind power and change to landscaping.
- Possible reduction of GHG through truck electrification. May be an opportunity for a partnership with the trucking industry.
Timeline

- **June 7**
  - Material to present to RTD meeting and STAC in June

- **June 28th**
  - Tentative Date for Rest Area Webinar
    - External stakeholder engagement

- **June (TBD)**
  - CDOT Maintenance Staff engagement

- **July**
  - Refine policy based on comments
  - Recommendations
Contact Information

Marissa Gaughan
CDOT MPO and Regional Planning
303-512-4235
Marissa.Gaughan@state.co.us

Thank you!

El Morro Rest Area
Rest Area Policy Working Group #3
June 7th 3:30-5pm
CDOT HQ Shumate Bldg. Mt. Evans A & B
Zoom Link: https://cdot.zoom.us/j/3866004070

1. Review Draft Policy Statement and Definitions
2. Review Tiers and Tier Matrix
3. Next Steps (tentative timeline)
   • Vet with CDOT maintenance staff – June
   • Webinar to engage external stakeholder groups – July 18th at 12pm
   • STAC Presentation – July
   • RTD Meeting – July or August
CDOT Rest Area Policy Guidance
Meeting # 3
June 7, 2017 – 3:30-5 p.m.
CDOT Mt. Evans A and B

Attendees - CDOT: Marissa Gaughan, Project Manager; Jeff Sudmeier, Multimodal Planning Branch Manager; Sarah Mitchell, Environmental Programs; Michael King and Gail Hoffman, Statewide Planning; Lenore Bates, Scenic Byways; Bob Wilson, Communications; Mark Rogers, CDOT Region 3; Karen Schneiders, CDOT Region 4 (via phone); Allison Bejarno, Information Management Branch. Colorado Tourism Office: Mateo Henderson, Director of Visitor Services. Consultant: ???. Federal Highway Administration (FHWA): Bill Haas, Gabby ?, and ??.

Purpose:
Establish a vision and policy guidance for rest areas (RAs) in Colorado. Continue the discussion to review: draft policy statement and definitions, tiers and tier matrix, and tentative timeline.

Background

- Attendees introduced themselves.
- Handouts were: Agenda; Rest Area Tiers Matrix; Rest Area Policy Statement and Policy Definitions; and Partnership and Sustainability Considerations.

Review Draft Policy Statement and Definitions

Revised Policy Statement (draft policy description provided in meeting handout)

“CDOT should ensure that public rest area facilities or acceptable alternatives are available with reasonable spacing along interstates and key corridors within the state for the safety, comfort, convenience, and information needs of motorists. Rest area parking and comfort stations should be free of charge and accessible at all hours. Rest areas at key entrances to the state should be provided to help promote tourism and economic vitality. CDOT should pursue partnerships at rest areas to maximize both effectiveness and cost containment, and to promote safety and sustainability.”

These definitions were discussed:

- Acceptable Alternatives – Jeff Sudmeier asked if CDOT would need to provide a rest area if acceptable alternatives exist in sufficient quantity. The responses were if there are enough acceptable alternatives in sufficient density, that might be the case. But it’s also important to have redundancy in rest areas in case of emergencies, as well as signage alerting travelers to the locations of acceptable alternatives.
- Information Needs – Lenore Bates noted that information kiosks detailing historic sites are provided at some rest areas. If a rest area is moved, those kiosks may need to be kept in place due to their varying contracts and funding sources: Scenic Byways, History Colorado, and local governments and entities.

Review Tiers and Tier Matrix

- Among the amenities listed in the matrix could be not only pet areas with leashing required, but off-leash dog parks.
- Revising the titles of Tier 4 – Seasonal and Tier 5 – Recreational could be considered to give CDOT more flexibility for partnerships, funding, and commercialization opportunities if not classified as rest areas in the federal sense.
- It was noted that the Glenwood Canyon rest areas often are so full that it’s a safety hazard navigating through them to find empty parking spaces. Truckers use the rest areas although designated truck parking doesn’t exist.
- Sarah Mitchell asked if there’s any way to collect data on how used various rest areas are as part of an assessment for tiering and for potential rest area closure. The consultant said an attempt was made to use water usage as a proxy, but not all the rest areas have water.
- Mateo Henderson also noted that not all Welcome Centers are open year around or offer a wide range of amenities. He said the Julesburg Welcome Center is the most heavily used of the Welcome Centers.

Next Steps/Timeline:

- Vet with CDOT maintenance staff – June
  - Sarah Mitchell said she’s had trouble obtaining information from maintenance people on sustainable practices at rest areas. She asked if Marissa could try to find out at the meeting.
- Webinar to engage external stakeholder groups – July 18 at noon
  - People will be asked to take a brief survey when they register.
- STAC Presentation – July
- RTD Meeting – July or August
  - Results from the survey of stakeholders should be back to inform the RTD discussion.
Rest Area Policy Working Group #4
July 27th 4-5pm
CDOT HQ RM 159
Zoom Link: https://cdot.zoom.us/j/7874253347

1. Update on what’s happened since we last met
   • Direction from RTDs
2. Review CDOT-Owned Rest Area Inventory
   • Analysis of CDOT Rest Areas using criteria from the Rest Area Policy
   • Safety Criteria – Need Region Help
   • Are we missing any criteria?
3. Next Steps (tentative timeline)
   • Maintenance Supers Meeting – August 1st
   • Present Rest Area Inventory to RTDs – August / September
   • Webinar to engage external stakeholder groups – Late Summer
   • STAC Presentation – September or October
CDOT Rest Area Policy Guidance

Maintenance Supers Meeting – August 2017
What are we trying to accomplish?

- Develop Rest Area Policy Statement that includes:
  - Policy Definitions
  - Policy Guidance
  - Rest Area Tier Structure
- Policy Statement is based on:
  - Work Group Input
    - CDOT: Region Planners, Safety, TSM&O, Communications, DTD, DTR, CRBRC
    - External: FHWA, STAC, TPRs, Colorado Tourism Office
  - CDOT Property Management Rest Area Study that assessed condition, function, and needs of CDOT rest areas. The Policy Statement establishes guidance and criteria so we can use the data collected in the Rest Area Study to determine if and how to invest at our rest areas.
  - ADA Accessibility Evaluation Findings
What are we trying to accomplish?
Rest Area Policy Statement

CDOT should ensure that public rest area facilities or acceptable alternatives are available with reasonable spacing along interstates and key corridors within the state for the safety, comfort, convenience, and information needs of motorists.

Rest area parking and comfort stations should be free of charge and accessible at all hours. Rest areas at key entrances to the state should be provided to help drive tourism and economic vitality. CDOT should pursue partnerships at rest areas to maximize both effectiveness and funding opportunities, and to promote safety and sustainability.
Rest Area Tiers

Safety Rest Area Tiers
- Tier 1 - Rest Area Welcome Centers
- Tier 2 - Standard Rest Areas
- Tier 3 - Basic Rest Areas

“Unconventional” Rest Areas
- Seasonal
- Recreational
- Other

See handout for list of Rest Area Amenities by tier.
Next Steps

1. Get your feedback on the policy statement/guidance and rest area tiers.
2. Assess the DOT Rest Areas using criteria and attributes based on the Policy Statement and Property Management Study.
3. Share results of that assessment, and make refinements to policy, if needed.
4. Continue to refine and vet with work group as we move forward.
Next Steps

Stakeholder involvement (Summer/Fall):
- RTD Meeting
- Executive Management Team
- Public (Webinar)
- STAC
- FAC
- TC

Contact Information:
Marissa Gaughan  
CDOT MPO and Regional Planning  
303-512-4235  
Marissa.Gaughan@state.co.us
CDOT Rest Area Program

Current and Next Steps, plus areas for future consideration

Current Phase

- Translate rest area policy guidance into criteria and apply to inventory of CDOT owned rest areas.
- Present and get feedback from:
  - Regional Transportation Directors
  - Maintenance Superintendents
  - Executive Management Team
  - Statewide Transportation Advisory Committee
  - Freight Advisory Committee
  - Transportation Commission
  - Public (surveys and webinar)
- Finalize Policy Guidance and Criteria

Next Steps

- Conduct additional data collection on rest area usage
- Develop Implementation Plan and Estimate Costs
  - Identify site specific recommendations (closure, repurpose, improvements, etc.)
  - Identify strategies for implementation
    - Funding
    - Maintenance
    - Sustainability / Energy Consumption
    - Partnerships
    - Opportunities

Potential Future Phases

Laundry list of areas/topics for future consideration

- Assess need and approach to formalization of policy, including possible adaptation as a formal Transportation Commission Policy Directive. Review and modify, as needed, with the Transportation Commission.
- Explore further partnership opportunities with Colorado Tourism Office.
- Further coordination with the Forest Service on Forest Service Rest Areas, including maintenance agreements and system assessments.
- “Safe Phone Zones” – Market CDOT Rest Areas as Safe Phone Zones. Other states have done this successfully, and have found sponsorship opportunities in this area.
- Findings from the Rest Area Policy Guidance and Study will be integrated into the CDOT Truck Parking Study, which just kicked off.
- Legislation Changes – Opportunities for commercializing Rest Areas, including concepts such as using rest areas for EV charging, that may not be possible now under current federal and state laws.
Appendix B
Research Summaries
The following is a list of national publications and similar studies completed by other states that have been consulted in the preparation of the CDOT Rest Area and Truck Parking Study.

**National Publications**

- AASHTO Guide for Development of Rest Areas on Major Arterials and Freeways
- Model Development for National Assessment of Commercial Vehicle Parking, FHWA
- Rest Area Forum: Summary of Proceedings. Publication No. FHWA-RD-00-034, FHWA
- *Jason’s Law Truck Parking Survey Results and Comparative Analysis*. Office of Freight Management and Operations. FHWA.

**State Specific Rest Area Studies**

- North Jersey Truck Rest Stop Study ([link](#))
- Connecticut (CT) Statewide Rest Area and Service Plaza Study ([link](#))
- Florida DOT: Commercial Motor Vehicle Parking Trends at Rest Areas and Weigh Stations ([link](#))
- New York Metropolitan Transportation Council: Multi-State Truck Stop Inventory and Assessment Study ([link](#))
- Illinois Center for Transportation: Truckers’ Park/Rest Facility Study ([link](#))
- CalTrans California’s Vision Safety Roadside Rest Area System ([link](#))
- Iowa DOT, Commercial Vehicle Parking ([link](#))
- Minnesota DOT, Truck Parking Availability Study
- Maryland DOT, Maryland Truck Parking Study ([link](#))
- South Dakota DOT, The Interstate Rest Areas Study: Along the I-29 and I-90 Corridors ([link](#))
- New York State Department of Transportation Region 8 (NYSDOT Region 8), I-84 Commercial Vehicle Parking/Rest Area Study ([link](#))
- Pennsylvania State Transportation Advisory Committee, Truck Parking in Pennsylvania ([link](#))
- Preliminary Truck Parking Inventory of the Interstate 81 Corridor: A Cataloging of Commercial Truck Stops and Public Rest Areas

**Other Publications**

- Truck Parking Issues at State Facilities in Colorado, CDOT
- Colorado I-70, I-25, I-76 Truck Parking Guide, CDOT
- Truck Parking at Night Along Interstate Highways—University of Tennessee
- NATSO, Rest Area Commercialization and Truck Parking Capacity
- Truck Stop Directory, Interstate America
- Heavy Commercial Vehicle Flow Atlas of the United States National Highway System. Univ. of Manitoba
Goals
The Guide provides an overview of components necessary to establish and maintain a successful statewide rest-area program and describes the range of services to be provided.

Abstract
Transportation officials must recognize the importance of rest areas. The primary responsibility of the state to persons using highway systems is safety, and rest areas are an important instrument for its improvement. Accident reduction is their primary function. Greater highway safety is the major benefit in establishing rest areas, through safe off-road locations for motorists to rest, sleep, change drivers, and check vehicle loads and/or minor mechanical problems. Additional benefits for motorists are relief from extended travel time and increased comfort and convenience.

Well-designed, well-maintained rest areas also create positive images for out-of-state motorists and enhance quality of life for the state’s own residents. They provide opportunities for state transportation agencies and tourism groups to communicate with motorists in promoting state and local programs, and to provide road ad weather information and such directional services as maps, routing suggestions, traffic incident warnings, and road construction schedules.

Once a rest area program is established, then management, research, and planning must become continuing activities to document user needs, to identify issues impacting rehabilitation and new development, to monitor issues and changes affecting program decisions, and to establish mechanisms communicating program purpose, service needs, and benefits to state and local transportation planners.

Managements’ commitment to a rest area development program should include establishing and supporting statewide program objectives, priorities, and funding levels as a part of each state’s overall infrastructure development objectives.

Conclusions
The primary goal of a rest area development program is to establish and maintain a comprehensive system responsive to safety and service needs of commercial and recreational motorists. All highway rest areas should provide safe stopping opportunities separated from highway traffic in an environment promoting relief from stresses of long distance driving.
Other Findings

The guide provides direction for completing Needs Assessments and Development Guidelines.

Needs Assessments should address both issues and corridor factors. A comprehensive, system wide recommendations for investment planning may include the following:

- Replace or expand areas that fail to meet current design standards and user capacity needs
- Correct health and safety deficiencies
- Rehabilitate existing facilities to extend useful lives
- Relocate or eliminate rest areas that are inappropriately located
- Construct new rest areas to augment the system and meet motorist needs
- Investigate partnerships and alternative funding programs

Development Guidelines should provide a sound foundation for planning, location, and design of rest areas. The guidelines should address:

- Types of traffic serve
- Site-spacing
- Tourism and information services
- Special site opportunities
- Range of service provided
- Maintenance required
- Utilities provided
- Concurrent construction opportunities and funding strategies
- Security
- Opportunities for combining facilities or functions

The Guide also provides information on:

- Upgrading Existing Rest Areas
- Locating New Rest Areas
- Site development and details
- Maintenance and Operation Plan

The Guide also provides information on Predictive Use Modal Parameters and the current spacing recommendation of 60 miles.
Goals

This study assessed the adequacy of truck parking along Interstate highways at both public rest areas and privately owned truck stops. The goal was to generate an up-to-date nationwide compilation of information about the supply, use, governing State and local statues, and present and future demand for parking at those facilities. Drawing on study findings, the study also suggested policies and programs to meet parking and rest needs.

Abstract

The steady growth in trucking nationwide appears to have increased the demand for rest areas along the Nation’s highways. In part, this is reflected by evidence that, increasingly, truck drivers seeking rest are parking illegally along highway shoulders and entrance and exit ramps. Rather than at either public rest areas or private truck stops.

Public rest areas on the highways system provide parking for automobile and truck drivers, as well as rest rooms. In most cases, vending machines are offered for food and beverages. Most private truck stops are located close to Interstate ramps and provide services such as fuel, showers, sleeping quarters, and restaurants, in addition to truck parking space. These differences in services provided apparently contribute significantly to truck drivers’ decisions about where to stop and for how long.

The research provides direct observation of truck parking activities at public rest areas, surveys of driver needs and attitudes, and a nationwide inventory of public rest areas. The comprehensive assessment of public rest areas projected a current shortfall of 28,400 truck parking spaces in public rest areas nationwide.

The process was followed to assess the supply and demand for long-term truck parking at private truck stops. This assessment determined that about 1/3 of truck stop operators, plan to expand their parking facilities. This would increase total projected capacity from 185,000 truck parking spaces to more than 213,000. However, analysis found no conclusive evidence that private truck stops and public rest areas are direct substitutes for each other. Rather, they are complementary.

Projected costs to meet future truck parking demands total between $489 and $629 million.

Conclusions

The problem of inadequate truck parking can only be met by creative strategies to help facilitate future rest area spending decisions over the next 10 years. Failure to solve the truck parking shortage could pose significant risks to the travelling public by forcing tired drivers to continue driving, or park on inherently dangerous locations such as ramps and shoulders.

Data Collection Methods

- Stakeholder Surveys (drivers, motor carrier executives, private truck stop operators)
- Direct observations
- Model analysis
Other Information / Findings

- Few states have parking regulations targeted specifically at trucks.
- Most states have design standards for rest areas.
- Most facilities provide restrooms, picnic tables, drinking water, and telephones.
- Nearly eight in ten rest areas report truck parking utilization as either full or overflowing onto the tramps at night.
- During the day, nearly half of the rest areas are full or overflowing.
- Parking areas for cars are underutilized, both during the day and the nights.
- Truck will park on shoulders and ramps to avoid parallel parking.
- Many states are reluctant to enforce laws against parking on shoulders and ramps because they prefer the truck drivers rest when they are tired.
- More than 90 percent of truck drivers believe there is a parking shortage.
- For short-term parking (less than 2 hours) truck drivers prefer public rest areas.
- Nearly 70% of truck drivers prefer private parking for overnight rest needs.
- The majority of truck drivers rated private truck stops as excellent or good, while the majority rate public rest areas as fair or poor.
- Many motor carrier executives believe that parking capacity should be increased at public rest areas and at private truck stops. Motor carrier executives believe that drivers prefer privately owned truck stops over public rest areas for long-term parking.
- Truck Stop Operators recognize that truck stops are the preferred location for truck drivers to park and sleep. Operator recognize a shortage of adequate long-term parking and site the biggest obstacles to increasing capacity at their facilities are cost and available land.
- The Truck Parking Demand Model (See FHWA Model Development for National Assessment of Commercial Vehicle Parking) correctly predicts demand 76% of the time. The factors that are statistically significant in predicting a rest area’s parking utilization include one-way ADT, distance from previous rest area, distance to then next interchange, adequate lighting, welcome centers, food facilities, attendants, repair facilities, and picnic tables.
- The total Colorado statewide shortfall estimate of truck parking spaces from the model is 420 spaces. The total truck parking spaces in rest areas is 26; the current requirements are 709; current spaces available 289. An estimate to provide the 420 spaces was calculated as $6.3 to $8.3M.
- Private Truck Stop characteristics include located close to a ramp (within ¾ mile), parking is free, has lighting, is paved, striped and secured at night.
- Using a systematic planning process states should examine the relationship between accident rates and parking shortfall estimates and between maintenance expenditures on damaged shoulders and the shortfall in truck parking spaces.
Goals
As part of the effort to respond to the congressional mandate, the current study measured truck driver parking needs and preferences. Through a nationwide survey of truck drivers, the study sought to determine:

Abstract
This research assessed truck driver parking needs and preferences in accordance with Section 4027 of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century. A survey was conducted to determine how truck drivers plan for and address their parking needs; how truck drivers select when, where, and at which facilities they park; and what truck drivers think of the adequacy of current parking facilities. This report summarizes the background, methodology, and outcome of the driver survey.

Surveys were distributed to a national sample of more than 2,000 truck drivers through site visits and mailings to truck stops. The sample included male and female drivers; independent owner/operators; and drivers for small-, mid-, and large-sized carriers. The majority of respondents identified themselves as long-haul drivers. Nearly all drivers reported that they, not their company colleagues, decide where they will park. Most drivers make this decision as they are driving. When drivers park their trucks, most expect to satisfy only their basic needs. Drivers prefer parking facilities that provide food, fuel, restrooms, phones, and showers. They also consider safety and convenience important. Drivers generally prefer private truck stops to public rest areas. However, for quick naps drivers showed a preference for rest areas over truck stops. Many respondents indicated they have trouble finding available parking at rest areas and truck stops. In fact, drivers asserted that building more truck stop and rest area spaces would be the best way to improve the parking situation. Survey respondents indicated that the parking facilities they encounter generally have characteristics that make those facilities usable. But, drivers did recommend that time limits be eliminated and that parking lot layouts be improved to accommodate large trucks.

Conclusions
Drivers need more parking spaces and they would like to find those spaces in clean, safe parking facilities. When drivers park their trucks, they want access to basic amenities.

Other Findings
Nearly all drivers reported that they, not their company colleagues, decide where they will park. Most drivers make the decision as they are driving. Drivers commented that they find it difficult to plan parking before they embark on their trips because their schedules often change.

Because truck stops typically provide showers, restaurants, and repair facilities, it is not surprising that drivers generally prefer private truck stops to public rest areas.
**Goals**

- Estimate the extent and geographic distribution of truck rest parking supply, demand, and shortages (current and projected) along the National Highway System (NHS) using existing national and State inventories and studies.
- Provide technical support to public-private partnerships in various States in carrying out their initiatives and preparing their plans of action.
- Determine how commercial vehicle drivers plan for and address their parking needs for both short-duration and Federal hours-of-service rest; how drivers select when, where, and at what facility they park; and how and why drivers decide to use public versus private parking facilities.

**Abstract**

The objective of this research was to estimate the extent and geographic distribution of truck rest parking supply and demand along the National Highway System in accordance with Section 4027 of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century. This report presents the development, calibration, validation, and application of the truck parking demand model used to meet the Section 4027 requirements.

The parking demand model developed for this study estimates parking demand for a highway segment (defined by the analyst) rather than a single parking facility. The model incorporates a variety of factors known to affect the demand for truck parking, which include: traffic engineering factors (e.g., annual average daily traffic, travel time, peak hour factors), truck driver behaviors (e.g., time spent loading/unloading, time spent at home, time spent resting at shipper/receiver), and Federal hours-of-service regulations (e.g., a maximum 70 hours on duty in eight days). A step-by-step method for selecting analysis segments and applying the model is presented. The first step in alleviating parking shortages is to identify the locations where shortages exist. The demand model is a good first step in achieving this goal. Overall, the model produces acceptable estimates of parking space demand. For 29 segments where parking counts were conducted, the model error was only –2 percent, an estimate within 269 spaces of the observed parked trucks. However, the model is not microscopic enough to always accurately predict segment-specific demand. This is because the model does not consider a number of factors that can affect the local distribution of demand (e.g., proximity to distribution centers that results in “staging,” proximity to other parking facilities that absorb demand, and factors that affect the short-haul/long-haul ratio). Because of these limitations, the model should be used as a guideline for identifying possible locations of parking shortages that can be evaluated more carefully through additional study and field observations.

**Conclusions**

In conclusion, one of the most powerful features of the truck parking demand model is its ability to estimate future demand so that long-range plans can be formulated. States could use this model to identify locations with possible parking shortages, then, based on local knowledge and field observations, refine the model to better reflect local conditions. The refined model could then be used to make projections of parking demand for long-range planning purposes.
Data Collection Methods

- Model parameters were calibrated using overnight field observations of parked trucks in eight States: Arkansas, Georgia, Idaho, Mississippi, Missouri, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and Virginia.
- Observational studies were performed on 29 segments of highway in these eight States representing four regions and ten corridors.
- Two model parameters were calibrated: the long-haul peak parking factor (PPFLH) and the short-haul to long-haul ratio (PSH/PLH) ratio.
- Survey responses from over 2,000 truck drivers.

Other Information / Findings

More than 90 percent of commercial drivers surveyed perceived that there was a shortage of truck parking, particularly for long-term or overnight parking. In addition, the survey results showed some important distinctions between public rest areas and private truck stops. The majority of drivers expressed a preference for public rest areas for short-term parking, while two-thirds indicated a preference for private truck stops for long-term rest needs, thus suggesting a distinction of the facility types in terms of the needs that they serve.

The results of the occupancy studies showed that the rest areas were overflowing with trucks at night, as evidenced by trucks parked along the shoulders of highway exit and entrance ramps, as well as on interchange ramps. While rest areas were overflowing, Model Development for National Assessment of Commercial Vehicle Parking Background 4 approximately 30 percent of the private truck parking spaces were not occupied, and the unoccupied private parking spaces outnumbered the trucks parked along the highways by nearly a three-to-one ratio. (Tennessee)

“To understand why some truck drivers park along the highway when there are available private parking spaces, in-depth interviews were held with five drivers. Opinions of the drivers interviewed were quite consistent. The findings were that private truck stops and public rest areas are not substitutes for each other because they meet different needs. While private truck stops are used when there is a need for fuel, a meal, or other amenities, drivers want to pull over as soon as possible when they feel sleepy. In such situations, they prefer to pull off at the nearest rest area or park wherever they can, even on the shoulders of ramps. In addition, drivers reported that it is difficult to find a convenient space in many private truck stops because the parking is not well designed, and there is a risk of minor accidents and damage when moving in and out of these parking lots (Tennessee)

- Approximately 14 percent of the commercial vehicles on eastbound I-94 utilized the rest areas.
- 20% of the commercial vehicles surveyed arrived before 11:00 p.m.
- 20% of the commercial vehicles surveyed departed after 7:00 a.m.
- Over the entire week for all rest areas, the oversized lots were at or over capacity 45 percent of the time.
- None of the rest areas were at capacity at 11:00 p.m.
- Almost 60 percent of the commercial vehicles arriving before 11:00 p.m. stayed for five hours or more.
Of the commercial vehicles arriving between 11:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., approximately 20 percent stayed in the rest area less than four minutes. One in three stayed eight minutes or less during the survey times.

The study conclusions were that commercial vehicle drivers who arrived at the rest areas before 11:00 p.m. tended to be able to find parking spaces. Once parked, they often stayed for most of the night. (Minnesota)

A key recommendation made by CTRE was that the State of Iowa should continue to be in the business of providing some overnight parking, as the Task Force believed that the State could not expect the private sector to meet all overnight parking demands. (Iowa)

The inventory included the number of parking spaces, facilities offered, distance from previous rest area and nearest city, operation time and parking time limits, average daily traffic and truck traffic, distance to the next interchange, and number of private parking spaces within ten miles. (Michigan)

National truck parking assessment process.
1 Identify major trucking corridors and select analysis segments
2 Inventory public and private parking space supply for each segment
3 Apply truck parking demand model for each segment and compare to supply

The Interstate America’s Truck Stop Directory is a comprehensive database with location and amenity information of private truck stop/travel plaza facilities.
Demand Problem Summary:

Demand
L - Length
AADT
Pt - Percent trucks
S - Speed
SH – Short Haul
LH – Long Haul
Supply
P_{RA} - Parking at Rest Areas
P_{TS} - Parking at Truck Stops

Using equations (1) through (12) and the parameter values shown in table 2, the short- and long-haul parking space demand is calculated:

Seasonal peak daily truck volume: \( V_t = \text{AADT} \times \text{Pt} \times F_s \)
Segment truck travel time per trip: \( TT = \frac{L}{S} \)
Truck-hours of SH and LH travel: \( THTSH = PSH \times V_t \times TT \)
\( THTLH = PLH \times V_t \times TT \)
Truck-hrs of SH parking demand: \( THPSH = \frac{TPS}{THTSH} \times THTSH / 12 \)
Truck-hrs of LH parking demand: \( THPLH = \frac{TPS}{THTLH} \times THTSH \)
Peak-hour parking demand for SH: \( PHPSH = PPFSH \times THPSH \)
Peak-hour parking demand for LH: \( PHPLH = PPFLH \times THPLH \)
SH and LH peak-hour parking demand by facility type: \( PHP(SH,RA) = PRA \times PHPSH \)
\( PHP(LH,RA) = PRA \times PHPLH \)
\( PHP(LH,TS) = PTS \times PHPSH \)

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Activity Average Time (hours)</th>
<th>Preference for Rest Area (# of drivers)</th>
<th>Preference for No (# of drivers)</th>
<th>Preference for Truck Stop (# of drivers)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restroom</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>208 (27%)</td>
<td>334 (44%)</td>
<td>222 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eat a meal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8 (1%)</td>
<td>63 (9%)</td>
<td>668 (90%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quick nap</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>328 (43%)</td>
<td>287 (38%)</td>
<td>143 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended rest</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>47 (6%)</td>
<td>108 (14%)</td>
<td>593 (79%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vending machines</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>227 (31%)</td>
<td>400 (54%)</td>
<td>111 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phones</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>138 (18%)</td>
<td>340 (45%)</td>
<td>276 (37%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel information</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>85 (12%)</td>
<td>370 (50%)</td>
<td>278 (38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Preference for Rest Area (# of drivers reporting preference multiplied by average time for activity)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restroom</td>
<td>52 (88.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eat a meal</td>
<td>8 (63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quick nap</td>
<td>328 (287)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended rest</td>
<td>235 (540)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vending machines</td>
<td>56.75 (100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phones</td>
<td>34 (85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel information</td>
<td>21.25 (92.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total truck-hours of parking</td>
<td>735.5 (1251)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Proportion of parking demand for rest areas and truck stops</td>
<td>Facility Demand (% truck-hours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest Areas</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck Stops</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Goals
This study examined the current state of truck parking and rest area facilities in the Northeast Illinois Region to determine if and how problems from truck parking affect freight transportation infrastructure, safety, and the region’s economy and environment.

Abstract
A taxonomic study of truck traffic volume and truck parking availability was completed. Truck parking sites for this report comprise private and public sites. Interviews were conducted with state, county, municipal authorities, and truck drivers. The primary problems found involved two groups of truckers. One group is the independent, over-the-road drivers with Chicagoland deliveries and pickups. This group has fewer resources available for securing parking when needed. These truckers are responsible for much of the ‘nuisance’ parking in residential, retail, or manufacturing areas. The second group contributing to nuisance parking is local company drivers who park in areas designed for over-the-road truckers and access ramps. The consequences of nuisance parking include safety hazards, problematic environmental effects from emissions and toxins, and a diminished freight transportation system affecting the local economy. Recommendations are given. Solutions include: improving parking sites by creating additional parking for the drivers needing it; and re-using brownfield sites, underutilized retail and manufacturing parking areas, and seasonally affected sites to create additional parking. Communication of site availability via radio or other means is also proposed.

Conclusions
Recommendations are given. Solutions include: improving parking sites by creating additional parking for the drivers needing it; and re-using brownfield sites, underutilized retail and manufacturing parking areas, and seasonally affected sites to create additional parking. Communication of site availability via radio or other means is also proposed.

Data Collection Methods
Parking supply-spatial
Research methods—interviews
Research methods—direct observation of overnight truck parking

Other Information / Findings
The research team found truck parking problems, primarily involving local company drivers and independent, over-the-road drivers making Chicagoland deliveries and pickups. The local company drivers have been parking in rest areas designed for over-the-road truckers and on highway access ramps. The independent over-the-road drivers, however, have few resources available for securing parking when needed and have been largely responsible for “nuisance” parking in residential, retail, or manufacturing areas. These parking problems create safety hazards, harmful emissions
and toxins, and a diminished freight transportation system that adversely affects the economy.

In May 2000, the National Transportation Safety Board completed a report, which incorporated a 1999 American Trucking Association survey and a 1999 Owner-Operator Independent Drivers Association membership survey.

The American Trucking Association has compiled statistics on trucking activities by driver type and operating characteristics. The following list defines each of the driver types that the American Trucking Association uses:

• Truckload drivers refer to a combination of owner-operators and company fleet drivers who run locally, regionally, and/or internationally. Many of these drivers pick-up freight from one owner and deliver it to its purchaser and therefore run irregular routes. Some of these drivers operate on teams, while others share tractors.
• Less Than Truckload drivers predominantly provide regional, expedited delivery of small packages or small quantities of freight. Their shipments are consolidated at terminals loaded on trucks bound for other areas of the region. At the destination terminals, the trucks are unloaded and the packages are distributed. These drivers typically run fixed routes and have a predictable schedule. Some drivers are union, some are independent.
• Private truck drivers are typically contract drivers who run fixed routes within a network of locations typically owned by a single entity within a fixed distribution network.

Truckers need to keep track of how many miles they travel though a state. They need to buy the amount of gas it takes to travel through the state in order to pay off their road tax.

In a series of listening sessions, state partner groups recommended the following short-term actions:

• Construct new public rest areas with additional truck parking spaces
• Consider public truck parking only rest areas
• Increase the priority of public rest area construction
• Add new truck parking spaces to existing public rest areas
• Redesign rest areas to improve vehicle circulation through the lot
• Convert parallel parking to pull-through parking for trucks
• Convert closed public rest areas into parking facilities
• Investigate the use of federal funds for rest area maintenance
• Explore alternative financing of public rest area construction
• Develop pilot projects for public rest areas
• Partner with other state agencies, such as the Department of Tourism
• Improve security at current sites with call boxes, cameras, and enforcement
• Identify combining use of current ports-of-entry, weigh stations, and police substations with truck parking facilities

Public rest areas and commercial truck stops are very different facilities. It is important to note that commercial enterprises offer many incentives and repeat purchasing programs to
build brand loyalty. Given an option, truckers generally prefer to park in a familiar area and frequent locations where a wide range of services are provided. Providing information on parking availability is one way to smooth demand in overcrowded areas. Examples of information initiatives for the future include the following:

• Educate drivers on the safety benefits of rest and related driver fatigue symptoms
• Develop ITS systems to deploy real-time information on current availability
• Publish a “Truckers Map” to pinpoint commercial truck parking areas
• Distribute parking information in credential mailings
• Use improved signage to inform users of parking availability

Policy and enforcement changes have been considered by several states, which include:

• Increased enforcement of parking rules at interchange ramps
• Changing parking limits to permit trucks more time at public rest areas
• Encouraging more local government and business support for operating commercial truck stop facilities
• Encouraging better recognition of credit and tax incentives for terminal operators who provide 24 hour access to “truck staging areas”
• Establishing building requirements for future warehouse and terminal facilities to incorporate truck parking and staging facilities as part of the development/building permitting process
• Encouraging public-private partnerships

Coordination with several stakeholder groups:
- Advocates for Auto and Highway safety
- America’s Road Team (ART)
- American Trucking Association (ATA) Foundation
- Commercial Vehicle Safety Alliance (CVSA)
- Motor Freight Carriers Association (MFCA)
- NATSO, Inc. the Assoc. representing America’s Travel Plazas and Truck Stops
- Owner-Operator Independent Driver Association (OOIDA)
- Parents against Tired Truckers (PATT)
- Petroleum Marketers Association of America (PMAA)
Goals
The NJTPA conducted this study as part of its comprehensive freight planning program. This report outlines the requirements, inventory, issues, and solutions to address the significant lack of truck parking spaces in the region.

Abstract
Truck parking facilities are an essential element of the region’s transportation infrastructure, accommodating fatigued drivers and enhancing safe travel. A 2000 National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) report indicated that driver fatigue may be a factor in as many as 30 to 40 percent of all heavy truck accidents in the U.S.

- Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and NJTPA surveys indicate that an overwhelming number of commercial truck drivers encounter a shortage of truck parking facilities, especially for long-term overnight parking. Most of the public rest areas and private truck stops in the NJTPA and surrounding regions are filled beyond capacity during these overnight periods. Truck traffic continues to grow, further straining capacity.
- Truck drivers often park on highway shoulders when there is insufficient space in parking facilities. Nearly 300 trucks were observed on the shoulders of major limited-access highways in the NJTPA region or on local roads in the port area, near rail yards, or adjacent to warehouse and distribution centers during one weekday night August 2006. These parked trucks represent a serious potential safety hazard to passing motorists.
- There are nearly 1,400 parking spaces in the NJTPA region at NJDOT Rest Areas, NJ Turnpike Service Areas, and private truck stops. On any given night there is a need for an additional 1,300 in those corridors with excess parking demand. Of the 34 regional truck parking facilities 82 percent were observed over capacity.
- Because most truck parking facilities in the region are currently operating over their design capacity during periods of peak activity, most of the future growth in truck parking demand will likely be accommodated through illegal parking on highway shoulders and on local streets. A 10 percent increase in peak parking demand could potentially result in a doubling of illegal truck parking activity on highway shoulders.
- Eighty-two percent of the region’s truck parking facilities were observed over capacity in the summer of 2006. Those that were underutilized are small private stops with a limited number of spaces, well off the regional highway system, in lower demand areas, or designated for tandem trailer drop-off/staging.
- The activity at facilities varies by locations but there are unique characteristics between short and long haul trucks and the impacts they have on the utilization of regional parking facilities. Drivers parked for the short term constitute the majority of truck traffic into and out of facilities, however the long-term drivers utilize most of the parking capacity.

Conclusions
Policy/Institutional
1. Secure sites as a necessary land use
2. Advance favorable federal legislation that promotes innovation and public-private partnerships
3. Pursue alternative fuels, energy and environmental opportunities
4. Advance complementary land use approaches
Planning and Finance
1. Provide incentives for private sector development of truck parking
2. Incorporate truck parking as a future design parameter for facility improvement planning and design
3. Integrate truck parking as an element of port and intermodal facility

Partnering
1. Promote public/private partnerships
2. Collaborate on a broader scale with neighboring DOTs, MPO regions, and local planning officials

New/Expanded Sites for Additional Parking Capacity

Data Collection Methods
• NJTPA Truck Parking Database
• Detailed Methodology for Calculating Truck Parking Demand
• Trucking Industry Telephone Interview Questionnaire
• Driver Interview Web Survey

Other Information / Findings
Federal Regulations
The hours truck drivers can be behind the wheel dictate, in large part, the demand for parking. The Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA) instituted revised hours-of-service regulations (49 CFR, Part 395) in August of 2005. Under these rules, long-haul truck operators are:
• Permitted to drive up to 11 hours in an on-duty window of 14 hours after they’ve been off-duty for a minimum of 10 consecutive hours.
• Limited to 60 on-duty hours in seven consecutive days, or 70 hours in eight consecutive days.
• Permitted to restart the seven and eight day windows once a driver is off duty for 34 consecutive hours.
The regulations also contain special short-haul provisions for truck drivers who operate within a 150-miles radius of their normal work location. These drivers:
• May operate their vehicles for a maximum of 11 hours after being off duty for at least 10 consecutive hours.
• Are limited to a total of 14 hours after five on-duty days in a week and a total of 16 hours after two on-duty days in a week.
• Are not required to keep detailed records of off-duty status (RODS).
• Must maintain accurate time records for a period of six months that show all on-duty start and end times and total on-duty hours each day.

Site Evaluation Criteria:
• Parcel Size
• Ownership
• Proximity to Interstate System
• Bi-Directional Accessibility
• Compatible Land Use
• Nearest Alternate Parking Site
• Utilization of Nearest Alternate Site
• Anticipated Level of Demand Satisfaction
Goals
In 1998, Congress issued a mandate that research be conducted to determine the location and quantity of parking spaces at public rest areas and private truck stops along the National Highway System (see section 4027 of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century). The congressional mandate specifies that current and projected truck parking shortages be assessed. To accurately assess shortages, it is necessary to go beyond a simple count of parking spaces available across the Country. Shortages must be estimated by measuring the parking supply in light of regional, driver-preference, and other influencing factors.

As part of the effort to respond to the congressional mandate, the current study measured truck driver parking needs and preferences. Through a nationwide survey of truck drivers, the study sought to determine:
- How truck drivers plan for and address their parking needs.
- How truck drivers select when, where, and at which facilities they park.
- What truck drivers think of the adequacy of current parking facilities.

Abstract
This research assessed truck driver parking needs and preferences in accordance with Section 4027 of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century. A survey was conducted to determine how truck drivers plan for and address their parking needs; how truck drivers select when, where, and at which facilities they park; and what truck drivers think of the adequacy of current parking facilities. This report summarizes the background, methodology, and outcome of the driver survey.

Surveys were distributed to a national sample of more than 2,000 truck drivers through site visits and mailings to truck stops. The sample included male and female drivers; independent owner/operators; and drivers for small-, mid-, and large-sized carriers. The majority of respondents identified themselves as long-haul drivers.

Conclusions
How Truck Drivers Plan for and Address Their Parking Needs
Nearly all drivers reported that they, not their company colleagues, decide where they will park. Most drivers make the decision as they are driving. Drivers commented that they find it difficult to plan parking before they embark on their trips because their schedules often change. For example, shipper and receiver locations may be “backed up” and cause them delay in moving on to their next destination. Because they are delayed, drivers cannot travel as far in their remaining legal duty hours as originally planned.

They must choose a parking facility that comes sooner along the corridor they are traveling. Despite this impediment to parking planning, many drivers said that they can improvise because they know the location of most parking facilities.

How Truck Drivers Select When, Where, and at Which Facilities They Park
Drivers’ responses to the survey demonstrated definite preferences and priorities when they come to choosing where they will park. When drivers park their trucks, most expect to satisfy only their basic needs. Drivers prefer parking facilities that provide food, fuel, restrooms, phones, and showers. They also consider safety and convenience important when they park their trucks. Drivers do not consider entertainment and other “luxuries” to be necessary characteristics of a parking facility. As one driver urged, “I just want to find a place to park that is safe and available.” Because truck stops typically provide showers, restaurants, and repair facilities, it is not surprising that drivers generally prefer private truck stops to public rest areas. Rest areas are preferred only when drivers park for quick naps. For more lengthy activities such as eating a meal, resting for the night, or repairing a truck, drivers would choose truck stops whenever possible.
What Truck Drivers Think of the Adequacy of Current Parking Facilities

When members of the survey team approached drivers to introduce the study, the single most common verbal response given by drivers was “build more spaces.” A handful of drivers remarked that they don’t see a problem with truck parking, with one driver going so far as to say, “Drivers just need to learn how to park their trucks!” However, the majority of drivers seemed to consider the problem epidemic. A majority of survey respondents indicated that they rarely or almost never find available parking at public rest areas. Fewer respondents reported such consistent trouble finding available parking at private truck stops; however, the number one recommendation made by drivers for improving the parking situation was “build more truck stop spaces.” The popularity of this recommendation may reflect the fact that over three-quarters of respondents prefer to use truck stops for long-term rest. Most survey respondents indicated that the parking facilities they encounter generally have characteristics that make those facilities usable. But, drivers did recommend that time limits be eliminated and that parking lot layouts be improved to facilitate the ingress and egress of tractor-trailers that are commonly 53 feet in length.

Drivers indicated in both their written and verbal remarks that one sure way to improve the truck parking situation is to discourage law enforcement officers from waking sleeping drivers. Drivers reflected the same concern as stakeholders that safety is jeopardized when fatigued truck drivers are on the road. The drivers expressed a sense of responsibility for getting off the road whenever they feel tired.

Recommendations from the Rest Area Forum

From the many issues discussed during last year's two-day Rest Area Forum in Atlanta, seven top concerns emerged. These concerns and some of the recommendations for addressing them are listed below. The recommendations do not necessarily represent a consensus view of all forum participants and are not listed in priority order.

Concern: Providing Safety and Security in Public Rest Areas and at Privately Owned Truck Stops

Forum Recommendations:

- Locate enforcement office substations at facilities to increase police presence.
- Establish a rating system for private facilities.
- Increase crime-prevention services at public rest areas.
- Conduct crime-prevention surveys at private facilities.
- Staff rest areas.
- Install security systems, cameras, and lighting.
- Post signs at rest areas that give a point of contact for reporting crime.
- Provide incentives for drivers who report crime in rest areas and at truck stops.
- Design landscaping with safety and security in mind.
- Eliminate commercial motor vehicle inspections in rest areas.

Concern: Privately Owned Truck Stops' Ability to Meet the Rest Parking Need

Forum Recommendations:

- Assist privately owned truck stops to meet the commercial motor vehicle parking need through low-interest loans, partnerships in construction, and tax incentive/abatement.
- Establish partnering agreement between the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials and the National Association of Truck Stop Operators to develop general guidelines for truck stops.
- Post logo signing for facilities adopting those design guidelines.
• Use local law enforcement to patrol and respond to calls at private truck stops for a security presence.
• Explore hindrances to rest area/truck stop expansion and construction (e.g., diesel emissions, noise-control issues, citizen opposition).

Concern: Availability of Alternative Parking Sites
Forum Recommendations:
• Explore use of right of way at interchanges, comfort stations, and park-and-ride lots, Brownfields programs for staging sites, major mall parking lots, state fairgrounds, stadiums, farmers’ markets, schools, and receiving/shipping facilities.
• Provide parking at designated weigh stations.
• Use available government land/facilities to provide parking in extreme locations by redeveloping closed military bases and airports as truck stops, parking, shipping terminals, and warehouses.

Concern: Location of Rest Areas and Truck Stops
Forum Recommendations:
• Adopt uniform spacing standards (e.g., every 100 kilometers, approximately one hour apart).
• Encourage private/public partnerships to meet needs in areas with parking shortages.
• Eliminate institutional barriers to public/private partnership and local expansion.
• Encourage shippers/receivers in urban areas to accept responsibility for providing parking and avoiding situations where drivers are forced into violating hours-of-service rules.

Concern: Federal, State, and Local Financial Support Parking
Forum Recommendations:
• Reopen closed rest areas.
• Provide additional parking at existing rest areas.
• Raise the priority level of rest area construction, modification, and upkeep investments by making them safety-related issues (e.g., driver fatigue, commercial motor vehicle parking on ramps).
• Make public rest areas and weigh stations that provide parking an integral part of the interstate system by federal definition.
• Provide federal funds to reimburse states for maintenance of public rest areas.
• Engage federal officials at the highest level to work with the chief executive officers of the states to re-evaluate parking policies.
• Enlist "grassroots" support.
• Enact federal legislation to implement solutions to commercial vehicle parking problems.
• Encourage and remove barriers to private-sector investments.
• Develop model legislation for states related to private-sector investments.
• Explore possible use of federal or state discretionary funds to support rest area construction, modification, and maintenance.
Concern: Time Limits Imposed by States on Legal Commercial Vehicle Parking
Forum Recommendations:
• Eliminate time limits for legally parked commercial motor vehicles and withhold funding for non-compliance.
• Eliminate time restrictions of less than eight hours.

Concern: Trucker Education About Driver Fatigue Forum Recommendations:
• Use current fatigue studies to identify areas of focus.
• Do a "don't drink and drive"-style, anti-fatigue public service announcement campaign?
• Target shippers, receivers, carriers, and insurance companies for information regarding fatigue.
• Target truckers with information at truck stops/rest areas, including the following messages: "Rest areas are not a destination." "Safety is an individual responsibility."
• Educate drivers on stopping alternatives.
• Provide better signage on corridors.
• Use intelligent transportation systems technology to deliver real-time parking information.
• Consider uniform logo signing to inform drivers about commercial vehicle parking availability.
• Develop and distribute maps and pamphlets identifying truck stops and rest areas with parking for commercial motor vehicles.
• List rest areas and truck stops on state maps.
• Make use of radio and national cellular telephone number to communicate rest area or truck stop information.
Goals
This report documents the findings of a study undertaken to investigate the adequacy of commercial truck parking facilities serving the National Highway System (NHS) in response to Section 4027 of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21). Section 4027 requires the following:...

...a study to determine the location and quantity of parking facilities at commercial truck stops and travel plazas and public rest areas that could be used by motor carriers to comply with Federal hours of service rules. The study shall include an inventory of current facilities serving the National Highway System, analyze where shortages exist or are projected to exist, and propose a plan to reduce the shortages. The study may be carried out in cooperation with research entities representing motor carriers, the travel plaza industry, and commercial motor vehicle drivers.

Abstract
The study involved: 1) a national assessment of the extent and geographic distribution of parking shortages, 2) research to clarify drivers’ parking-related needs and decision-making, and 3) development of a technical guidance document to be used by partnerships of public- and private-sector stakeholders in 49 States for inventorying current facilities serving the NHS, analyzing current and projected shortages in commercial truck parking at public rest areas and commercial truck stops and travel plazas, and developing plans for action at the appropriate jurisdictional levels.

The process involved: 1) the development of an inventory of public and commercial truck spaces serving the NHS, 2) development, calibration, and application of a truck parking demand model, 3) a national survey of truck drivers to determine how drivers plan for and address their parking needs, how truck drivers select when, where, and at which facilities they park, and what truck drivers think of the adequacy of current parking facilities, 4) an estimate of parking demand using a modeling approach, 5) identification of parking deficiencies at the State and corridor level by comparing supply and demand, and 6) identification of improvements that were recommended by State partnerships to mitigate any existing or future problems identified.

Conclusions
- Only 11 and 34 percent, respectively, of truck drivers surveyed in the national driver survey indicated that they frequently or almost always find parking available at public rest areas and at commercial truck stops and travel plazas. Nearly half reported rarely or almost never finding available parking at public rest areas. The survey results indicate that truck drivers do perceive that there is a problem with the adequacy of available truck parking.
- An analysis of the driver surveys indicated that drivers prefer commercial truck stops and travel plazas for most activities that require them to park, but they prefer public rest areas when stopping for taking a quick nap. Weighting these results by the relative time spent on each activity indicated that 23 percent of the demand for truck parking is at public rest areas and 77 percent of the demand is for parking at commercial truck stops and travel plazas. This split is a key element in understanding the adequacy of truck parking because in many areas where there is an apparent shortage of spaces at public rest areas, there is an apparent surplus at commercial truck stops and travel plazas. One way to address the shortage of public parking spaces is to take steps to shift the demand to the available private spaces.
The national survey of truck parking spaces identified 31,249 spaces at 1,771 public facilities and between 167,881 and 284,601 spaces at 3,382 commercial facilities. The demand model estimated a total demand for 66,067 spaces at public facilities and 221,249 spaces at commercial facilities. While the estimated demand for parking spaces at public facilities far outstrips the supply, the supply at commercial facilities seems sufficient to meet the current demand.

A total of between 182,225 and 288,995 parking spaces was identified along Interstate highways, compared to an estimated demand for 245,389 truck parking spaces. A total of between 16,558 and 26,855 parking spaces was identified along non-Interstate highways, compared to an estimated demand for 41,927 spaces. The total supply of parking spaces along Interstate highways seems to match the estimated demand, while the total supply along non-Interstate highways falls far short of the estimated demand. Part of the discrepancy along non-Interstate highways may be accounted for by the greater access to other locations at which to park (e.g., restaurants and shopping malls) along non- Interstate highways than along Interstate highways.

An analysis of the supply and demand for truck parking indicates that 35 States have a current shortage of parking at public facilities, while only 8 States have a shortage at commercial facilities, and 12 States have a shortage when both types of facilities are considered together. In some cases, the apparent shortage may be mitigated by regional factors.

The growth rate of demand for truck parking was estimated to be 2.7 percent annually, while the growth rate of supply of public spaces was estimated to be 1 percent annually, and the growth rate of private spaces was estimated to be 6.5 percent annually. These estimates suggest that, if other factors that affect truck parking remain the same, the apparent shortage of spaces at public rest areas will worsen while a growing surplus of spaces at commercial truck stops will develop.

A few States restrict parking at public rest areas, which can further exacerbate any supply shortages that may exist for parking at public facilities. At the same time, some States augment the parking spaces available at public rest areas with parking spaces at other public facilities such as weigh stations.

A number of factors indicate that the degree to which truck drivers use parking spaces at public rest areas and commercial truck stops and travel plazas interchangeably is limited. Responses to the driver survey indicate a preference for different facilities, depending on the reason for the stop. Field observational studies noted that parking spaces at public rest areas often fill up sooner than spaces at commercial facilities. The study team believes these differences arise for the following reasons: public rest areas typically offer more convenient access to the highway and more certainty of whether a parking space exists (because drivers can often observe the lot from the highway), while commercial truck stops and travel plazas typically offer more amenities. One way to shift demand from public rest areas to commercial truck stops and travel plazas would be to increase the convenience and certainty of finding parking spaces at commercial facilities.

Geographically, truck parking shortages appear to be more common in the Northeast and the Midwest.

A number of recommendations for addressing truck parking shortages were proposed by participants in the Rest Area Forum, national stakeholders, and State partnerships. Most of these recommendations fall into one of the following six categories: expand or improve public rest areas,
expand or improve commercial truck stops, encourage formation of public-private partnerships, educate or inform drivers about available spaces, change parking enforcement rules, and conduct additional studies.

Although there is a consensus that the adequacy of truck parking is an important issue that must be addressed, there is wide disagreement both among the various stakeholder groups and among the States about the best approach to addressing the problem. Although the problem has national consequences, both the problem and the proposed solutions seem to be more local in nature. For example, some States have an apparent shortage of parking spaces while nearby States have an apparent surplus, and any shortages that do exist are often concentrated on a few sections of highway within a State. The solutions, too, can be local in nature, with some States proposing to leverage existing ITS initiatives to broadcast parking information, others proposing to open more parking facilities, and others relying on private industry to meet the demand. One point of agreement, however, is that the various agencies, organizations, and special interest groups worked together as part of the State partnerships and want to continue to work together to address this issue.

What problems are associated with an inadequate supply of truck parking spaces?
An inadequate supply of truck parking spaces can result in two negative consequences: (1) tired truck drivers may continue to drive because they have difficulty finding a place to park for rest, and (2) truck drivers may choose to park at unsafe locations, such as the shoulder of the road and exit ramps, if they are unable to find available parking. Both of these consequences generate a safety hazard for the truck driver and for other drivers using the NHS. However, any program meant to address the problems of an inadequate supply of truck parking spaces must concentrate on a number of issues beyond simply providing additional parking spaces.

Is there an adequate supply of truck parking spaces for the NHS?
In determining whether the supply of truck parking spaces is adequate, it is important to evaluate not only the total supply of truck parking, but also the distribution and type (i.e., Will truckers use the spaces?) of those parking spaces.

A key issue is to determine what types of parking spaces are available. That is, do the available spaces have the convenience and amenities necessary so that the driver will choose to use them? If these spaces do not meet the needs of a driver, the driver may choose to either drive tired or park on the shoulder. This fact leads to another key element in addressing this problem: a proposed solution must not only consider the number of available spaces, but must also consider the factors that influence truck drivers’ choices about where and when to park.
Is it appropriate for the State and Federal governments to take steps to address any inadequacies in truck parking, if they exist?

Even if there is a shortage of truck parking spaces, it may not be the responsibility of the State or Federal government to address the problem. Certain stakeholder groups have argued that expanding public parking for commercial vehicles amounts to a subsidy of the trucking industry and unfairly penalizes the commercial truck stops that serve it.

The other side of the issue is that tired truck drivers pose an imminent health risk to other drivers on the road and that governments have a prevailing interest to protect citizen-drivers by helping tired truck drivers find rest. The clearest indication of whether the government has a role to play in addressing this issue comes directly from the comments of the stakeholders interviewed for this study. While different stakeholders prefer different roles for government, ranging from leveraging ITS technologies to better disseminate information about available parking spaces to building more and better public parking facilities, most stakeholders do agree that government should play a role.

### Other Information / Findings

#### Facts about Colorado

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commercial truck parking demand: Peak hour demand along interstates and other NHS routes carrying more than 1,000 trucks per day, 2000.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Rest Area Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commercial truck parking demand: Comparison of state and demand model estimates.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commercial truck parking inventory: Public rest area facilities along interstates and other NHS routes carrying more than 1,000 trucks per day.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commercial truck parking inventory: Commercial truck stop and travel plaza facilities along interstates and other NHS routes carrying more than 1,000 trucks per day.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking space utilization: Demand/supply ratio along interstates and other NHS routes carrying more than 1,000 trucks per day.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goals

STUDY GOAL AND OBJECTIVES
The overall goal of this research was to determine the individual and collective value of rest areas and welcome centers in order to assess the appropriate level of service for rest areas on MDOT roadways. Consideration was given both to the economic value of rest areas, in addition to the functional value provided by rest areas. Further research objectives include the following:

- Quantify the functions and value of rest areas in Michigan.
- Identify correlation between driver fatigue-related crashes and availability of rest areas.
- Develop a benefit/cost analysis tool to evaluate economic impacts associated with rest areas, both individually and as a system.
- Develop criteria to evaluate the impacts of rest area closure on motorists.

Abstract

Research was performed to determine the value of public rest areas in Michigan, including welcome centers. A benefit/cost (B/C) economic analysis procedure was utilized to assess rest areas both individually and as a system. The benefits associated with rest areas included: travel diversion cost savings, comfort and convenience benefits, increased tourism spending (welcome centers only), and crash reductions. The costs associated with rest areas included amortized construction costs, operating costs, and routine maintenance costs. The results of the economic analysis showed that nearly all MDOT rest areas currently possess B/C ratios that exceed 1.0. The system wide B/C ratio was estimated at 4.56 with individual values for the 81 facilities ranging between 0.78 and 11.66. A majority of the benefits originated from a combination of comfort/convenience (i.e., the “value” to users), reduction of targeted fatigue-related crashes (estimated at 3.37 crashes per facility per year) and tourism benefits (welcome centers only). The facilities with the highest B/C ratios included heavily utilized facilities located on major limited-access freeways in the lower peninsula of Michigan. The facilities with the lowest B/C ratios were underutilized facilities with high operation and maintenance costs – particularly facilities located in northern Michigan and especially those that are closed during winter months. A value index for overall prioritization of rest area facilities was computed for each facility considering the B/C ratio along with several non-economic functional factors. To provide flexibility for future forecasting and planning, a software tool was developed to allow for estimation of the impacts associated with the removal of an existing facility or addition of a new facility to the network.

Conclusions

Analysis of nearly 20,000 recent hourly rest area traffic volume counts from 76 rest areas was performed in order to assess general rest area usage trends. The peak overall rest area utilization occurred on Fridays. Passenger vehicle utilization follows a pattern of increased use on Friday, Saturday, and Sunday, with lower utilization during weekdays. Commercial vehicle demand for rest areas was greatest during Monday through Thursday, with considerable drop offs on Saturday and Sunday. Passenger vehicle travelers are far more likely to use the rest area during the afternoon hours compared to other times of the day.
Commercial vehicle utilization was highest during the morning and afternoon periods. As expected, commercial vehicles represented a much greater proportion of the nighttime rest area volumes compared to daytime periods.

The average self-reported vehicular occupancy was 2.76 persons per vehicle. As expected, commercial trucks had the lowest occupancies at 1.25 persons per vehicle, while passenger vehicle occupancy was 2.42 persons per vehicle. Further analysis of the passenger vehicle travelers by trip purpose found that the occupancies differed based on the purpose of the trip. Passenger vehicle occupancies for vacation/personal trips had occupancies of 2.54 persons per vehicle, while work related trips had occupancies of 1.42 persons per vehicle. Overall, 22.1 percent of the vehicles included children aged 17 and under. Data collected during pilot versions of the survey showed that 18.3 percent of passenger vehicle occupants were children aged 17 and under.

The overwhelmingly common reasons for stopping at a rest area were to use the restroom (95%) and to stretch/walk/take break (55%). The primary reason for selecting the rest area rather than a nearby commercial facility was due to the quick access from the highway (88.3%). When asked to rate their overall satisfaction with Michigan rest areas on a scale of 1 (very unsatisfied) to 5 (very satisfied), 84.7 percent of rest area users chose either a 4 or 5 satisfaction level with a mean satisfaction of 4.26. Motorcyclists, RV’ers, frequent rest area users, vacation travelers, and persons traveling with children had the highest satisfaction levels, while commercial truck drivers, younger travelers, and first time rest area users had lower levels of satisfaction.

Analysis of fatigue-related crash data within a 20 mile radius of each rest area along the particular route were collected and analyzed. It was concluded that fatigue-related crashes are impacted by the presence or absence of rest areas and the estimated magnitude of the crash reductions due to rest area presence are well correlated with mainline traffic volumes. Modeling of the rest area related crash reductions estimated the greatest safety impacts to be associated with facilities on roadways with the highest mainline traffic volumes and possessing the highest turn-in rates. Considering the entire system of MDOT rest areas and welcome centers, it was estimated that Michigan rest areas and welcome centers contribute to the reduction of fatigue-related crashes system wide per year within 20 miles upstream and downstream of the facilities – an average of 3.37 crashes per facility per year.
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The average self-reported vehicular occupancy was 2.76 persons per vehicle. As expected, commercial trucks had the lowest occupancies at 1.25 persons per vehicle, while passenger vehicle occupancy was 2.42 persons per vehicle. Further analysis of the passenger vehicle travelers by trip purpose found that the occupancies differed based on the purpose of the trip. Passenger vehicle occupancies for vacation/personal trips had occupancies of 2.54 persons per vehicle, while work related trips had occupancies of 1.42 persons per vehicle. Overall, 22.1 percent of the vehicles included children aged 17 and under. Data collected during pilot versions of the survey showed that 18.3 percent of passenger vehicle occupants were children aged 17 and under.

The overwhelmingly common reasons for stopping at a rest area were to use the restroom (95%) and to stretch/walk/take break (55%). The primary reason for selecting the rest area rather than a nearby commercial facility was due to the quick access from the highway (88.3%). When asked to rate their overall satisfaction with Michigan rest areas on a scale of 1 (very unsatisfied) to 5 (very satisfied), 84.7 percent of rest area users chose either a 4 or 5 satisfaction level with a mean satisfaction of 4.26. Motorcyclists, RV’ers, frequent rest area users, vacation travelers, and persons traveling with children had the highest satisfaction levels, while commercial truck drivers, younger travelers, and first time rest area users had lower levels of satisfaction.

Analysis of fatigue-related crash data within a 20 mile radius of each rest area along the particular route were collected and analyzed. It was concluded that fatigue-related crashes are impacted by the presence or absence of rest areas and the estimated magnitude of the crash reductions due to rest area presence are well correlated with mainline traffic volumes. Modeling of the rest area related crash reductions estimated the greatest safety impacts to be associated with facilities on roadways with the highest mainline traffic volumes and possessing the highest turn-in rates. Considering the entire system of MDOT rest areas and welcome centers, it was estimated that Michigan rest areas and welcome centers contribute to the reduction of fatigue-related crashes system wide per year within 20 miles upstream and downstream of the facilities – an average of 3.37 crashes per facility per year.
The purpose of the Statewide Truck Parking and Rest Area Study is to determine the sufficiency of the number of truck parking and rest areas throughout the state, the optimum locations for both existing and potential new locations, and the adequacy of amenities at existing areas. The results of this study will assist CDOT with determining if existing truck parking and/or rest areas should be closed, upgraded or remain; recommending upgrades to existing truck parking and/or rest areas; determining if there is a need to construct new truck parking and/or rest areas; and assessing the optimum locations of both existing and potentially new truck parking and/or rest areas.

The rest areas in Glenwood Canyon are not included in this analysis. The four Region 3 rest areas which are not included are Bair Ranch, Grizzly Creek, Hanging Lake, and No Name. These four rest areas serve purposes beyond the scope of this review and therefore would require different, separate analysis.

1.0 Glenwood Canyon Rest Area History

Glenwood Canyon Rest Areas were created as part of the $490 million 12 year construction of I-70 through Glenwood Canyon. A project of this magnitude in such an environmentally sensitive and regionally important area required extensive measures and planning to maintain and enhance the corridor. The original two lane highway I-70 was replacing had no designated recreational facilities which led motorists to create informal pull-offs with camping and picnic areas which often posed safety and environmental risks. Community members became involved in the 1970s during early design stages of the I-70 Glenwood Canyon project and strongly encouraged CDOT to include recreational facilities into the project’s design. CDOT determined to develop and provide access to as many rest areas and scenic turnouts as feasible though the canyon. The four rest areas, Bair Ranch, Grizzly Creek, Hanging Lake, and No Name, were conceived of during this initial public involvement period.

These rest areas were not only important to local stakeholders, but were also an important design element contributing to the project’s high standard of environmental stewardship, safety, and mobility. In the Glenwood Canyon I-70 Project Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) they were listed among the measures to minimize harm; “Loss of existing recreational opportunities in the Canyon will be mitigated by development of expanded recreation opportunities at rest areas and improved access to the river and public land with the bike path/pedestrian trail.”
2.0 Summary

Due to their inclusion as a measure to minimize harm in an EIS and unique role as recreational access the Bair Ranch, Grizzly Creek, Hanging Lake, and No Name rest areas are not included in the Statewide Truck Parking and Rest Area Study. The methods and standards used to evaluate the importance, location, and condition of the other rest areas in the study could not be appropriately applied to these rest areas. Further study to evaluate these rest areas would need to include specifically defined criteria and measures of their recreational access and environmental mitigation impacts.
recreation purposes. The bikepath/pedestrian trail connects
to the existing bikeway, which continues west to Glenwood
Springs via the old U.S. 6 highway; at the east end it con-
nects with the proposed frontage road for travel eastward.

Major rest stop areas with full directional vehicular access
to the roadway are proposed at Grizzly Creek and Bair Ranch.
Minor rest stop areas with no roadway access are proposed at
West End, French Creek and Book Cliffs. Minor rest stop areas
with partial access are proposed at Hanging Lake and the
Shoshone Power Plant. Parking areas separate from the through
roadway are provided at all rest areas with vehicular access.

The Proposed Action to be assessed in this report incorporates
the results of ongoing updating and fine-tuning that have been
undertaken to refine the alignment and to analyze roadway
structure and channel requirements through the central portion
of the Canyon (ref. Figures 2a-e). Proposed impact mitigation
measures will be accomplished as segments of the highway are
completed.

The Proposed Action will require that approximately 122,700
cubic yards of fill be placed in the Colorado River and will
affect approximately 14 acres of existing wetlands vegetation
in the Canyon. Affected wetlands will be replaced on at least
a one-to-one basis. The quantity of fill required, as stated
above, differs from the amount published in the draft SEIS.
This is a result of additional design fine-tuning accomplished
subsequent to publication of the draft. Of the 57,700 cubic
yards of additional fill, most (40,750 cubic yards) is for
mitigation and is required for development of the Hanging Lake
access and parking area. This development mitigates impacts
to existing recreation and wetlands through the provision of
14. Visual intrusion of the highway will be mitigated by use of design elements such as angular pier shape, rough-finished textures, earth tones for concrete, and special retaining wall features.

15. Loss of existing recreational opportunities in the Canyon will be mitigated by development of expanded recreation opportunities at rest areas and improved access to the river and public land with the bikepath/pedestrian trail.

16. Ninety day notice will be given to the national Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration if any geodetic control survey monuments will be affected.
CDOT Statewide Rest Area Study: Colorado Welcome Centers

This technical memorandum documents Colorado Tourism Office insights (via Kelly Barbello the Director of Visitor Services at the Colorado Tourism Board) on the role, use, and operation of Colorado Welcome Centers.

1.0 Operations

The Colorado Tourism Office (CTO) has 10 designated Colorado Welcome Centers in the state. These welcome centers have the primary goal of encouraging people to see more of Colorado, stay longer, and promote local attractions and businesses. In addition to this overarching goal the welcome centers have more specialized uses depending on location and often provide amenities to truckers and RV travelers. As a marketing and outreach arm one of the primary ways the CTO measures success is by documenting visitation and amenity usage, in order to evaluate the successfulness and usefulness of each facility monthly visitor counts are maintained.

1.1 Staffing

All Welcome Center locations have personnel onsite during business hours. Each welcome center has a manager employed by the state, two of the welcome centers have additional state employees, and the remaining 8 are staffed by volunteers.

1.2 Usage

Usage varies greatly by location, however, roughly 85% of Welcome Center visitors are passenger vehicles. Truck drivers also utilize their services, however, some of the welcome centers are inaccessible to trucks or difficult for trucks to access.

2.0 Partnerships

Each Colorado Welcome Center has differing operational structures and often partner with local entities in some fashion.

2.1 CDOT Welcome Center/Rest Area Partnerships

Three of the welcome centers are also CDOT rest areas and are operated with differing degrees of partnership with CDOT. At these locations CTO pays for interior upkeep and all of the additional welcome center amenities. CDOT directly provides and pays for maintenance at the Fruita Welcome Center and Rest Area, at the Burlington Welcome Center and Rest Area CDOT contributes annually to the maintenance by contributing to the city (roughly $72,000) for the city to provide maintenance to the facility, CDOT funds maintenance at the Julesburg Welcome Center and Rest Area by giving money to
the county in order for the county to provide maintenance. These partnerships have many operational benefits and also allow welcome center staff and volunteers to develop relationships with CDOT personnel. At some of these partnership locations CDOT staff seems overburdened and communicating and fulfilling maintenance needs has occasionally presented an issue, particularly at the Julesburg facility.

2.2 Welcome Center Partnerships
The Alamosa Welcome Center and Silverthorne Welcome Center that are identified and promoted along with the CTO Welcome Centers are operated locally and are not funded by the state. The remaining five welcome centers CTO provides significant funding for, but doesn’t necessarily cover all operational costs. They operate in partnership with local entities usually the city, county, or local business organizations.

3.0 Future Plans
In 2008 the CTO and University of Colorado Leeds School of Business conducted a Colorado Welcome Center Survey to gather and analyze data on the state’s Welcome Centers, their visitors, and their impact on the state’s travel and tourism sector. CTO is currently in the process of conducting another survey to evaluate the Welcome Centers and their roles in the communities they serve. Over the course of this survey they may also look at if there are any needs for additional welcome centers or to close or relocate existing welcome centers. Communication between CDOT and CTO regarding the Statewide Rest Area Study and the Welcome Center survey may be beneficial for both parties.
COLORADO WELCOME CENTERS

ALAMOSA WELCOME CENTER
610 State Avenue
Alamosa, CO 81101
Kale Mortensen
719-589-9396
719-589-6854 Fax
Kale.Mortensen@state.co.us

BURLINGTON WELCOME CENTER
48265 I-70
Burlington, CO 80807
Taren Mulch & Rhonda Peterson
719/346-5554
719/346-8820 FAX
Taren.Mulch@state.co.us
Rhonda.Peterson@state.co.us

CORTEZ WELCOME CENTER
928 E Main Street
Cortez, CO 81321
Noel Cooley
970/565-4048
970/565-8373 Fax
Noel.Cooley@state.co.us

DINOSAUR WELCOME CENTER
101 Stegosaurus Street/ PO Box 207
Dinosaur, CO 81610
Cheryl McDonald
970/374-2205
970/374-2206 Fax
Cheryl.Mcdonald@state.co.us

FT. COLLINS WELCOME CENTER
3745 E Prospect Rd. Suite 105
Ft. Collins, CO 80525
Cheryl Glanz
970/491-4775
970/491-4871 Fax
Cheryl.Glanz@state.co.us

FRUITA WELCOME CENTER
340 Hwy 340
Fruita, CO 81521
Orilee Witte
970/858-9335 x 10
970/858-0462 Fax
Orilee.Witte@state.co.us

JULESBURG WELCOME CENTER
20934 County Road 28
Julesburg, CO 80737
Sue Carter & Valerie Price
970/474-2054
970/474-2058 Fax
Sue.Carter@state.co.us
Valerie.Price@state.co.us

LAMAR WELCOME CENTER
109 E. Beech Street
Lamar, CO 81052
Leslie Stagner
719/336-3483
719/336-2325 FAX
Leslie.Stagner@state.co.us

SILVERTHORNE WELCOME CENTER
246 Rainbow Drive
Silverthorne, CO 80498
Lucadia Bee
970/468-0353
970/262-9133 Fax
Lucadia.Bee@state.co.us

TRINIDAD WELCOME CENTER
309 Nevada Avenue
Trinidad, CO 81082
Barbara Howard & Jennifer Collins
719/846/9512
719/846/6872 Fax
Barbara.Howard@state.co.us
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Business Research Division (BRD) at the Leeds School of Business was asked by the Colorado Tourism Office (CTO) to conduct a welcome center visitor survey to gather and analyze data on the state’s 10 official Colorado Welcome Centers (CWC), their visitors, and their impact on the state’s travel and tourism sector during the summer season of 2008. The study included primary research designed to measure the welcome center program and its impact on travelers’ activities and expenditures. Results are representative of only summer 2008, and may not be extrapolated to other months or years given the uniqueness of both the season (excludes winter sports visitors), and the year (record fuel prices, contracting economy).

The Colorado Welcome Centers are visited by domestic and international travelers alike, and each serve visitors with varying demographics, trip durations, and trip activities. More than a million individuals were impacted by the centers in 2007, primarily by the information they obtained and the facility services they used. The 10 official Colorado Welcome Centers served nearly 340,000 visitors in June, July, and August of 2008, and these visitors spent an estimated $182 million in the state. In total, these summer visitors had a $422 million impact (direct, indirect, and induced) on the state in 2008. Additionally, given that 38.2% of respondents reported finalizing some or all of their lodging plans during their trip and 59.7% reported finalizing some or all of their activities during their trip, the Welcome Centers had the opportunity to impact more than $24.7 million in lodging expenditures and $32.2 million in activity expenditures.

The realized impact that the centers had on visitors was quantified in extra visitor days, additional activities, plans for future trips, and increased spending. Notably, visitors who reported increasing their length of stay in Colorado because of information received from the Welcome Centers stayed an average of 2.6 additional days. Just under one-in-four added activities to their trip, and more than one-in-three obtained information for a future trip due to information provided by the centers. Nearly 55% reported learning about something new to see or do in the state of Colorado. The direct spending associated with the explicit behavior change in June, July, and August of 2008 (2.6 nights by 7% of visitors), was estimated at $4.9 million. The change in total output (direct, indirect, and induced) was $11.4 million.

More than 38% of visitors indicated they made some or all accommodations arrangements during their trip, and almost 60% planned some or all of their activities during their trip, indicating that welcome centers have immense opportunity to influence visitor behavior. To this point, visitors were seeking information—more than four-out-of-five visitors stopped at the welcome center to obtain information, primarily pertaining to directions and maps (37.6%), attractions and activities (37.0%), and lodging and restaurants (9.8%). Furthermore, knowing how visitors obtain information will help the state tourism office and the welcome centers to better target their visitors. Visitors sought information most frequently from the Internet (61%), previous experience (49.8%), welcome/visitor centers (28.7%), guidebooks (23.3%), personal recommendations (22.5%), and the official Colorado State Vacation Guide (18.8%).
A clear majority (65.7%) of visitors were planning on participating in some form of outdoor activity. Most of these individuals specifically noted visiting the mountains, national parks, or national monuments; going sightseeing; or engaging in active outdoor activities (e.g., hiking, rafting, camping, fishing, biking). Other major trip activities included touring cities (31.3%), and engaging in arts, cultural, or historic activities (15.1%).

Two-out-of-three visitors stopped at the centers for facility-specific reasons, of which nearly 58% stopped for restrooms and water fountains, and 35% took a travel break, including stretching their legs and picnicking. Thus, clean bathrooms, working hand dryers, and shaded picnic areas help ensure visitors have positive experiences at the centers, and appear to be important factors in attracting visitors to the centers.

Critiques of the centers were few. Nine-out-of-ten visitors liked the centers just the way they are, and nearly 99% would recommend the centers to others. Suggestions for additions to the welcome centers ranged from goods (e.g., souvenirs, food, drinks), information (e.g., brochures, maps), the facility (e.g., playground, signs, shade), or services (e.g., wireless Internet, reservations). Suggestions for improvements focused on the facility (e.g., cleaner bathrooms, better signage), goods (e.g., coffee-alternative, more shirt sizes), information (e.g., more brochures, more camping information), and services (e.g., update website, later hours).

While some of these critiques would be easy to address (e.g., camping information), others pertain to structural changes that take time and money to facilitate (e.g., playgrounds). However, understanding that one-in-five visitors are under 18 shows the importance of having kid-friendly information and attractions at the centers. In another example, having knowledgeable volunteers and specific information pertaining to active outdoor activities (hiking, biking, camping, fishing, rafting) is also important as one-quarter of visitors planned to engage in active outdoor activities.

The welcome centers are supported by state and local communities, and staffed with the volunteers wishing to extend their knowledge of the state with visitors. The results of this study show that welcome centers impact visitors, acting as a valuable source of information and services.
PURPOSE OF STUDY
The Business Research Division (BRD) at the Leeds School of Business was asked by the Colorado Tourism Office (CTO) to conduct a welcome center visitor survey to gather and analyze data on the state’s 10 official Colorado Welcome Centers (CWC) (Figure 1), their visitors, and their impact on the state’s travel and tourism sector during the summer season. The study included primary research designed to measure the welcome center program and its impact on travelers’ activities and expenditures.

The 10 Colorado Welcome Centers include:

- Colorado Welcome Center at Alamosa — Alamosa
- Colorado Welcome Center at Burlington — Burlington
- Colorado Welcome Center at Cortez — Cortez
- Colorado Welcome Center at Dinosaur — Dinosaur
- Colorado Welcome Center at Fort Collins — Fort Collins
- Colorado Welcome Center at Fruita — Fruita
- Colorado Welcome Center at Julesburg — Julesburg
- Colorado Welcome Center at Lamar — Lamar
- Colorado Welcome Center at Red Rocks — Morrison
- Colorado Welcome Center at Trinidad — Trinidad
Survey results fall into six categories:

- Completed Surveys—Identifies the timeline and success of the onsite and follow-up surveys.
- Visitor Profile—Identifies the profile of visitors who stop at the welcome centers.
- Trip Profile—Identifies visitors’ purposes for visiting Colorado, as well as their desired activities, destinations, length of stay, transportation, and accommodations. Also identifies the resources visitors’ used to plan trips in Colorado, and when their trip preparations were finalized.
- Spending Profile—Group spending by category and draws conclusions on spending per night and spending per person.
- Welcome Center—Identifies information obtained and services sought from individual welcome centers, as well as attributes that are lacking or in need of improvement at the centers.
- Impact of Welcome Centers—Identifies the impact that Colorado Welcome Centers had on visitors’ stays in Colorado, including activities, accommodations, spending, and the number of days spent in the state.

Survey results are expressed in aggregate, as well as by individual welcome center.

**METHODOLOGY**

*Creating the Survey Instrument*

BRD researchers met with the CTO Board and the Colorado Welcome Centers managers on April 8, 2008, in Denver to discuss the project methodology, field questions, discuss concerns, and explore potential survey questions.

Welcome center managers engaged in an exercise ranking subtopical characteristics within six topical categories taken from questions asked in previous surveys. The purpose of this exercise was to gauge which types of information would be most useful to the welcome centers in critiquing and improving their services. Topical areas included people profile, trip profile, welcome center attributes, trip preparation, future visits to Colorado, Impacts. During a preliminary exercise, results revealed that, among other attributes, welcome center managers ranked age, sex, and annual household income higher than educational level and marital status for usefulness of information to improve their centers (Appendix 2). This information was used to facilitate the creation of the survey instrument.

BRD researchers reviewed previous Colorado Welcome Center surveys and previous survey results; conducted a literature search of other relevant studies; and consulted with CTO staff and board members, and CWC managers prior to creating a draft survey. Two surveys were created, with the on-site survey (Appendix 3) capturing the broadest information and the follow-up survey (Appendix 4) securing greater detail, as well as answer variations as visitors’ trips proceeded. Between the initial survey and the follow-up survey, specific questions were tailored to provide answers by sub-categorical topical area (Appendix 5). Once created, the draft survey was reviewed by David Corsun at the Daniels College of Business. The
revised draft survey was then submitted to Sue Piatt at the Colorado Tourism Office and Cindi Meharg at the Colorado Welcome Centers for revisions.

Survey questions fall into six categories (Appendix 5):

- **People Profile**—Identifies the profile of visitors who stop at the welcome centers, including age, income, group size, etc.
- **Trip Profile**— Identifies visitors’ purposes for visiting Colorado, as well as their desired activities, destinations, length of stay, transportation, spending, and accommodations.
- **Welcome Center**—Identifies information obtained and services sought from individual welcome centers, as well as attributes that are lacking or in need of improvement at the centers.
- **Trip Preparation**—Identifies resources visitors’ used to plan trips in Colorado, and when their trip preparations were finalized.
- **Future Visits to Colorado**—Identifies the frequency of visits, as well as plans for future visits to the state.
- **Impacts (Return on Investment)**—Identifies the impact that Colorado Welcome Centers had on visitors’ stays in Colorado, including activities, accommodations, spending, and the number of days spent in the state.

**Testing the Survey**

The survey instrument was then tested at the Red Rocks Welcome Center on May 22, 2008, and at the Fort Collins Welcome Center on May 23, 2008. Appropriate revisions were made following the survey testing and feedback from David Corsun, Sue Piatt, and Cindi Meharg.

**Training Surveyors**

After the survey instrument was finalized, BRD staff formulated survey interview procedures and created a training schedule for surveyors. Training sessions were conducted at the Fort Collins Welcome Center on June 2, 2008, and June 5, 2008. New surveyors first shadowed one of the two lead surveyors. Once they were comfortable with the process, they conducted surveys under supervision before surveying independently.

**Administering the Survey**

Survey quotas were established by the BRD researchers and approved by Sue Piatt and Cindi Meharg. Quotas for each welcome center were based on the monthly traffic at each center. The three busiest centers, Fruita, Burlington, and Julesburg, each had quotas of 300 total completed surveys to be gathered in three separate trips over the months of June, July, and August. Fort Collins and Trinidad each had quotas of 150 total completed surveys to be gathered in two separate trips over the months of June, July, and August. Cortez, Red Rocks, Dinosaur, and Lamar each had quotas of 100 completed surveys in two separate visits over the months of June, July, and August. Alamosa was not included in the RFP, nor was it included in the proposal, but BRD researchers added two visits to this new welcome center and placed a minimum quota of 100 completed surveys. (See Figure 1 for Welcome Center locations.)
BRD surveyors were provided with black polo shirts with “Colorado Leeds School of Business” embroidered on the front of the shirt. Surveyors generally wore khaki pants, black shoes, and the black polo shirts for a consistent and professional appearance.

BRD staff provided an incentive to visitors to take part in the survey, which greatly increased their willingness to participate. For each completed survey, the participating visitor received one Colorado scratch lottery ticket. Various games were purchased for $1 each. Tickets provided visitors with the chance to win up to $21,000.

Once the initial survey was completed, surveyors gave participants their lottery ticket and a follow-up survey to be completed when they returned home. Postage-paid envelopes were provided with the follow-up surveys. In addition, surveyors asked visitors for either their e-mail address or physical address for the purpose of following up with them. An e-mail version or another paper version of the follow-up survey was sent to visitors who provided an address. This exercise served to remind and encourage visitors to fill out the follow-up, and accounted for people losing their initial follow-up survey.

CIRCUMSTANCES IMPACTING SURVEYING
Circumstances led to the deviation from the original survey schedule. Sites that were affected included Alamosa, Burlington, and Fruita.

- On June 17, 2008, BRD staff traveled to Fruita to survey, but construction caused the welcome center to close June 18 through June 20. The survey trips were rescheduled for July and August.
- BRD staff had scheduled surveying in Alamosa on June 18 and June 19. Per Cindi Meharg’s suggestion, the survey trip was canceled due to a lack of highway signage limiting the number of visitors to the welcome center. Alamosa surveys were thus limited to July and August.
- Construction was planned in Burlington beginning in July, causing the welcome center to temporarily move locations. For this reason, two trips were made to Burlington in June in order to meet quota, and one trip was made in August.

SURVEY RESULTS

Completed Surveys
Surveys were conducted at the Colorado Welcome Centers in June, July, and August, with a total of 2,177 completed on-site surveys collected by project end. With additional surveys administered at every welcome center location, completed surveys exceeded the project quota by 28%. The project garnered 690 follow-up surveys for a response rate of 32%. (See Table 1.)
The 2,177 on-site surveys represented 0.6% of total visitation to Colorado Welcome Centers in June, July, and August 2008 (Table 2). These three summer months are historically the busiest for the welcome centers. In 2007, visitors to the Colorado Welcome Centers during June, July, and August represented 41.7% of total annual visitation (Table 3). Visits to the welcome centers decreased from 2007 to 2008, with overall visitation for June, July, and August down 20.1% from 2007, despite Alamosa coming online. Visitation decreases in 2008 accelerated as fuel prices and the general economy impacted households, and as road construction imperiled convenient access to select centers (Figure 2).

### TABLE 1: SURVEYS COLLECTED, BY MONTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Alamosa</th>
<th>Burlington</th>
<th>Cortez</th>
<th>Dinosaur</th>
<th>Fort Collins</th>
<th>Fruita</th>
<th>Julesburg</th>
<th>Lamar</th>
<th>Red Rocks</th>
<th>Trinidad</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>2,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Over Quota</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| | Follow-up Surveys | 40 | 103 | 42 | 39 | 79 | 97 | 107 | 42 | 70 | 71 | 690 |
| | Response Rate | 34% | 30% | 25% | 31% | 33% | 29% | 32% | 37% | 38% | 33% | 32% |

Table 1: Surveys Collected, by Month

### TABLE 2: COLORADO WELCOME CENTER VISITATION, JUNE-AUGUST, 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Alamosa</th>
<th>Burlington</th>
<th>Cortez</th>
<th>Dinosaur</th>
<th>Fort Collins</th>
<th>Fruita</th>
<th>Julesburg</th>
<th>Lamar</th>
<th>Red Rocks</th>
<th>Trinidad</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>2,646</td>
<td>22,162</td>
<td>6,830</td>
<td>4,566</td>
<td>15,634</td>
<td>18,391</td>
<td>25,819</td>
<td>4,225</td>
<td>4,492</td>
<td>9,025</td>
<td>113,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>4,190</td>
<td>13,282</td>
<td>6,084</td>
<td>5,571</td>
<td>17,531</td>
<td>20,210</td>
<td>30,854</td>
<td>3,935</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>10,922</td>
<td>117,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>3,493</td>
<td>9,788</td>
<td>5,310</td>
<td>4,626</td>
<td>15,324</td>
<td>23,519</td>
<td>25,697</td>
<td>2,891</td>
<td>7,021</td>
<td>8,492</td>
<td>106,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June, July, August</td>
<td>10,329</td>
<td>45,232</td>
<td>18,224</td>
<td>14,763</td>
<td>48,489</td>
<td>62,120</td>
<td>82,370</td>
<td>11,051</td>
<td>16,913</td>
<td>28,439</td>
<td>337,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Over 2007</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>-41.9%</td>
<td>-20.1%</td>
<td>-3.6%</td>
<td>-7.6%</td>
<td>-40.3%</td>
<td>-7.1%</td>
<td>-10.7%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>-16.4%</td>
<td>-20.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Percent of Total</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Alamosa began operations in 2008.
## TABLE 3: COLORADO WELCOME CENTER VISITATION, 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Alamosa</th>
<th>Burlington</th>
<th>Cortez</th>
<th>Dinosaur</th>
<th>Fort Collins</th>
<th>Fruita</th>
<th>Julesburg</th>
<th>Lamar</th>
<th>Red Rocks</th>
<th>Trinidad</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>7,186</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,767</td>
<td>12,180</td>
<td>10,043</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>1,659</td>
<td>35,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>7,671</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,367</td>
<td>13,691</td>
<td>9,647</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>1,494</td>
<td>2,310</td>
<td>39,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>10,324</td>
<td>1,641</td>
<td>1,641</td>
<td>4,202</td>
<td>15,869</td>
<td>13,076</td>
<td>1,365</td>
<td>1,804</td>
<td>4,057</td>
<td>53,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>10,194</td>
<td>3,022</td>
<td>1,403</td>
<td>5,072</td>
<td>22,603</td>
<td>15,843</td>
<td>1,520</td>
<td>1,980</td>
<td>12,392</td>
<td>74,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>15,967</td>
<td>4,620</td>
<td>2,630</td>
<td>9,683</td>
<td>30,206</td>
<td>18,509</td>
<td>2,578</td>
<td>3,909</td>
<td>5,870</td>
<td>93,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>26,246</td>
<td>6,966</td>
<td>4,403</td>
<td>16,669</td>
<td>35,142</td>
<td>32,925</td>
<td>4,747</td>
<td>6,180</td>
<td>10,759</td>
<td>136,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>27,991</td>
<td>7,552</td>
<td>5,721</td>
<td>18,624</td>
<td>35,850</td>
<td>32,925</td>
<td>4,747</td>
<td>6,180</td>
<td>10,759</td>
<td>152,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>23,580</td>
<td>8,277</td>
<td>5,187</td>
<td>17,171</td>
<td>32,993</td>
<td>28,331</td>
<td>3,582</td>
<td>4,640</td>
<td>10,220</td>
<td>133,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>20,790</td>
<td>7,343</td>
<td>4,287</td>
<td>14,561</td>
<td>30,241</td>
<td>20,827</td>
<td>3,025</td>
<td>3,541</td>
<td>8,216</td>
<td>112,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>14,836</td>
<td>5,052</td>
<td>2,016</td>
<td>8,897</td>
<td>24,189</td>
<td>16,314</td>
<td>2,766</td>
<td>3,253</td>
<td>5,980</td>
<td>83,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>11,107</td>
<td>1,963</td>
<td>1,101</td>
<td>4,924</td>
<td>16,842</td>
<td>14,878</td>
<td>1,453</td>
<td>1,912</td>
<td>3,231</td>
<td>57,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>8,468</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,379</td>
<td>11,980</td>
<td>10,596</td>
<td>1,146</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>2,726</td>
<td>39,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>184,360</td>
<td>48,858</td>
<td>28,389</td>
<td>109,316</td>
<td>281,786</td>
<td>218,441</td>
<td>27,457</td>
<td>34,856</td>
<td>80,470</td>
<td>1,013,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June, July, August</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>77,817</td>
<td>22,795</td>
<td>15,311</td>
<td>52,464</td>
<td>103,985</td>
<td>88,708</td>
<td>12,375</td>
<td>15,553</td>
<td>34,029</td>
<td>423,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


## FIGURE 2: CHANGE IN VISITATION COMPARED TO CHANGE IN FUEL PRICES, 2007-2008

![Figure 2: Change in Visitation Compared to Change in Fuel Prices, 2007-2008](http://www.eia.doe.gov)

Visitor Profile

While most visitors surveyed had made prior visits to Colorado (73.3%), 14.4% of those surveyed at the welcome centers were making their first visit to the state. Of those who had made prior visits to Colorado, nearly 58% had visited the state six or more times. More than 12% of visitors were Colorado residents staying at least one night away from home. (See Table 4."

TABLE 4: PRIOR VISITS TO COLORADO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Alamosa</th>
<th>Burlington</th>
<th>Cortez</th>
<th>Dinosaur</th>
<th>Fort Collins</th>
<th>Fruita</th>
<th>Julesburg</th>
<th>Lamar</th>
<th>Red Rocks</th>
<th>Trinidad</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Resident</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Visitor</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
<td>70.1%</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or Fewer Visits</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 or More Visits</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>74.9%</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-Time Visitor</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While most visitors were from other U.S. states (84.2%), 3.8% were international visitors and 12.0% were Colorado residents\(^1\) staying at least one night away from home (Appendix 6). Most visitors (58%) came from 10 other states and Colorado, including Texas, California, Illinois, Iowa, Missouri, Kansas, Florida, Nebraska, Oklahoma, and Arizona (Table 5). More than 66% of visitors were from states west of the Mississippi.

TABLE 5: PRIMARY RESIDENCE OF VISITORS SURVEYED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>12.0%(^1)</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Colorado residents captured in Table 4 may include individuals with residences in multiple states, whereas Colorado residents captured in Table 5 include Colorado only as their primary residence.
Efforts were made to talk with one individual from each group, and in instances where there was a family with children under 18, surveyors solicited responses from one adult in the group. Of the visitors who answered survey questions, 56.1% were male and 43.9% were female (Table 6).

**TABLE 6: GENDER OF VISITORS SURVEYED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Alamosa</th>
<th>Burlington</th>
<th>Cortez</th>
<th>Dinosaur</th>
<th>Fort Collins</th>
<th>Fruita</th>
<th>Julesburg</th>
<th>Lamar</th>
<th>Red Rocks</th>
<th>Trinidad</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Surveyed visitors provided answers on behalf of their group, such as the number of people in the group and the age of individuals. The greatest percentage of visitors were 55 and older (39.6%), and the fewest visitors were between 18 and 24 years old (12.8%). Twenty-seven percent of visitors were between 34 and 54 years old, and 20.6% were younger than 18. Centers had similar age distributions of visitors, except for Alamosa, which had the greatest concentrations of visitors over 34 (Table 7). The average number of people per group was 2.7 (median 2.0) (Table 8).

**TABLE 7: AGE DISTRIBUTION OF VISITOR GROUPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Alamosa</th>
<th>Burlington</th>
<th>Cortez</th>
<th>Dinosaur</th>
<th>Fort Collins</th>
<th>Fruita</th>
<th>Julesburg</th>
<th>Lamar</th>
<th>Red Rocks</th>
<th>Trinidad</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>U.S. Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 18</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-34</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-54</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and Over</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 8: GROUP SIZE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Alamosa</th>
<th>Burlington</th>
<th>Cortez</th>
<th>Dinosaur</th>
<th>Fort Collins</th>
<th>Fruita</th>
<th>Julesburg</th>
<th>Lamar</th>
<th>Red Rocks</th>
<th>Trinidad</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The greatest representation came from households with incomes over $100,000 (28%) and those with incomes between $50,000 and $75,000 (24.9%). The smallest representation was households with incomes less than $25,000 (7.8%) (Table 9). The household income distribution of visitors to welcome centers was higher than the national income distribution. This question elicited the fewest responses in the follow-up survey, with only 78.1% of respondents reporting a household income range.
TABLE 9: HOUSEHOLD INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Welcome Centers</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under $25K</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25-$50K</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50-$75K</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75-$100K</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $100K</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Trip Profile

Just over half of visitors surveyed reported destinations in multiple states during their trip, while 49.4% of visitors responded that Colorado was their sole destination; however, responses varied widely by welcome center (Table 10). More than average visitors to tourist areas, such as Dinosaur and Cortez, responded that they considered multiple states destinations on their trip. Conversely, Red Rocks had the highest percentage of visitors respond Colorado was their primary destination.

TABLE 10: VISITOR DESTINATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Alamosa</th>
<th>Burlington</th>
<th>Cortez</th>
<th>Dinosaur</th>
<th>Fort Collins</th>
<th>Fruita</th>
<th>Julesburg</th>
<th>Lamar</th>
<th>Red Rocks</th>
<th>Trinidad</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Only</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple States</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average length of stay showed high levels of variability by center, with Alamosa, Burlington, and Trinidad recording the highest number of visitor nights, and Fort Collins, Dinosaur, and Julesburg recording the fewest visitor nights. However, median duration showed greater likeness between centers. The average stay per visitor group was 6.7 nights, with a median of 4.0 (Table 11). Shown another way, 80.6% of visitors stayed less than a week, and responses were similar across centers (Table 12). Upon completion of their trip, visitors reported staying on average 0.2 (median 1.0) nights longer in Colorado.

TABLE 11: NUMBER OF NIGHTS IN COLORADO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Alamosa</th>
<th>Burlington</th>
<th>Cortez</th>
<th>Dinosaur</th>
<th>Fort Collins</th>
<th>Fruita</th>
<th>Julesburg</th>
<th>Lamar</th>
<th>Red Rocks</th>
<th>Trinidad</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 12: NIGHTS IN COLORADO BY DURATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Alamosa</th>
<th>Burlington</th>
<th>Cortez</th>
<th>Dinosaur</th>
<th>Fort Collins</th>
<th>Fruita</th>
<th>Julesburg</th>
<th>Lamar</th>
<th>Red Rocks</th>
<th>Trinidad</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 8</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>81.2%</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-14</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 14</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Visitors were asked aided questions about the purpose of their trip, with responses falling into six categories and two subcategories:

- Visit Friends and Family
- Explore Colorado
- Special Event
  - Personal Event
  - Commercial Event
- Business
- Passing through to Another State
- Other

Visitors were asked to select all categories that applied to their trip. The greatest percentage of people indicated they were in Colorado to explore the state (63.3%) (Table 13). Nearly 39% of visitors indicated that they were passing through Colorado to another state, and 36.6% were traveling in Colorado to visit friends and family. More than 9% of visitors were in Colorado for a personal special event (e.g., wedding, family reunion, funeral, etc.), and 8.0% indicated a commercial event (i.e., concert, convention\(^1\), etc.). Business travelers represented 8.7% of visitor reasons, and 3.2% of visitors indicated other reasons for travel (i.e., moving, college, and medical treatment). (See Table 13.)

TABLE 13: REASONS FOR TRIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Alamosa</th>
<th>Burlington</th>
<th>Cortez</th>
<th>Dinosaur</th>
<th>Fort Collins</th>
<th>Fruita</th>
<th>Julesburg</th>
<th>Lamar</th>
<th>Red Rocks</th>
<th>Trinidad</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explore Colorado</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passing Through</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends and Family</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Event - Personal</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Event - Commercial</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) The survey period intentionally avoided outlier special events, such as the Democratic National Convention in Denver.
Visitors were subsequently asked the single-most important reason for their trip in Colorado, with 32.5% responding they were exploring Colorado, 23.8% passing through, and 21.2% visiting friends and family. Nearly 8% were visiting Colorado for a personal special event and 5.4% were visiting for a commercial event. The remaining visitors were primarily in Colorado for business (6.6%) or other reasons (3.0%). (See Table 14.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 14: MOST IMPORTANT REASON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passing Through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends and Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Event – Personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Event - Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following their trip to Colorado, 59.8% of visitors indicated finalizing all or most of their accommodations prior to visiting the state, while 38.2% made their accommodations during their visit (Table 15). Conversely, 39.2% of visitors finalized most of their activities prior to visiting the state, while 59.7% finalized some or all of their activities during their trip (Table 16).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 15: FINALIZED LODGING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Before/Some During</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All During</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 16: FINALIZED ACTIVITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Before/Some During</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All During</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall, the Internet was cited as the most common resource used when planning visits to Colorado, with 61.0% of visitors indicating they tapped the web for planning information. Nearly half of visitors surveyed said they relied at least partially on previous experience visiting the state to plan their trip. Many visitors indicated that state-provided resources were used to help in trip planning, with 28.7% using welcome/visitors centers, and 18.8% using the Colorado State Vacation Guide. More than one-out-of-five visitors indicated using guidebooks, personal recommendations, and highways signs. Global positioning system (GPS) devices were cited by 16.7% of visitors, while only 1.4% and 1.2%, respectively, indicated using the Yellowpages/telephone or a travel agent for planning their Colorado trip. Of the 31.1% of visitors who indicated other planning resources, 51.2% specifically identified an atlas or map, 31.8% mentioned AAA, 3.3% indicated that their place of work had planned the trip, and 2.2% sourced magazines. (See Table 17.)

### TABLE 17: PLANNING RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Alamosa</th>
<th>Burlington</th>
<th>Cortez</th>
<th>Dinosaur</th>
<th>Fort Collins</th>
<th>Fruita</th>
<th>Julesburg</th>
<th>Lamar</th>
<th>Red Rocks</th>
<th>Trinidad</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Experience</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome Center/Visitor Center</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidebooks</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Recommendations</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Signs</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Vacation Guide</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPS</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellowpages/Telephone</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Agent</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlas/Map</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAA</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magazine</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the resources visitors indicated they rely on the most, the Internet (31.1%) and previous experience (20.1%) garnered the highest number of responses. More than 13% of visitors reported welcome and visitor centers are their primary planning resource, and another 13% cited personal
recommendations. Other resources (e.g., AAA, atlas/maps, magazines, etc.) accounted for 7.5% of responses. The Colorado State Vacation Guide and other guidebooks each were primary resources for 5.6% of visitors. Together, highway signs, GPS, travel agents, Yellowpages/telephone, and “don’t know” totaled 3.8%. (See Table 18.)

**TABLE 18: PRIMARY RESOURCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Alamosa</th>
<th>Burlington</th>
<th>Cortez</th>
<th>Dinosaur</th>
<th>Fort Collins</th>
<th>Fruita</th>
<th>Julesburg</th>
<th>Lamar</th>
<th>Red Rocks</th>
<th>Trinidad</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Experience in Colorado</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome Center/Visitor Centers</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Recommendations</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado State Vacation Guide</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Guidebook</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Signs</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPS in Car</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Agent</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellowpages/Telephone</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the on-site survey, visitors were asked to list the top three activities of interest during their Colorado trip. Responses were sorted into 14 categories (Table 19). Given the number and diversity of outdoor responses, the outdoor category was further divided into nine subcategories (Table 20).

At 65.7%, most visitors indicated they were interested in outdoor activities during their trip. More than 31% of visitors cited a specific city that they would visit. At 15.1%, arts, historical, and cultural activities were the third most common response by visitors. Nearly 8% of respondents indicated they were particularly interested in Colorado’s tourist trains. Sports, family activities, and events were each listed by more than 4% of visitors. The remaining categories, including shopping, brewery/winery tours, weather, relocations, and other, each represented less than 3% of responses. (See Table 19.)

Regarding outdoor activities, 41.8% of visitors indicated interest in mountains, parks, and monuments during their trip. Nearly 16% indicated sightseeing as one of their top activities. Active outdoor activities were mentioned often, specifically hiking (13.0%), rafting (5.7%), camping (5.6%),
fishing (4.7%), and biking (3.0%). Visitors partaking in ATV activities totaled 1.6%, and all other outdoor responses (e.g., botanical gardens, hot springs) accounted for 10.0%. (See Table 20.)

### TABLE 19: TRIP ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Alamosa</th>
<th>Burlington</th>
<th>Cortez</th>
<th>Dinosaur</th>
<th>Fort Collins</th>
<th>Fruita</th>
<th>Julesburg</th>
<th>Lamar</th>
<th>Red Rocks</th>
<th>Trinidad</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>82.3%</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>95.7%</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts/Culture/Historic</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trains</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brewery/Winery</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casinos</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocate</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 20: OUTDOOR ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Alamosa</th>
<th>Burlington</th>
<th>Cortez</th>
<th>Dinosaur</th>
<th>Fort Collins</th>
<th>Fruita</th>
<th>Julesburg</th>
<th>Lamar</th>
<th>Red Rocks</th>
<th>Trinidad</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mountains, Parks, Monuments</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>72.8%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sightseeing</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiking</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafting, Canoeing, Kayaking</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biking</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATV (Four-Wheeling)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (General)</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upon completion of their trip, visitors who submitted follow-up surveys provided information about their participation in activities during their visit in the state. Outdoor/nature activities were cited most often, capturing 65.9% of visitor responses. More than 52% reported participating in city sightseeing activities. Just over half of visitors indicated participating in shopping activities during their trip, compared to 2.6% in the initial survey.
who reported shopping would be one of their top three activities. Arts, cultural, and historical activities were undertaken by 39.6% of visitors. Bars, pubs, and breweries were visited by 21.3%, compared to 5.4% for wineries and vineyards. Nearly 17% participated in festivals, fairs, and events, while 10.4% took in sporting events and 4.9% visited casinos. (See Table 21.)

### TABLE 21: ACTIVITIES REPORTED IN FOLLOW-UP SURVEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Alamosa</th>
<th>Burlington</th>
<th>Cortez</th>
<th>Dinosaur</th>
<th>Fort Collins</th>
<th>Fruita</th>
<th>Julesburg</th>
<th>Lamar</th>
<th>Red Rocks</th>
<th>Trinidad</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor/Nature</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Sightseeing</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>50.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts/Culture/Historical</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bars/Pubs/Breweries</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festivals/Fairs/Events</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winery/Vineyards</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casinos/Gaming</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Spending Profile

Average expenditures as estimated by visitors to the Colorado Welcome Centers were $838 per group, with a median of $500 (Table 22). Groups spent on average $187 per night in the state, or $84 per person per night (Table 23 and Table 24).

### TABLE 22: TOTAL SPENDING BY VISITOR GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Alamosa</th>
<th>Burlington</th>
<th>Cortez</th>
<th>Dinosaur</th>
<th>Fort Collins</th>
<th>Fruita</th>
<th>Julesburg</th>
<th>Lamar</th>
<th>Red Rocks</th>
<th>Trinidad</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>$873</td>
<td>$886</td>
<td>$812</td>
<td>$743</td>
<td>$833</td>
<td>$594</td>
<td>$739</td>
<td>$675</td>
<td>$1,310</td>
<td>$972</td>
<td>$838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 23: SPENDING BY VISITOR GROUP PER NIGHT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Alamosa</th>
<th>Burlington</th>
<th>Cortez</th>
<th>Dinosaur</th>
<th>Fort Collins</th>
<th>Fruita</th>
<th>Julesburg</th>
<th>Lamar</th>
<th>Red Rocks</th>
<th>Trinidad</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>$162</td>
<td>$167</td>
<td>$178</td>
<td>$216</td>
<td>$215</td>
<td>$169</td>
<td>$173</td>
<td>$157</td>
<td>$268</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 24: SPENDING PER VISITOR PER NIGHT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Alamosa</th>
<th>Burlington</th>
<th>Cortez</th>
<th>Dinosaur</th>
<th>Fort Collins</th>
<th>Fruita</th>
<th>Julesburg</th>
<th>Lamar</th>
<th>Red Rocks</th>
<th>Trinidad</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>$77</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>$105</td>
<td>$99</td>
<td>$74</td>
<td>$78</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>$110</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median</strong></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 25: SPENDING BY GROUP, FOLLOW-UP SURVEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Alamosa</th>
<th>Burlington</th>
<th>Cortez</th>
<th>Dinosaur</th>
<th>Fort Collins</th>
<th>Fruita</th>
<th>Julesburg</th>
<th>Lamar</th>
<th>Red Rocks</th>
<th>Trinidad</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td>$1,436</td>
<td>$1,102</td>
<td>$1,185</td>
<td>$857</td>
<td>$1,073</td>
<td>$1,014</td>
<td>$1,114</td>
<td>$1,501</td>
<td>$1,680</td>
<td>$1,141</td>
<td>$1,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median</strong></td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change Over Initial Survey</strong></td>
<td>482</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 26: PERCENTAGE OF VISITOR SPENDING BY CATEGORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Alamosa</th>
<th>Burlington</th>
<th>Cortez</th>
<th>Dinosaur</th>
<th>Fort Collins</th>
<th>Fruita</th>
<th>Julesburg</th>
<th>Lamar</th>
<th>Red Rocks</th>
<th>Trinidad</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lodging</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food/Drink</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports and Other Outdoor Activities</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Arts and Cultural Activities</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nightlife</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Activities</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All</strong></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extrapolating per person expenditures of $80 and trip durations of 6.7 nights to the 337,930 visitors that visited the Colorado Welcome Centers in June, July, and August 2008, total estimated spending by this segment of Colorado visitors was $182.1 million in the summer of 2008, for a total economic impact of $422.4 million (direct, indirect, and induced). Spending by this segment of visitors to the state accounted for nearly 3,900 direct jobs and nearly 2,200 indirect jobs. Total wages paid to direct and indirect employees was estimated at more than $142 million in 2008. (See Table 27.) While this entire impact is not causally related to the Welcome Centers, it is important to understand that the Centers are touching a significant segment of visitors to Colorado, and thus have the opportunity to portray the State in its most favorable light through the hospitality of the volunteers, information obtained in the Centers, and conveniences provided by the Centers.
As expected, groups spending more days in Colorado generally spent, on average, more money. Conversely, average spending per night decreased as length of stay increased, anecdotally caused by RV visitors staying at campgrounds and cooking in, rather than staying at hotels and eating at restaurants. (See Figure 3 and Figure 4.)

**TABLE 27: TOTAL VISITOR SPENDING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percent of Total Spending</th>
<th>Direct Spending (in millions)</th>
<th>Total Output, Direct and Indirect (in millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lodging</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>$61.2</td>
<td>$131.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>87.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food/Drink</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>102.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nightlife</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports and Other Outdoor Activities</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Arts and Cultural Activities</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Activities</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$182.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>$422.4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 3: PER NIGHT AVERAGE GROUP SPENDING BY NUMBER OF NIGHTS IN COLORADO**

**FIGURE 4: AVERAGE GROUP SPENDING BY NUMBER OF NIGHTS IN COLORADO**
Welcome Centers

Visitors were asked aided questions regarding their reasons for visiting the Colorado Welcome Center. Responses fell into three categories; visitors indicated all reasons that applied.

- Information
  - Directions/Maps
  - Attractions/Activities
  - Lodging/Restaurants
  - Events/Festivals
  - History/Culture/Ecology
  - Road/Weather
- Facility
  - Restrooms/Water Fountain
  - Travel Break
  - Internet
  - Food/Drinks
- Other

The most common reason for visiting the Colorado Welcome Centers was to get information (80.6%), while 65.3% of the reasons were facility specific. In addition, 20.6% of visitors reported stopping for other reasons, including souvenirs, free t-shirts (promotion), free coffee, coupon books, the train, or other on-site attractions (Table 28).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Alamosa</th>
<th>Burlington</th>
<th>Cortez</th>
<th>Dinosaur</th>
<th>Fort Collins</th>
<th>Fruita</th>
<th>Julesburg</th>
<th>Lamar</th>
<th>Red Rocks</th>
<th>Trinidad</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>87.1%</td>
<td>94.2%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
<td>79.9%</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>65.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of those who reported “other” reasons for stopping, some reported that on-site attractions lured them to the welcome center, including the wind blade in Lamar, the teepees in Julesburg, the trolley ride in Trinidad, the war memorial in Fruita, and the Red Rocks Amphitheatre. In addition, 4.5% of visitors reported stopping specifically to pick up a free t-shirt—a promotion advertised on the www.Colorado.com website, as well as in regional newspapers.
Of the visitors who were seeking information from the Colorado Welcome Centers, 37.6% stopped to get directions or maps and 37.0% stopped to obtain information on attractions and activities. Nearly 10% of visitors sought information on lodging and restaurants, while 8.0% picked up information on history, culture, and ecology. The remaining visitors found out about events and festivals (4.5%), and road and weather conditions (3.1%). (See Table 29.)

**TABLE 29: VISITORS SEEKING INFORMATION, BY TYPE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Alamosa</th>
<th>Burlington</th>
<th>Cortez</th>
<th>Dinosaur</th>
<th>Fort Collins</th>
<th>Fruita</th>
<th>Julesburg</th>
<th>Lamar</th>
<th>Red Rocks</th>
<th>Trinidad</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directions/Maps</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractions/Activities</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging/Restaurants</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History/Culture/Ecology</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events/Festivals</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road/Weather Conditions</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most visitors who stopped at the welcome center facility specified they stopped to use restrooms and the water fountain (57.6%). Another 34.5% took a travel break at the facility. The remainder of visitors stopped to purchase food or drinks (5.6%) or to use the Internet (2.3%). (See Table 30.)

**TABLE 30: VISITORS USING THE FACILITIES, BY FACILITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Alamosa</th>
<th>Burlington</th>
<th>Cortez</th>
<th>Dinosaur</th>
<th>Fort Collins</th>
<th>Fruita</th>
<th>Julesburg</th>
<th>Lamar</th>
<th>Red Rocks</th>
<th>Trinidad</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restrooms/Water Fountain</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
<td>68.1%</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Break</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Food or Drinks</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Visitors were asked their primary reason for stopping at the Colorado Welcome Centers. A majority of visitors selected information-related purposes (55.4%), while 32.8% chose facility-related purposes and 11.9% stopped for other reasons (Table 31). More specifically, 25.8% of visitors stopped primarily to gather information on attractions and activities, 22.9% stopped for directions or maps, 17.1% for restrooms or water fountains, and 15.4% to use the facility for a travel break (Table 32).

---

1Regardless of the availability of food and drinks, visitors were asked the reason for stopping at the welcome center. Some locations have vending machines and snacks.
When asked during the on-site survey, nearly all visitors to the Colorado Welcome Centers indicated that the welcome centers met their needs (98.3%), with only 1.7% stating otherwise (Table 33). The follow-up survey results revealed that 96.9% of visitors indicated that the centers were very or somewhat useful and 98.7% would recommend others stop at the welcome centers (Table 34 and Table 35). Only 0.7% cited that the centers were not useful and 1.3% would not recommend others visit the centers (Table 34 and Table 35). Visitors overwhelmingly found information to be correct, while 4% discovered some inaccuracies (Table 36).

### TABLE 31: PRIMARY REASON FOR VISITING THE WELCOME CENTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Alamosa</th>
<th>Burlington</th>
<th>Cortez</th>
<th>Dinosaur</th>
<th>Fort Collins</th>
<th>Fruita</th>
<th>Julesburg</th>
<th>Lamar</th>
<th>Red Rocks</th>
<th>Trinidad</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>59.9%</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 32: PRIMARY REASON FOR VISITING THE WELCOME CENTERS BY SUBCATEGORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Alamosa</th>
<th>Burlington</th>
<th>Cortez</th>
<th>Dinosaur</th>
<th>Fort Collins</th>
<th>Fruita</th>
<th>Julesburg</th>
<th>Lamar</th>
<th>Red Rocks</th>
<th>Trinidad</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractions/Activities</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directions/Maps</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging/Restaurants</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events/Festivals</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History/Culture/Ecology</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road/Weather Conditions</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrooms/Water Fountain</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Break</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Food or Drinks</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 34: USEFULNESS OF WELCOME CENTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Alamosa</th>
<th>Burlington</th>
<th>Cortez</th>
<th>Dinosaur</th>
<th>Fort Collins</th>
<th>Fruita</th>
<th>Julesburg</th>
<th>Lamar</th>
<th>Red Rocks</th>
<th>Trinidad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Useful</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>68.1%</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Useful</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Useful</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 35: RECOMMEND TO OTHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Alamosa</th>
<th>Burlington</th>
<th>Cortez</th>
<th>Dinosaur</th>
<th>Fort Collins</th>
<th>Fruita</th>
<th>Julesburg</th>
<th>Lamar</th>
<th>Red Rocks</th>
<th>Trinidad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>97.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>97.4%</td>
<td>97.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 4% of visitors who indicated receiving incorrect information, specific responses describing the incorrect information were limited. Responses critiqued information provided on attraction prices, tour times, camping, maps, and restaurant hours. Some of these were directed at brochures that had inaccurate information, while other pertained to the travel counselor’s information.

TABLE 36: INFORMATION CORRECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Alamosa</th>
<th>Burlington</th>
<th>Cortez</th>
<th>Dinosaur</th>
<th>Fort Collins</th>
<th>Fruita</th>
<th>Julesburg</th>
<th>Lamar</th>
<th>Red Rocks</th>
<th>Trinidad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>97.4%</td>
<td>96.1%</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
<td>94.9%</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td>95.7%</td>
<td>98.0%</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
<td>97.1%</td>
<td>97.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Visitors were asked what improvements or additions they would make to the facilities, personnel, services, or information offered. Nearly 90% of visitors could not think of any possible additions, and 91.5% of visitors could not brainstorm suggestions for improvements (Table 37 and Table 39). Of the visitors who made suggestions for additions to the welcome centers, 33.8% were goods-related (e.g., souvenirs, food, drinks, etc.), 26.9% were information-related (e.g., brochures, maps, etc.), 20.8% related to services (e.g., wireless Internet, reservations, etc.), and 2.8% were other (Table 38). Of those who made suggestions for improvements to the welcome centers, 60.9% were facility-related (e.g., cleaner bathrooms, better signage, etc.), 15.2% related to services (e.g., update website, later hours, etc.), and 6.5% were other (Table 40). (For detailed lists of suggested additions and improvements, see Appendix 6 and Appendix 9.)
A majority (54.8%) of visitors indicated that the Colorado Welcome Centers impacted their trip by providing new ideas of things to see or do that they did not know about prior to their stop at the center (Table 41).
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TABLE 41: NEW IDEAS OF THINGS TO SEE AND DO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Alamosa</th>
<th>Burlington</th>
<th>Cortez</th>
<th>Dinosaur</th>
<th>Fort Collins</th>
<th>Fruita</th>
<th>Julesburg</th>
<th>Lamar</th>
<th>Red Rocks</th>
<th>Trinidad</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact of Visitor Travel Spending

In order to quantifiably measure the Welcome Centers’ return on investment to Colorado, visitors were asked in the follow-up survey how the centers impacted their trip. Nearly 7% of respondents reported extending their stay in Colorado an average of 2.6 days due to visiting the Welcome center. Just over 5% of visitors who extended their stay were on trips between 0 and 7 days (5.2%), while 1.4% stayed between 8 and 14 days, and 0.3% stayed longer than 14 days. Nearly one-in-four visitors added activities to their trip, and more than one-in-three visitors received information for future trips in Colorado. (See Table 42.)

TABLE 42: IMPACT OF WELCOME CENTERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Alamosa</th>
<th>Burlington</th>
<th>Cortez</th>
<th>Dinosaur</th>
<th>Fort Collins</th>
<th>Fruita</th>
<th>Julesburg</th>
<th>Lamar</th>
<th>Red Rocks</th>
<th>Trinidad</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extended Stay¹</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Added Activities</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received Info for Future Trip</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Influence</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Days Extended</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, visitors were asked in the on-site interview their estimated total expected budget (expenditures) for the Colorado portion of their trip. Upon follow-up, visitors were again asked their total expenditures on the Colorado portion of their trip, and were then asked to provide a breakdown of expenditures by the following categories:

- Lodging (including camping & RV permits and all varieties of hotels)
- Transportation (including fuel, car rental & public transportation)
- Food/Drink (including groceries & restaurants)
- Nightlife
- Sports and other outdoor activities
- Shopping (including gifts & retail)
- Other Arts and Cultural activities (including museum entrances, concerts, fairs, etc.)
- Children’s activities
Secondary effects, or the multiplier effects, estimate the indirect employment and earnings generated in the study area due to the interindustry relationships between the facility and other industries. As an example, consider a manufacturing company operating in Boulder County. The firm employs management, engineers, and support staff for their direct manufacturing operations. In addition, the company spends on goods and services to support their manufacturing operations, leading to auxiliary jobs in the community in transportation, accounting, utilities, retail goods, and so on—the indirect impact. Furthermore, employees spend their earnings on goods and services in the community, leading to jobs in retail, accounting, entertainment, and so on—the induced impact.

Conceptually, multipliers quantify the number of jobs. Multipliers are static and do not account for disruptive shifts in infrastructure without specifically addressing infrastructure changes. This model uses IMPLAN multipliers purchased from the Minnesota IMPLAN Group (MIG) and aggregated for each study area. Public revenues and public costs are not tabulated due to the unknown residence dispersion of secondary employees.

The measurable impact of the Centers was quantifiable through the conscious and identifiable behavioral changes of visitors. Following their trip in Colorado, visitors were asked if they increased their stay, and if so, by how many days. About 7% of follow-up respondents explicitly reported consciously increasing their stay by an average of 2.6 nights. In addition, visitors were asked during the on-site survey and in the follow-up survey about the duration of their trip in Colorado as well as associated expenditures. Overall trip durations increased on average by 0.3 nights (median 1.0), while average expenditures increased by $349 over their initial projections. Issues exist when attempting to capture behavioral change with either means of surveying — the former asks visitors for their identifiable change in behavior days or weeks after it has occurred, and the latter is a comparison of subconscious behavior before and after it has occurred.

The direct spending associated with the explicit behavior change in June, July, and August of 2008 (2.6 nights by 7% of visitors), was estimated at $4.9 million. The change in total output (direct, indirect, and induced) was $11.4 million.

Additionally, given that 38.2% of respondents reported finalizing some or all of their lodging plans during their trip and 59.7% reported finalizing some or all of their activities during their trip, the Welcome Centers had the opportunity to impact more than $24.7 million in lodging expenditures and $32.2 million in activity expenditures.
CONCLUSION
With more than one million annual visitors, the Colorado Welcome Centers are sought as distinctive sources of information and services to domestic and international visitors alike. As a collective body, these centers are distinguished at disseminating information on Colorado activities, attractions, lodging, restaurants, roads, and so on. In the summer of 2008, visitors to the welcome centers were responsible for $182 million in spending in the state, which translates into 3,900 direct jobs and $422 million in direct and indirect output. Furthermore, additional direct spending consciously attributable to information provided by Welcome Centers was $4.9 million from June-August 2009, resulting in $11.4 million in additional output (direct, indirect, and induced).

Completed Surveys
Colorado’s 10 welcome centers are located at nine entrances to the state, and one heavily visited Denver city park at the foot of the mountains. The centers recorded 337,930 visitors in the months of June, July, and August 2008, or 20% fewer than the same period in 2007. This was at a time when automobile fuel prices topped $4 per gallon, and the economy was showing severe signs of slowdown. Survey trips occurred during all three months to the centers, resulting in 2,177 completed on-site surveys and 690 follow-up surveys.

Visitor Profile
While visitor commonalities exist from center to center, no one profile represents all Colorado Welcome Centers. Nearly three-in-four visitors (73.3%) to the Colorado Welcome Centers had made prior visits to Colorado, while 14.4% were first-time visitors and 12.4% were Colorado residents staying at least one night away from home. Responses varied between locations, with Red Rocks, Fort Collins, and Cortez showing the greatest percentage of first-time visitors to the state, and Dinosaur and Alamosa recording the greatest percentages of Colorado residents staying at least one night away from home. Colorado and 10 other states accounted for the largest percentage of visitors (58%). The age distribution of visitors varied widely from center to center, with 20.6% falling under the age of 18, 12.8% between 18 and 34, 27% between 34 and 55, and 39.6% 55 and older. The greatest household income representation was in excess of $100,000 annually.

Trip Profile
It is important to note that when visitors arrive at the welcome centers, their trip is not all finalized, which creates an opportunity to affect their time in Colorado. Thirty-eight percent have yet to finalize accommodations plans, and 60% are still planning activities and attractions. Considering that half of these visitors are on a trip that includes visiting other states, welcome centers have the opportunity to provide compelling reasons for visitors to spend more time, and thus more money, in Colorado rather than elsewhere. The types of activities and attractions that interested visitors varied widely from center to center, as would be expected given the different activities and attractions offered by geographical location in Colorado. Most visitors (65.7%) were planning on participating in some form of outdoor activity, and most of these specifically noted visiting the mountains, national parks, or national monuments; going sightseeing; or engaging in active outdoor activities (e.g., hiking, rafting, camping, fishing, biking). Other major trip activities included touring cities (31.3%), and engaging in arts, cultural, or historic activities (15.1%).


**Spending Profile**

As indicated in the on-site survey results, an average of $838 (median $500) was spent by groups that visited the centers. Results from comparing the on-site survey to the follow-up survey revealed that group spending increased on average $349 over the course of the trip. Visitors reported spending about one-third of their total Colorado trip expenditures on lodging, 22.9% on food/drink, 19.5% on transportation, and 14.3% on shopping. These percentages were fairly representative from center to center.

**Welcome Center**

Quantifiably, the welcome centers influenced visitors to stay longer, participate in more activities, spend more, and plan on returning to the state in the future. Of visitors who responded to the follow-up survey, 7% reported increasing their stay by an average of 2.6 days, nearly 25% added activities, and one-third obtained information to be used for a future trip to Colorado. More than half of visitors learned of something new to see or do while visiting the state. Comparing the on-site survey to the follow-up survey, visitors increased their spending on average by $373 for the total group on the Colorado portion of their trip.

Of the roughly 80% of visitors seeking information from the welcome center, 37.6% were seeking directions and maps, 37.0% seeking information on attractions and activities, and 9.8% were seeking information on lodging and restaurants. Visitors most frequently received information from the Internet (61%), previous experience (49.8%), welcome/visitor centers (28.7%), guidebooks (23.3%), personal recommendations (22.5%), and the official Colorado State Vacation Guide (18.8%). Critiques of the information offered at welcome centers were minimal, with suggestions ranging from more specific information to updated brochures.

Many visitors stopped at the welcome centers to use the facilities—58% for restrooms and water fountains, and 35% to take a travel break. Providing above-par quality services will help ensure that visitors return to the welcome centers, opening opportunities for the transfer of information. Considering the few critiques regarding the facility (e.g., more shade, paper towels in the bathrooms, playgrounds), welcome centers received high marks in the quality of the establishments.

Ongoing support of the welcome centers at the state level is leveraged by the local community engaging volunteers to staff the centers. These individuals provide personal recommendations for local and state activities and attractions. This study shows that the welcome centers impact visitors, acting as a valuable source of information and services.
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Appendix 1: Results by Welcome Center

Alamosa Welcome Center

Completed Surveys
The Alamosa Welcome Center is at the junction of Colorado Highway 17 and U.S. Highway 285, in the middle of the San Luis Valley. The center came online in 2008, and recorded 10,329 total visitors in the months of June, July, and August. Survey trips were planned for all three months, but the June trip did not occur due to a delay in highway signage resulting in low traffic for the month. A total of three survey trips were made to Alamosa in July and August, resulting in 118 completed on-site surveys and 40 follow-up surveys.

Visitor Profile
More than two-thirds of visitors to the Alamosa Welcome Center had made prior visits to Colorado, while one-out-of-ten were first-time visitors and 22.9% were Colorado residents. Visitors represented in the surveys were older in age than the average for all centers, with 24.6% between 35 and 54, and 58.4% age 55 and over. Those between 18 and 34, and under 18 each represented 8.5% of the groups. The average group size, at 2.4 people, was slightly smaller than the state average. The greatest household income representation was between $50,000 and $75,000 annually.

Trip Profile
Nearly 70% of visitors to the center were only visiting Colorado, while the rest were on a trip that included other states. The average length of stay in Colorado was 10.3 nights, with a median of 4.0 nights, indicating that a small percentage of groups stayed longer, skewing the average. In fact, 12.7% of visitors stayed more than 14 days—the largest percentage in the state. Nearly 67% of visitors were traveling primarily to explore the state, and 74.6% indicated they planned to participate in outdoor activities or visit outdoor attractions during their trip. Tourist trains were cited by nearly one-in-four visitors as a top activity or attraction—the most in the state. More than 36% of visitors to this center finalized all or some of their lodging arrangements during their trip, and nearly 59% finalized some or all of their activities during their trip. Regarding planning resources, visitors most often cited using the Internet (58.5%), previous experience (34.7%), “other” resources (37.3%), and welcome/visitor centers (24.6%).

Spending Profile
As indicated in the on-site survey results, an average of $873 (median $500) was spent by parties that visited the center - higher than the state average. Results from comparing the on-site survey to the follow-up survey revealed that group spending increased on average $482 over the course of the trip. Visitors reported spending about one-third of their total Colorado trip expenditures on lodging, 24.1% on transportation, 21.6% on food/drink, and 11.7% on shopping.

Welcome Center
Nearly 51% of visitors stopped at the center primarily to collect information—mostly about attractions and activities, as well as to get directions and maps. Visitors stopping for the facility were primarily using the restroom and water fountain, or taking a travel break. An overwhelming majority of visitors found the center somewhat to very useful (94.9%), and 100% reported they would recommend the center to others. The center provided new ideas of things to see and do to 61.9% of visitors.
Burlington

Completed Surveys
The Burlington Welcome Center sits along the major I-70 East-West corridor at the Kansas border, and is typically one of the state’s top three busiest centers, recording nearly 185,000 visits in 2007. The site tallied 45,232 visits in June, July, and August. Foreseeing that construction along I-70 would cause the center to move to a temporary location in July, two survey trips were made to Burlington in June and one in mid-August, resulting in 346 completed on-site surveys and 103 follow-up surveys.

Visitor Profile
Nearly four-out-of-five visitors to the Burlington Welcome Center had made prior visits to Colorado, while 14.7% were first-time visitors and 6.1% were Colorado residents. Visitors represented in the surveys were older in age than the average for all centers, with 24.4% between 35 and 54, and 45.5% age 55 and over. Kids represented 18.6% of visitors, while 11.5% were between 18 and 34. The average group size at 2.5 people was slightly smaller than the state average. The greatest household income representation was between $25,000 and $50,000 annually.

Trip Profile
Nearly 54% of visitors to the center were only visiting Colorado, while the rest were on a trip that included other states. The average length of stay in Colorado was 9.6 nights, with a median of 4.0 nights, indicating that 77.3% stayed less than a week. Visitors to the center were primarily exploring the state (24%), passing through to another state (25.1%), or visiting friends and family (23.4%). More than 53% indicated they planned to participate in outdoor activities or visit outdoor attractions during their trip. Cities were cited by 36.4% of visitors as a top activity or attraction—among the highest in the state. More than 38% of visitors to this center finalized all or some of their lodging arrangements during their trip, and over 55% finalized some or all of their activities during their trip. Regarding planning resources, visitors most often cited using the Internet (67.3%), previous experience (57.8%), guidebooks (31.5%), “other” resources (37.3%), and welcome/visitor centers (24.9%)

Spending Profile
As indicated in the on-site survey, an average of $886 (median $500) was spent by parties that visited the center, which was slightly higher than the state average. Results from comparing the on-site survey to the follow-up survey revealed group spending increased on average $216 over the course of the trip. Visitors reported spending about one-third of their total Colorado trip expenditures on lodging, 23.5% on transportation, 22.4% on food/drink, and 12.5% on shopping.

Welcome Center
More than 51% of visitors stopped at the center primarily to collect information—mostly about directions, maps, attractions, and activities. Visitors stopping for the facility were primarily using the restroom and water fountain, or taking a travel break. An overwhelming majority of visitors found the center somewhat to very useful (96.1%), and 97.1% reported they would recommend the center to others. The center provided new ideas of things to see and do to 42.2% of visitors.
Cortez

Completed Surveys
The Cortez Welcome Center serves southwestern Colorado at the junction of U.S. Highways 160 and 491 from Utah, Arizona, and New Mexico. The center recorded 48,858 visits in 2007, 46.7% of which were in the months of June, July, and August. In 2008, the center tallied 18,224 visits over the same three months. Survey trips were made in June and August, resulting in 165 completed on-site and 42 follow-up surveys.

Visitor Profile
More than 73% of visitors to the Cortez Welcome Center had made prior visits to Colorado, while 17% were first-time visitors and 9.7% were Colorado residents. Thirty-three percent of visitors represented in the surveys were between 35 and 54, and 37.8% were 55 and over. Kids under 18 represented 19% of the visitors, and 10.3% were between 18 and 34. The average group size, at 2.5 people, was slightly smaller than the state average. The greatest household income representation was between $50,000 and $75,000 annually.

Trip Profile
Nearly 35% of visitors to the center were only visiting Colorado, while the rest were on a trip that included other states. The average length of stay in Colorado was 5.9 nights, with a median of 3.0 nights, and 81.2% stayed less than one week. Nearly 61% of visitors were traveling primarily to explore the state, and 59.4% indicated they planned to participate in outdoor activities or visit outdoor attractions during their trip. Arts, cultural, and historic activities were cited by two-thirds of respondents, primarily due to the proximity to Mesa Verde National Park. Forty percent of visitors to this center finalized all or some of their lodging arrangements during their trip, and 66.7% finalized some or all of their activities during their trip. Regarding planning resources, visitors most often cited using the Internet (75.8%), welcome/visitor centers (41.8%), guidebooks (39.4%), and previous experience (35.2%).

Spending Profile
As indicated in the on-site survey, an average of $812 (median $500) was spent by parties that visited the center, which was slightly lower than the state average. Results from comparing the on-site survey to the follow-up survey revealed group spending increased on average $373 over the course of the trip. Visitors reported spending about one-third of their total Colorado trip expenditures on lodging, 19.1% on transportation, 22.1% on food/drink, and 17.4% on shopping.

Welcome Center
More than 76% of visitors stopped at the center primarily to collect information—mostly about attractions and activities, as well as to get directions and maps. Visitors stopping for the facility were primarily using the restroom and water fountain, or taking a travel break. All visitors found the center somewhat to very useful, and 100% reported they would recommend the center to others. The center provided new ideas of things to see and do to 61.2% of visitors.
Dinosaur

Completed Surveys
The Dinosaur Welcome Center rests in northwestern Colorado, three miles east of the Utah border, at the junction of U.S. Highway 40 and State Highway 64. The center recorded 28,389 visitors in 2007, despite being closed December-February. More than half of the visits were made in June, July, and August. June-August 2008 numbers were down only 3.6%, with 18,224 visits. Two total trips were made to the center, one in June and one in August, resulting in 124 completed on-site surveys, and 39 follow-up surveys.

Visitor Profile
More than 57% of visitors to the Dinosaur Welcome Center had made prior visits to Colorado, while 13.7% were first-time visitors and 29% were Colorado residents. Most visitors (44.8%) were 55 and over, while 25.8% were between 35 and 54, 10.5% were between 18 and 34, and 19% were under 18. The average group size, at 2.5 people, was slightly smaller than the state average. The greatest household income representation was between $50,000 and $75,000 annually.

Trip Profile
More than 24% of visitors to the center were only visiting Colorado, while the rest were on a trip that included other states. The average length of stay in Colorado was 5.3 nights, with a median of 2.0 nights, and this center had the largest percentage of visitors staying less than a week (86.6%). More than one-third of visitors were traveling primarily to explore the state, and 82.3% indicated they planned to participate in outdoor activities or visit outdoor attractions during their trip. More than 51% of visitors to this center finalized all or some of their lodging arrangements during their trip, and nearly 61.5% finalized some or all of their activities during their trip. Regarding planning resources, visitors most often cited using previous experience (53.2%), the Internet (50.0%), welcome/visitor centers (45.2%), and guidebooks (37.1%).

Spending Profile
As indicated in the on-site survey, an average of $743 (median $400) was spent by parties that visited the center, which was lower than the state average. Results from comparing the on-site survey to the follow-up survey showed that group spending increased on average $114 over the course of the trip. Visitors reported spending 31.8% of their total Colorado trip expenditures on lodging, 26.0% on transportation, 25.9% on food/drink, and 14.3% on shopping.

Welcome Center
More than 69% of visitors stopped at the center primarily to collect information—mostly about attractions and activities, as well as to get directions and maps. Visitors stopping for the facility were primarily using the restroom and water fountain, or taking a travel break. An overwhelming majority of visitors found the center somewhat to very useful (97.5%), and 97.4% reported they would recommend the center to others. The center provided new ideas of things to see and do to 55.7% of visitors.
Fort Collins

Completed Surveys
The Fort Collins Welcome Center is located in north-central Colorado along the major North-South I-25 corridor. This was the fourth-busiest center in 2007, with 109,316 visits, of which 48% were made in June, July, and August. The center tallied 48,489 visitors from June-August 2008. Due to its close proximity to the University of Colorado in Boulder, the Fort Collins Welcome Center served as the primary training center for this survey project, in addition to the regularly scheduled survey trips. In all, two training trips and three survey trips were made in June, July, and August, resulting in 240 completed on-site and 79 follow-up surveys.

Visitor Profile
More than 72% of visitors to the Fort Collins Welcome Center had made prior visits to Colorado, while 19.6% were first-time visitors and 7.9% were Colorado residents. About 42% of visitors were 55 and over, while 24.1% were between 33 and 54, 12.7% between 18 and 34, and 20.8% under 18. The average group size was 2.6—roughly on par with the state average. The greatest household income representation was greater than $100,000.

Trip Profile
More than 37% of visitors to the center were only visiting Colorado, while the rest were on a trip that included other states. The average trip duration in Colorado was 4.4 nights, with a median of 3.0 nights. Eighty-five percent of visitors stayed less than a week, while only 2.1% stayed longer than two weeks—less than any other center in the state. Nearly 29% of visitors were traveling primarily to explore the state, and 67.5% indicated they planned to participate in outdoor activities or visit outdoor attractions during their trip. Cities were cited by about one-third of respondents as part of their trip activities. More than 44.8% of visitors to this center finalized all or some of their lodging arrangements during their trip, and nearly 66.7% finalized some or all of their activities during their trip. Regarding planning resources, visitors most often cited using the Internet (72.1%), welcome/visitor centers (45.8%), previous experience (37.5%), and personal recommendations (32.1%).

Spending Profile
As indicated in the on-site survey, an average of $833 (median $500) was spent by parties that visited the center, which was higher than the state average. Results from comparing the on-site survey to the follow-up survey revealed that group spending increased on average $240 over the course of the trip. Visitors reported spending about one-third of their total Colorado trip expenditures on lodging, 19.5% on transportation, 21.3% on food/drink, and 14.3% on shopping.

Welcome Center
More than any other center, 79.2% of visitors stopped at the center primarily to collect information—mostly about attractions and activities, as well as to get directions and maps. Visitors stopping for the facility were primarily using the restroom and water fountain, or taking a travel break. An overwhelming majority of visitors found the center somewhat to very useful (98.7%), and 97.4% reported they would recommend the center to others. The center provided new ideas of things to see and do to 64.0% of visitors.
Fruita

Completed Surveys
The Fruita Welcome Center is along the East-West I-25 corridor, only miles from the Utah border. Typically the busiest center, the Fruita Welcome Center recorded 281,441 visitors in 2007, of which 103,985 came in the months of June, July, and August. Debilitating construction led to a dramatic decrease in visitation in 2008, causing the center to close at one point during the summer and bringing the three-month total down to 62,120 visitors. The June survey trip was canceled due to construction, and three trips were made to Fruita in July and August, resulting in 337 completed on-site surveys and 97 follow-up surveys.

Visitor Profile
More than 69% of visitors to the Fruita Welcome Center had made prior visits to Colorado, while 15.4% were first-time visitors and 15.1% were Colorado residents. Age demographics revealed that 44.7% of visitors were 55 and over, 24.1% were between 35 and 54, 13.2% fell between 18 and 34, and 17.9% were under 18. The average group size, at 2.7 people, was on track with the state average. The greatest household income representation was between $50,000 and $75,000 annually.

Trip Profile
Nearly 28% of visitors to the center were only visiting Colorado, while the rest were on a trip that included other states. The average length of stay in Colorado was 5.1 nights, with a median of 2.0 nights. Most visitors stayed for shorter periods of time, skewing the average. In fact, 83.7% of visitors stayed less than a week, while 5.1% stayed longer than two weeks. Nearly 32% of visitors were traveling primarily to explore the state, and 64.1% indicated they planned to participate in outdoor activities or visit outdoor attractions during their trip. City activities were mentioned by one-third of visitors. Nearly 44% of visitors to this center finalized all or some of their lodging arrangements during their trip, and 58.6% finalized some or all of their activities during their trip. Regarding planning resources, visitors most often cited using the Internet (49.6%), “other” resources (44.5%), previous experience (38.0%), and welcome/visitor centers (19.9%).

Spending Profile
As indicated in the on-site survey, an average of $594 (median $300) was spent by parties that visited the center, which was lower than the state average. Results from comparing the on-site survey with the follow-up survey indicated group spending increased on average $419 over the course of the trip. Visitors reported spending 34.6% of their total Colorado trip expenditures on lodging, 18.5% on transportation, 27.6% on food/drink, and 12.9% on shopping.

Welcome Center
Nearly 48% of visitors stopped at the center primarily to collect information—mostly about attractions and activities, as well as to get directions and maps. Visitors stopping for the facility were primarily using the restroom and water fountain, or taking a travel break. An overwhelming majority of visitors found the center somewhat to very useful (96.8%), and 95.7% reported they would recommend the center to others. The center provided new ideas of things to see and do to 55.4% of visitors.
Julesburg

Completed Surveys
The Julesburg Welcome Center sits in the northeastern corner of the state, a few miles from the Nebraska border, along Interstate 76 that links Interstate 80 with Denver. This center was the second busiest in 2007, recording 218,441 visitors, of which 40.6% came in June, July, and August. From June-August 2008, Julesburg tallied 82,370 visitors. A total of four trips were made in June, July, and August, resulting in 333 completed on-site and 107 follow-up surveys.

Visitor Profile
More than 73% of visitors to the Julesburg Welcome Center had made prior visits to Colorado, while nearly one-out-of-ten were first-time visitors and 17.1% were Colorado residents. Age demographics revealed that one-third of visitors were 55 and over, one-fourth were between 35 and 54, 13.5% fell between 18 and 34, and 27.8% were under 18, representing the greatest under 18 representation in the state. The average group size, at 3.0 people, was larger than the state average. The greatest household income representation was between $25,000 and $50,000 annually.

Trip Profile
More than 54% of visitors to the center were only visiting Colorado, while the rest were on a trip that included other states. The average length of stay in Colorado was 5.3 nights, with a median of 4.0 nights—slightly less than the state average. Approximately 82% stayed less than a week. One-in-five visitors were traveling primarily to explore the state, and 58.6% indicated they planned to participate in outdoor activities or visit outdoor attractions during their trip. One-in-four had city activities planned. Thirty percent of visitors to this center finalized all or some of their lodging arrangements during their trip, and 46.7% finalized some or all of their activities during their trip. Regarding planning resources, visitors most often cited using previous experience (58.9%), the Internet (49.5%), “other” (25.2%), personal recommendations (23.7%), and welcome/visitor centers (20.1%).

Spending Profile
As indicated in the on-site survey, an average of $739 (median $500) was spent by parties that visited the center, which was lower than the state average. Results from comparing the on-site survey to the follow-up survey indicated group spending increased on average $375 over the course of the trip. Visitors reported spending 37.7% of their total Colorado trip expenditures on lodging, 17.1% on transportation, 23.2% on food/drink, and 11.3% on shopping.

Welcome Center
This is the only center where more visitors stopped primarily for the facility (62.5%) rather than to collect information (32%). Of those stopping for the facility, most were taking a travel break or using the restrooms/water fountains. An overwhelming majority of visitors (93.2%) found the center somewhat to very useful, and 97.2% reported they would recommend the center to others. The center provided new ideas of things to see and do to 51.1% of visitors.
Lamar

Completed Surveys
The Lamar Welcome Center is at the junction of major north-south and east-west U.S. highways in southeastern Colorado. The center recorded 27,457 total visitors in 2007, 45.1% of which visited in June, July, and August. This three-month period had 11,051 total visitors in 2008. Three survey trips were made to Lamar, resulting in 113 completed on-site surveys and 42 follow-up surveys.

Visitor Profile
More than 76% of visitors to the Lamar Welcome Center had made prior visits to Colorado, while only 8.8% were first-time visitors and 15.0% were Colorado residents. Most visitors to the center were 55 and over (33.3%), while 25.4% were between 35 and 54, 12.9% were between 18 and 34, and 23.6% were under 18. The average group size, at 2.8 people, was slightly higher than the state average. The greatest percentage of annual household incomes was evenly split between the $50,000-$75,000 segment and the greater than $100,000 segment.

Trip Profile
Nearly 42% of visitors to the center were only visiting Colorado, while the rest were on a trip that included other states. The average length of stay, at 6.4 nights (median of 4.0 nights), was on par with the state, with nearly 80% staying less than a week. Nearly 30% of visitors were traveling primarily to explore the state, and 59.3% indicated they planned to participate in outdoor activities or visit outdoor attractions during their trip. City activities were cited by 26.5% of visitors. More than 52% of visitors to this center finalized all or some of their lodging arrangements during their trip, and 71.4% finalized some or all of their activities during their trip. Regarding planning resources, visitors most often cited using previous experience (61.9%), the Internet (59.3%), highway signs (35.4%), “other” resources (33.6%), and welcome/visitor centers (15.0%).

Spending Profile
As indicated in the on-site survey, an average of $675 (median $400) was spent by parties that visited the center, which was lower than the state average. Results from comparing the on-site survey to the follow-up survey indicated group spending increased on average $826 over the course of the trip. Visitors reported spending about one-quarter of their total Colorado trip expenditures on lodging, 17.9% on transportation, 23.3% on food/drink, and 24.3% on shopping.

Welcome Center
More than 65% of visitors stopped at the center primarily to collect information—mostly about attractions and activities, as well as to get directions and maps. Visitors stopping for the facility were primarily using the restroom and water fountain, or taking a travel break. All visitors found the center somewhat to very useful, and 100% reported they would recommend the center to others. The center provided new ideas of things to see and do to 63.7% of visitors.
Red Rocks

_Completed Surveys_
The Red Rocks Welcome Center at the Red Rocks Amphitheatre lies just west of Denver along I-25 at the gateway to the mountains. The center had 34,856 visitors in 2007, of which 44.6% came in June, July, and August. Over this three-month period in 2008, the center hosted 16,913 visitors for an 8.7% increase. Given the proximity of Red Rocks to the University of Colorado at Boulder, this site was used to test the survey instrument and for training purposes, in addition to the normal survey trips. There were two testing/training trips to Red Rocks and three survey trips, resulting in 184 completed on-site surveys and 70 follow-up surveys.

_Visitor Profile_
More than 70% of visitors to the Red Rocks Welcome Center had made prior visits to Colorado, while first-time visitors, at 26.1%, accounted for a greater percentage than all other centers. At 3.8%, Colorado residents made up the smallest percentage of visitors. Visitors to the Red Rocks Center were on average the youngest in the state, with only 20.6% age 55 and over, 38.6% between 35 and 54, 22.2% between 18 and 34, and 18.6% under 18. The average group size, at 2.7 people, was on par with the state. The greatest household income representation was greater than $100,000 annually.

_Trip Profile_
Nearly 85% of visitors to the center were only visiting Colorado—more than any other center - while the rest were on a trip that included other states. The average length of stay in Colorado was 7.2 nights, with a median of 5.0 nights. Nearly 85% stayed less than a week. Nearly 26% of visitors were traveling primarily to explore the state, and 95.7% indicated they planned to participate in outdoor activities or visit outdoor attractions during their trip. More than one-in-three planned city-related activities. Nearly 26% of visitors to this center finalized all or some of their lodging arrangements _during_ their trip, and nearly 68.5% finalized some or all of their activities during their trip. Regarding planning resources, visitors most often cited using the Internet (83.7%), previous experience (59.8%), highway signs (59.8%), personal recommendations (50.0%), and welcome/visitor centers (45.7%).

_Spending Profile_
As indicated in the on-site survey, an average of $1,310 (median $1,000) was spent by parties that visited the center, which was greater than any other location in the state. Results from comparing the on-site survey to the follow-up survey indicated group spending increased on average $370 over the course of the trip. Visitors reported spending about 38.1% of their total Colorado trip expenditures on lodging, 16.1% on transportation, 19.1% on food/drink, and 14.6% on shopping.

_Welcome Center_
Nearly 51% of visitors stopped at the center primarily to collect information—mostly about attractions and activities, as well as to get directions and maps. Visitors stopping for the facility were primarily using the restroom and water fountain, or taking a travel break. An overwhelming majority of visitors found the center somewhat to very useful (95.7%), and 100% reported they would recommend the center to others. The center provided new ideas of things to see and do to 46.7% of visitors.
Trinidad

Completed Surveys
The Trinidad Welcome Center is located near the New Mexico border along the North-South I-25 corridor. Trinidad hosted 80,470 visitors in 2007, with more than 34,000 visiting in the months of June, July, and August. In 2008, significant construction along I-25 around Trinidad created difficulties in reaching the center. Visitation from June-August 2008 was 28,439, down more than 16% from 2007. Three survey trips were made to the center, resulting in 217 completed on-site and 71 follow-up surveys.

Visitor Profile
More than 84% of visitors to the Trinidad Welcome Center had made prior visits to Colorado—the greatest percentage of prior visitors in the state. More than 14% were first-time visitors and 8.3% were Colorado residents. Visitor ages were generally on par with the state averages, with 39.1% age 55 and over, 27.9% between 35 and 54, 10.3% 18 to 34, and 22.6% under 18. The average group size, at 2.9 people, was slightly larger than the state average. The greatest household income representation was greater than $100,000 annually.

Trip Profile
More than 71% of visitors to the center were only visiting Colorado, while the rest were on a trip that included other states. The average length of stay in Colorado was 8.3 nights, with a median of 5.0 nights. Nearly three-quarters of visitors stayed less than one week. More than 36% of visitors were traveling primarily to explore the state, and 65.4% indicated they planned to participate in outdoor activities or visit outdoor attractions during their trip. Nearly 38% planned to participate in city-related activities. Nearly 28% of visitors to this center finalized all or some of their lodging arrangements during their trip, and nearly 59.4% finalized some or all of their activities during their trip. Regarding planning resources, visitors cited using previous experience (58.1%), the Internet (52.5%), “other” resources (29.5%), and welcome/visitor centers (18.4%).

Spending Profile
As indicated in the on-site survey, an average of $972 (median $650) was spent by parties that visited the center, which was slightly higher than the state average. Results from comparing the on-site survey to the follow-up survey indicated group spending increased on average $169 over the course of the trip. Visitors reported spending about one-third of their total Colorado trip expenditures on lodging, 19.4% on transportation, 24.4% on food/drink, and 17.1% on shopping.

Welcome Center
Nearly 30% of visitors stopped at the center primarily to collect information—mostly about attractions and activities, as well as to get directions and maps. Visitors stopping for the facility were primarily using the restroom and water fountain, or taking a travel break. All visitors responded that the center was somewhat to very useful, and 100% reported they would recommend the center to others. The center provided new ideas of things to see and do to 62.2% of visitors.
### Appendix 2: Ranking Exercise for Welcome Center Managers

#### Topic: People Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Top 1</th>
<th>Top 2</th>
<th>Top 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Topic: Trip Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Top 1</th>
<th>Top 2</th>
<th>Top 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Topic: The Welcome Center

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Top 1</th>
<th>Top 2</th>
<th>Top 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Topic: Trip Preparation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Top 1</th>
<th>Top 2</th>
<th>Top 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Topic: Future visits to Colorado

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Top 1</th>
<th>Top 2</th>
<th>Top 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Topic: Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Top 1</th>
<th>Top 2</th>
<th>Top 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: In-person Survey

Colorado Welcome Centers – Visitors Survey

2008 WELCOME CENTER VISITOR SURVEY

On-site Questionnaire

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Survey Type: 1 Interview 2 Self-Administered

QUALIFIER – IF INELIGIBLE TO PARTICIPATE – SAVE THIS SURVEY FOR NEXT PARTICIPANT

• “Where are you from?”
  1 Colorado (Do not mark until eligibility is confirmed)
    “Are you staying at least one night away from home?”
  2 Yes (In question #2, mark “Colorado Resident” without verbalizing the question)

No: “Well thank you for your time, but you are not eligible to participate in our survey.”

2 Other U.S. State
3 Foreign Country

POST-SURVEY: FILL OUT A LOTTERY TICKET, A COPY OF THE FOLLOW-UP SURVEY & ENVELOPE.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

A. “Would you also be willing to complete a short follow-up survey after you return home from your trip?”
  1 Yes (write corresponding I.D. code on Follow-up & hand over in envelope)
  2 No (Give them their lottery ticket & complete surveyor log)

B. “Here’s one you can take with you, but we would also like to send you a reminder by mail or email. Which would you prefer?”
  1 Mail
  2 Email

C. “What is that address?” Print clearly.

D. “What is your first & last name?” Print clearly.

Survey Log

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time of Day</th>
<th>Surveyor Initials</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Weather</th>
<th>Other Special Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alamosa (A), Burlington (B), Cortez (C), Dinosaur (D), Fort Collins (FC), Fruita (FR), Lamar (L), Julesburg (J), Red Rocks (RR), Trinidad (T)

Lottery Ticket Code ________________________________
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2008 WELCOME CENTER VISITOR SURVEY

1) **What is your zip code?** (or country, if not from USA) ________________________

2) **Have you ever visited Colorado before?**
   1. Yes, I am (or was) a Colorado Resident
   2. Yes, How many times?   ☐ 1  ☐ 2  ☐ 3  ☐ 4  ☐ 5  ☐ 6 or more
   3. No

3) **Is your destination for this trip Colorado only or multiple states?**
   1. Colorado only
   2. Multiple States

4) **Are you traveling in Colorado ...? Please check all that apply.**
   1. To visit friends & family
   2. To explore Colorado
   3. For a Special Event – Please specify below:
      3a. Personal Event (wedding, reunion, birthday, etc.)
      3b. Commercial Event (festival, show, concert, etc.)
   4. For Business (including conferences)
   5. Passing through to another state – What is your destination? ________________________
   6. Other - Specify: ________________________________________________________________

5) **Of the above, please circle the single most important reason.**

6) **What are the top three Colorado activities or attractions that interest you while on this trip?** (Colorado specific things only: i.e. family activities or passing through are NOT applicable)
   1. ________________________________________________
   2. ________________________________________________
   3. ________________________________________________

7) **Which of the following describe the reasons for your stop at the Welcome Center? Please check all that apply. (This is what you were **hoping** to find at the Welcome Center, regardless of whether it was available or not.)**
   1. To get Directions or Maps
   2. To get Information on Attractions & Activities
   3. To get Information on Lodging & Restaurants
   4. To get Information on Events & Festivals
   5. To get Information on Local History, Culture & Ecology
   6. To get Information on Road & Weather Conditions
   7. To use the Restrooms or Water Fountain
   8. To take a Travel Break (stretch, walk pets, picnic, etc.)
   9. To use the Internet (including WIFI)
   10. To purchase food or drinks
   11. Other - Specify: ________________________________________________________________

8) **Of the above, please circle the single most important reason.**

*Please continue.*
9) Did the Welcome Center adequately serve those needs?
   1 □ Yes
   2 □ No

10) Are there any services or facilities currently not available that you would like to see at the Welcome Center?
    1 □ No, I can’t think of anything.
    2 □ Yes (Please specify) _______________________________________________________

11) Did you notice anything that is available at this Welcome Center but needs improving, such as the quality or quantity of the personnel or certain facilities, services, or information?
    1 □ No, I can’t think of anything.
    2 □ Yes (Please specify) _______________________________________________________

12) Which of the following resources do you use to help you decide what to visit & where to stay while travelling in Colorado? Please check all that apply.
    1 □ Internet
    2 □ Welcome Centers/Visitor Information Centers
    3 □ Official Colorado State Vacation Guide
    4 □ Guidebooks
    5 □ Highway Signs
    6 □ GPS in car
    7 □ Previous Experience in Colorado
    8 □ Recommendations (including local hosts)
    9 □ Yellow Pages
    10 □ Travel Agent
    11 □ Other - Specify: _________________________________
    12 □ I Don’t Know

13) Of the above resources, please circle the one you rely on most.

14) Did this Welcome Center give you ideas about things to do or see that you did not know about before visiting the Welcome Center?
    1 □ Yes (Please specify) _______________________________________________________
    2 □ No

15) How many nights do you plan to spend in Colorado during this trip? ______________

16) How much money do you plan to spend while you are travelling in Colorado? (Excluding airfare.) $ __________

17) How many people are covered by that amount? __________

18) In your entire travel party (that’s everyone staying away from home together), how many people fall into each of the following age groups? Please write the corresponding amount in each box. (Please do NOT make tick marks.)
    1 □ Under 16 _______________
    2 □ 18 to 34 _______________
    3 □ 35 to 54 _______________
    4 □ 55 and over _______________

19) Please indicate your gender.
    1 □ Male
    2 □ Female

THANK YOU!
Appendix 4: Follow-up Survey

2008 WELCOME CENTER VISITOR SURVEY

Follow-up Questionnaire

Thank you for participating in our Welcome Center visitor survey during your recent visit to Colorado. We sincerely hope that you enjoyed your visit. Now that you have returned from your trip, please take a few minutes to answer some additional questions. We request that the same person who participated in our on-site interview also complete this questionnaire. If you have any questions or concerns, please email: welcomecenters@colorado.edu or call Brian Lewandowski at 303-492-3307.

1) Overall, how useful was the information you received at the Colorado Welcome Center?

- Very Useful
- Somewhat Useful
- Not Useful
- Undecided

2) What was the single most valuable service, amenity, or information you received at the Colorado Welcome Center? (Please list one thing only.)

________________________________________________________________________

3) Did you find any of the information you received from the Colorado Welcome Center to be incorrect?

☐ Yes  Please explain: ___________________________________________________________________________________________

☐ No

4) How did your visit to the Colorado Welcome Center affect your plans? (Please check all that apply.)

- I extended my stay in Colorado by ____________ nights. (please write the number of extra nights)
- I added activities to my Colorado itinerary, including __________________________________________________________________________
- I received information on Colorado activities and/or seasonal attractions to help me plan a possible future trip.
- It did not influence my trip.

5) Would you recommend the Colorado Welcome Center to other visitors to use as a resource for their Colorado trip planning?

☐ Yes
☐ No

6) When were your lodging plans finalized? (Please check one.)

- All before trip (including package tours)
- Most before trip
- Some before trip and some during
- All during trip
- I Don’t know

7) When were your activities plans finalized? (Please check one.)

- All before trip (including package tours)
- Most before trip
- Some before trip and some during
- All during trip
- I Don’t know
8) Which of the following did you use to help you decide what to visit & where to stay while travelling in Colorado? (Please check all that apply.)

1  Internet
2  Welcome Centers / Visitor Information Centers
3  Colorado State Recreation Guide
4  Other Guidebook
5  Highway Signs
6  GPS in car
7  Previous Experience in Colorado
8  Personal Recommendations (Including local hosts)
9  Yellow Pages / Telephone
10  Travel Agent
11  Other – Please specify: __________________________
12  I Don’t Know

9) Of the above, please circle the resource you rely on the most.

Please continue on the back side.

Colorado

2008 WELCOME CENTER VISITOR SURVEY

10) During your Colorado trip, in which of the following activities did you participate? (Please check all that apply.)

1  Outdoor/Nature activities (hiking, camping, etc)
2  Sports (golf, tennis, etc)
3  Arts/Culture/Historic activities
4  City Sightseeing
5  Casino/Gaming
6  Festivals/Fairs/events
7  Bars/Pubs/Brewery visits
8  Winery/Vineyard visits
9  Shopping
10 Other (Please specify): __________________________

11) Approximately how many nights did you stay in the following accommodations while in Colorado? (Please write a number next to all that apply.)

    Resort
    Hotel/Motel
    Bed & Breakfast
    Hostel
    National or State Park/Forest Campgrounds
    Commercial Campground
    Home Of Family/Friends
    Other (Please Specify): __________________________

12) On your recent trip to Colorado, approximately how many meals did you eat?...? (Please try to account for all meals and write a number next to all that apply.)

    at Fine Dining Restaurants
    at Casual/Family Restaurants
    at Fast Food Restaurants
    Cooking-in/Picnic/Camping
    as Guests in a Home
    as part of a Pre-paid Package
    Other (Please Specify): __________________________

13) What modes of transportation did you use to get to and around Colorado? (Please check all that apply.)

1  Airplane
2  Rental Automobile
3  Personal Automobile
4  Public Transportation (Train, bus)
5  Charter Bus / Tour Bus
6  Other (Please Specify): __________________________
14) How many nights did you spend in Colorado during your recent trip? __________

15) Please estimate how much money was spent by your travel party (those paying together & staying together) while in Colorado for each of the following categories:

| $ | Lodging (including camping & RV permits and all varieties of hotels) |
| $ | Transportation (including fuel, car rental & public transportation) |
| $ | Food/Drink (including groceries & restaurants) |
| $ | Nightlife |
| $ | Sports and other Outdoor activities |
| $ | Shopping (including gifts & retail) |
| $ | Other Arts and Cultural activities (including museum entrances, concerts, fairs, etc) |
| $ | Children’s activities |
| $ | **Total Expenditures** |

16) How many people were covered by the above amount? __________

17) What is your age? __________

18) What is your average yearly household income?

- [ ] Under $25,000
- [ ] $25,000-$49,999
- [ ] $50,000-$74,999
- [ ] $75,000-$99,999
- [ ] $100,000 and over

Thank you so much for your participation! To submit your completed survey, please mail to the University of Colorado in the enclosed envelope. If the envelope has been misplaced please address to:

**Colorado Welcome Center Survey**  
University of Colorado at Boulder  
420 UCB  
Boulder, CO 80309-0420

Sponsored by the Colorado Tourism Office, Colorado Welcome Centers, and the University of Colorado.
### Appendix 5: Welcome Center Survey Categories and Corresponding Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Questions by Category</th>
<th>Associated On-site Question</th>
<th>Associated Follow-up Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong> Topic: People Profile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1 Age (participant)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Sex</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Annual household income</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 Kids</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5 Residency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6 Education level</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7 Marital status</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong> Topic: Trip Profile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 Purposes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 Main purpose</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3 Final destination</td>
<td>3, 4,</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4 Length of stay in CO</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5 Group size</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6 Activities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7 Age category (of travel party)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8 Mode of transportation</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9 Accommodations</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>11, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong> Topic: The Welcome Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 Information received</td>
<td>7, 8, 9</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 Services sought</td>
<td>7, 8, 9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 Influence of CWC information / Information quality</td>
<td>12, 13, 14</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Colorado Welcome Centers – Visitors Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Confidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>Did CWC add time to visit</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>Personnel quality</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>Services not available</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>Facility quality</td>
<td>10, 11</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8</td>
<td>Appearance of facility</td>
<td>10, 11</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Topic: Trip Preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>Use of CWC for trip itinerary</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4, 5, 8, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Collect information prior to trip</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>6, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>Planning for trip</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6, 7, 8, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td>Booking for trip</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6, 7, 8, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Topic: Future visits to Colorado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>Likelihood of other visits to Colorado within next year</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>Likelihood of other visits to Colorado within next 3 years</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>Likelihood of other visits to Colorado within next 5 years</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4</td>
<td>Number of prior visits to Colorado</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Topic: Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Money spent in Colorado</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Spending by category (e.g., lodging, food, retail, entertainment)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Per capita money spent in Colorado</td>
<td>16, 17</td>
<td>15, 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 6: RESIDENCE OF VISITORS SURVEYED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>91.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>93.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>93.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>94.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>95.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>95.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>96.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>96.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>97.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>97.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>98.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>98.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>98.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>98.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>99.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>99.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>99.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>78.7%</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>99.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada/Mexico</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>99.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>99.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>99.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>84.4%</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>99.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>85.8%</td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>99.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>88.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,177</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Appendix 7: International Percentage of Individuals Surveyed, by Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alamosa</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cortez</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinosaur</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Collins</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruita</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julesburg</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamar</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Rocks</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.8%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 8: Detailed Additions recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Alamosa</th>
<th>Burlington</th>
<th>Cortez</th>
<th>Dinosaur</th>
<th>Fort Collins</th>
<th>Fruita</th>
<th>Julesburg</th>
<th>Lamar</th>
<th>Red Rocks</th>
<th>Trinidad</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signage</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathroom/Water Fountain</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Information</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking/Access</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snacks/Drinks</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Souvenirs/Purchases</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shade</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Access</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV/Trailer Amenities</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pets</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 9: Detailed improvement Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Alamosa</th>
<th>Burlington</th>
<th>Cortez</th>
<th>Dinosaur</th>
<th>Fort Collins</th>
<th>Fruita</th>
<th>Julesburg</th>
<th>Lamar</th>
<th>Red Rocks</th>
<th>Trinidad</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More Information Available</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps/Atlas</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directions</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Area Info/History</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brochures</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info on Colorado Activities</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info of Other States¹</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snacks/Drinks</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Souvenirs/Purchases</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer(Wi-Fi)</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Amenities</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathroom Improvements²</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Fountain</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pet Area</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shade</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV Amenities</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Includes requests for maps of other states.
²Bathroom comments specifically noted cleanliness, as well as dissatisfaction with hand dryers (prefer hand towels).
## Appendix 10: Estimated Distance and Time between Colorado Welcome Centers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Alamosa</th>
<th>Burlington</th>
<th>Cortez</th>
<th>Dinosaur</th>
<th>Fort Collins</th>
<th>Fruita</th>
<th>Julesburg</th>
<th>Lamar</th>
<th>Red Rocks</th>
<th>Trinidad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alamosa</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4H 53M</td>
<td>3H 37M</td>
<td>6H 27M</td>
<td>4H 42M</td>
<td>4H 53M</td>
<td>6H 16M</td>
<td>3H 19M</td>
<td>3H 33M</td>
<td>1H 47M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>4H 53M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8H 31M</td>
<td>7H 21M</td>
<td>3H 14M</td>
<td>6H 26M</td>
<td>1H 59M</td>
<td>1H 54M</td>
<td>2H 45M</td>
<td>4H 7M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cortez</td>
<td>3H 37M</td>
<td>8H 31M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5H 7M</td>
<td>7H 42M</td>
<td>3H 23M</td>
<td>9H 17M</td>
<td>6H 55M</td>
<td>6H 34M</td>
<td>5H 23M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinosaur</td>
<td>6H 27M</td>
<td>7H 21M</td>
<td>5H 7M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5H 21M</td>
<td>1H 57M</td>
<td>7H 14M</td>
<td>8H 13M</td>
<td>4H 51M</td>
<td>7H 55M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Collins</td>
<td>4H 42M</td>
<td>3H 14M</td>
<td>7H 42M</td>
<td>5H 21M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5H</td>
<td>2H 46M</td>
<td>4H 4M</td>
<td>1H 19M</td>
<td>4H 4M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruita</td>
<td>4H 53M</td>
<td>6H 26M</td>
<td>3H 23M</td>
<td>1H 57M</td>
<td>5H</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6H 36M</td>
<td>7H 17M</td>
<td>3H 55M</td>
<td>6H 35M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julesburg</td>
<td>6H 16M</td>
<td>1H 59M</td>
<td>9H 17M</td>
<td>7H 14M</td>
<td>2H 46M</td>
<td>6H 36M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3H 53M</td>
<td>2H 54M</td>
<td>5H 36M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamar</td>
<td>3H 19M</td>
<td>1H 54M</td>
<td>6H 55M</td>
<td>8H 13M</td>
<td>4H 4M</td>
<td>7H 17M</td>
<td>3H 53M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3H 35M</td>
<td>2H 31M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Rocks</td>
<td>3H 33M</td>
<td>2H 45M</td>
<td>6H 34M</td>
<td>4H 51M</td>
<td>1H 19M</td>
<td>3H 55M</td>
<td>2H 54M</td>
<td>3H 35M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3H 14M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad</td>
<td>1H 47M</td>
<td>4H 7M</td>
<td>5H 23M</td>
<td>7H 55M</td>
<td>4H 4M</td>
<td>6H 35M</td>
<td>5H 36M</td>
<td>2H 31M</td>
<td>3H 14M</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MapQuest, Inc.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Miles</th>
<th>Alamosa</th>
<th>Burlington</th>
<th>Cortez</th>
<th>Dinosaur</th>
<th>Fort Collins</th>
<th>Fruita</th>
<th>Julesburg</th>
<th>Lamar</th>
<th>Red Rocks</th>
<th>Trinidad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alamosa</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>312.05</td>
<td>193.62</td>
<td>361.32</td>
<td>279.02</td>
<td>280.42</td>
<td>418.13</td>
<td>202.18</td>
<td>202.55</td>
<td>109.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>312.05</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>506.26</td>
<td>450.74</td>
<td>221.27</td>
<td>420.17</td>
<td>123.63</td>
<td>103.35</td>
<td>181.52</td>
<td>238.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cortez</td>
<td>193.62</td>
<td>506.26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>301.77</td>
<td>441.64</td>
<td>215.56</td>
<td>560.82</td>
<td>395.65</td>
<td>365.14</td>
<td>303.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinosaur</td>
<td>361.32</td>
<td>450.74</td>
<td>301.77</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>287.1</td>
<td>95.67</td>
<td>495.34</td>
<td>491.55</td>
<td>274.2</td>
<td>480.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Collins</td>
<td>279.02</td>
<td>221.27</td>
<td>441.64</td>
<td>287.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>314.47</td>
<td>187.23</td>
<td>261.8</td>
<td>75.81</td>
<td>261.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruita</td>
<td>280.42</td>
<td>420.17</td>
<td>215.56</td>
<td>95.67</td>
<td>314.47</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>434.16</td>
<td>460.74</td>
<td>243.39</td>
<td>382.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julesburg</td>
<td>418.13</td>
<td>123.63</td>
<td>560.82</td>
<td>495.34</td>
<td>187.23</td>
<td>434.16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>232.84</td>
<td>195.38</td>
<td>382.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamar</td>
<td>202.18</td>
<td>103.35</td>
<td>395.65</td>
<td>491.55</td>
<td>261.8</td>
<td>460.74</td>
<td>232.84</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>222.08</td>
<td>136.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Rocks</td>
<td>202.55</td>
<td>181.52</td>
<td>365.14</td>
<td>274.2</td>
<td>75.81</td>
<td>243.39</td>
<td>195.38</td>
<td>222.08</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>206.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad</td>
<td>109.63</td>
<td>238.18</td>
<td>303.07</td>
<td>480.39</td>
<td>261.3</td>
<td>382.45</td>
<td>382.44</td>
<td>136.1</td>
<td>206.82</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MapQuest, Inc.
CDOT Statewide Truck Parking and Rest Area Study: Safety Analysis

The purpose of the Statewide Truck Parking and Rest Area Study is to determine the sufficiency of the number of truck parking and rest areas throughout the state, the optimum locations for both existing and potential new locations, and the adequacy of amenities at existing areas. The results of this study will assist CDOT with determining if existing truck parking and/or rest areas should be closed, upgraded or remain; recommending upgrades to existing truck parking and/or rest areas; determining if there is a need to construct new truck parking and/or rest areas; and assessing the optimum locations of both existing and potentially new truck parking and/or rest areas. The study concentrated on Interstates 25, 70, and 76.

The following three safety-related criteria for assessing the existing conditions were established at the beginning of the study effort:

- Incident rate on adjacent highway – measured using recent crash data to determine locations with overrepresentations of crashes or crash types compared to interstates statewide
- Closest services – measured using a threshold of 60-mile maximum or one-hour travel time distance between locations with parking or services
- Crime data on site – measured as the number of reported crimes

Drowsy driving is a type of crash for which rest areas are a recommended countermeasure (NCHRP Report 500, Volume 14: A Guide for Reducing Crashes Involving Drowsy and Distracted Drivers). The intent of rest areas is to provide safe locations for commercial and non-commercial motorists to stop, stretch, nap, use the restroom, switch drivers, etc. A safe location can either be a rest area provided and maintained by a DOT or commercial facilities such as truck stops, gas stations, restaurants, and hotels. Parking along the shoulder of an interstate or highway is not considered a safe location for drivers to stop and alleviate their drowsiness. FHWA recommends a spacing of 50 miles or 1 hour driving time (NCHRP Report 500, Volume 14: A Guide for Reducing Crashes Involving Drowsy and Distracted Drivers) and AASHTO recommends a spacing of 60 miles or 1 hour driving time (Guide for Development of Rest Areas on Major Arterials and Freeways, Third Edition) between rest areas or commercial facilities.

This technical memorandum documents the assessment and conclusions for the first two safety-related criteria.
1.0 Methodology

CDOT provided a summary of locations along the three interstates at which crashes with “Asleep at the Wheel” occurred more often than expected when compared to all interstate crashes in the state of Colorado. An over-represented crash type is a candidate for study to determine if improvements can be implemented to reduce the frequency and/or severity of crashes. “Asleep at the Wheel” is the entry in a crash report that represents drowsy driving. The data were from the years 2007 through 2011. The methodology established to analyze the safety criteria consists of two parts. The first part is to determine if the crash data suggests the need for new rest areas to be opened and maintained by CDOT. The second part is to determine if the 60-mile spacing distance can be maintained with the recommendations for closing existing rest areas maintained by CDOT.

1.1 Methodology to Determine if Crash Data Suggests Need for New Rest Areas

This methodology addresses the criteria for the incident rate on adjacent highways/interstate. The first step in this analysis process was to stratify the data into two categories: locations within an urban area or within 30 miles of the boundary of an urban area, and rural locations more than 30 miles outside of an urban area. This division is based on the assumption that rest areas are not necessary within or adjacent to an urban area due to the availability of commercial services. At half the 60-mile spacing distance, the 30-mile threshold is based on the assumption that crashes that occur within this proximity to an urban area will not factor into decisions about opening new rest areas. The mileposts that represent urban area boundaries were established using Google Earth™ imagery and the CDOT OTIS milepost map. An area was considered urban based on the development adjacent to interchanges and the frequency of interchanges.

After the data stratification, the rural area locations at which “Asleep at the Wheel” crashes were overrepresented were compared to existing rest area locations to determine if they were located within 30 miles of an existing rest area. The assumption is that crash locations within 30 miles of an existing rest area would not be candidates for a new rest area because the proximity is close enough for a driver to take advantage of the facility.

1.2 Methodology to Determine if the 60-Mile Spacing can be maintained with the Recommendations for Closing Existing Rest Stops

This methodology addresses the criteria for closest services. A field review was conducted of each interchange on the three interstates outside of metropolitan areas to document amenities or lack thereof. Using this documentation, the locations of services were identified to determine if a 60-mile spacing distance can be maintained in rural areas with the proposed closure of existing CDOT rest areas. Availability of services at a 60-mile spacing maintains consistency with national AASHTO guidance for providing safe areas for drivers to reduce drowsy driving. Each direction of travel was considered independently.

2.0 Analysis and Conclusions

The data analysis followed the methodology described in the previous section. The conclusions presented are based on the results of the data analysis.

2.1 Need for New Rest Areas Based on Crash Data

Stratification of the 172 locations resulted in the identification of 30 locations (3 on I-70 and 27 on I-76) in rural areas at which “Asleep at the Wheel” crashes are overrepresented. All of the locations on I-25 were within 30 miles of an urban area. The 3 locations on I-70 fall between MP 403 and 407, which is within the 30-mile distance for the rest area at milepost (MP) 383 (Arriba Rest Area). For the rest area at MP 437 (Burlington Rest Area), these locations fall just beyond the 30-mile distance by 1 to 4 miles. All of the I-76 locations fall within a 30-mile proximity to an existing CDOT rest area at either MP 66
(Wiggins Rest Area) or 125 (Sterling Rest Area). Because these crash locations fall within the national guidelines for rest area spacing, the crash data does not suggest the need for new rest areas adjacent to the rural interstates in Colorado. However, further analysis could be conducted to determine if there are any location-specific improvements that have the potential to reduce this crash type.

2.2 Maintenance of 60-Mile Spacing with the Recommendations for Closing Existing Rest Stops

The following rest areas are proposed to be closed:

- I-25: MP 74 (Colorado City) and MP 111/114 (Pueblo)
- I-70: MP 160 (Edwards), MP 332 (Deer Trail), and MP 383 (Arriba)
- I-76: MP 66 (Wiggins)

Ownership of the following rest areas is proposed to be transferred to another jurisdiction:

- I-70: MP 90 (Rifle exit)
- I-76: MP 125 (Sterling)

Using the field review documentation, the locations of commercial services provide the ability to maintain a maximum 60-mile spacing between safe stopping locations on all three interstates with the closure of these rest areas. In most cases, the distance is less than 60 miles. Furthermore, the desired spacing can be maintained even if other jurisdictions refuse to transfer ownership and the Rifle and Sterling rest areas are closed. Existing commercial services can provide safe stopping locations that would not require drivers to travel for more than 1 hour or 60 miles between locations.

3.0 Summary

Two of the safety criteria for the study required review of the incident rate for drowsy driving on highway/interstates with existing rest areas and spacing of safe stopping locations. The analysis of the incident rate criteria with regard to recent crash history suggests that new rest areas are not necessary. The analysis of existing commercial services suggests that safety goals can be met with the proposal to close or transfer ownership of existing rest areas.
Spreadsheet indicates LOSS and crash-pattern characteristics for the adjacent roadway over a 2-mile stretch centered on the Rest Area Mile Marker location. The data is based on crash history reported during a 5-year period: 7/1/2011 - 6/30/2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Region 2</td>
<td>Cuerno Verde Rest Area</td>
<td>SH 327A</td>
<td>55.20</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>54.20</td>
<td>56.20</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>II/III</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Region 2</td>
<td>El Morro Welcome Center</td>
<td>SH 327A</td>
<td>17.27</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>16.83</td>
<td>18.83</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Region 2</td>
<td>Gobblers Knob Rest Area</td>
<td>SH 327A</td>
<td>55.20</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>54.20</td>
<td>56.20</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>II/III</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Region 2</td>
<td>Holy Springs Rest Area</td>
<td>SH 50B</td>
<td>467.39</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>466.39</td>
<td>467.58 (Border)</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II/III</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Region 2</td>
<td>Pueblo (Northbound) Rest Area</td>
<td>I-25</td>
<td>514.99</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>113.99</td>
<td>115.99</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Region 2</td>
<td>Pueblo (Southbound) Rest Area</td>
<td>I-25</td>
<td>511.69</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>110.69</td>
<td>112.69</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Region 3</td>
<td>Rest Ranch Trailhead</td>
<td>SR 170</td>
<td>128.50</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>127.50</td>
<td>129.50</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II/III</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Region 3</td>
<td>Edwards Rest Area</td>
<td>SH 287A</td>
<td>162.80</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>161.80</td>
<td>163.80</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Region 3</td>
<td>Elk Springs Rest Area</td>
<td>US 50A</td>
<td>17.14</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>16.14</td>
<td>16.14</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>II/III</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Region 3</td>
<td>Pikes Peak Welcome</td>
<td>I-70</td>
<td>38.50</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>16.50</td>
<td>20.50</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Region 3</td>
<td>Grizzly Creek Trailhead</td>
<td>I-70</td>
<td>121.02</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>120.02</td>
<td>122.02</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>II/III</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Region 3</td>
<td>Hanging Lake Trailhead</td>
<td>I-70</td>
<td>125.13</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>124.13</td>
<td>126.13</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>IV’</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Region 3</td>
<td>Hayden Rest Area</td>
<td>US 40A</td>
<td>101.00</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>102.00</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Region 3</td>
<td>Wheeler Rest Area</td>
<td>SH 13</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>I/II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Region 3</td>
<td>Roaring Trailhead</td>
<td>SH 287A</td>
<td>199.00</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>188.00</td>
<td>190.00</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Region 3</td>
<td>Sisk Rest Area</td>
<td>SH 40A</td>
<td>89.00</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>88.00</td>
<td>91.00</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>IV’</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Region 3</td>
<td>Coal Pass Rest Area</td>
<td>SR 170</td>
<td>330.00</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>189.00</td>
<td>210.00</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>IV’</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Region 4</td>
<td>Bertha Rest Area</td>
<td>SR 170</td>
<td>383.00</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>382.00</td>
<td>384.00</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II/III</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Region 4</td>
<td>Burlington Welcome Center</td>
<td>SR 170</td>
<td>537.60</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>536.60</td>
<td>538.60</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Region 4</td>
<td>Durango Trailhead</td>
<td>SH 77A</td>
<td>532.01</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>531.01</td>
<td>533.01</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Region 4</td>
<td>Luneburg Welcome Center</td>
<td>I-70</td>
<td>130.00</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>129.00</td>
<td>131.00</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II/III</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Region 4</td>
<td>Madera Welcome Center</td>
<td>I-25</td>
<td>388.00</td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>387.00</td>
<td>389.00</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Region 4</td>
<td>Ringside Rest Area</td>
<td>SR 170</td>
<td>325.00</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>324.00</td>
<td>326.00</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Region 4</td>
<td>Virginia Dale Rest Area</td>
<td>SH 287C</td>
<td>383.50</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>382.50</td>
<td>384.50</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Region 5</td>
<td>Hijos Rest Area</td>
<td>SR 170</td>
<td>59.00</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>58.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>IV’</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Region 5</td>
<td>Cortez Rest Area</td>
<td>SH 160A</td>
<td>96.42</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>95.42</td>
<td>97.42</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Region 5</td>
<td>Phase Creek Rest Area</td>
<td>SH 160A</td>
<td>191.39</td>
<td>4,900</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>190.39</td>
<td>192.39</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table notes:
- Yes in one or more boxes, or LOSS measures exhibited a crash frequency above the statewide average for facility type
- LOSS = Level of Service Safety
- II/III = LOSS is approximately at statewide average for facility type
- Based on input from regions. Additional evaluation may be necessary to capture other contributing factors to crash rates in certain locations.
Appendix C

Individual Rest Area Maps
Cuerno Verde
Colorado City
Rest Area
I-25 Mile Marker 74.39

Year Built: Grade: B

Rest Area Study
DRAFT
June 2016

Key Amenities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Full</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent ADT</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent Truck %</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Crash Rate</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Nearest Truck Parking   | 0 miles (Mile Post 74) |
| Nearest Passenger       | 0 miles (Mile Post 74) |
| Vehicle Services        | 0 miles (Mile Post 74) |

Additional Features:

| Vending Machines        |    |
| Pet Areas               |    |
| Utilities               |    |
| Lighting                |    |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Spaces (in use)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Cars: 36 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trucks: 21 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicap Parking: 3 (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predicted Usage: 320 vehicles/hr
Actual Usage: __________

Handicap Access

Access:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Full</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent ADT</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent Truck %</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Crash Rate</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Nearest Truck Parking | 0 miles (Mile Post 74) |
| Nearest Passenger Vehicle Services | 0 miles (Mile Post 74) |
|                           | 20 miles (Mile Post 94) |
El Morro Rest Area
I-25 Mile Marker 17.72

Year Built: 2000
Steel Frame
Grade: B

Rest Area Study
DRAFT
June 2016

Key Amenities:
- Restrooms
- Picnic Areas
- Handicap Access
- Point of Interest

Access:
- Full
- Adjacent ADT: 11,000
- Adjacent Truck %: 19.7%
- Annual Crash Rate: 0.64

Nearest Truck Parking:
- 7 miles (Mile Post 11)
- 16 miles (Mile Post 34)

Nearest Passenger Vehicle Services:
- 4 miles (Mile Post 14)
- 16 miles (Mile Post 34)

Additional Features:
- Vending Machines
- Pet Areas
- Utilities
- Lighting

Number of Spaces (in use):
- Passenger Cars: 35 (5)
- Trucks: 20 (3)
- Handicap Parking: 3 (0)

Predicted Usage: 248 vehicles/hr
Actual Usage: __________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Full</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent ADT</td>
<td>3,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent Truck %</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Crash Rate</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearest Truck Parking</td>
<td>27 miles (Mile Post 82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 miles (Mile Post 25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearest Passenger</td>
<td>27 miles (Mile Post 82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Services</td>
<td>27 miles (Mile Post 82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 miles (Mile Post 25)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Space (in use)</th>
<th>Passenger Cars: 15 (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trucks: 6 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Handicap Parking: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted Usage</td>
<td>79 vehicles/hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Usage</td>
<td>__________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Features:**

- Key Amenities: Restrooms
- Restrooms

**Sources:** Esri, HERE, DeLorme, USGS, IGN, Aerogrid, IGN, IGN (France), and IGN (Spain). OpenStreetMap contributors and the GIS User Community.
Holly Rest Area
US50 Mile Marker 467

Year Built: __________
Grade: __________

Rest Area Study
DRAFT
June 2016

Key Amenities:
- Restrooms
- Picnic Areas
- Handicap Access
- Trailer Dump
- Point of Interest

Rest Area: Holly
US50 Mile Marker 467

Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, i-cubed, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community.

Access:
- Full
- Adjacent ADT: 1,900
- Adjacent Truck %: 25.2%
- Annual Crash Rate: 0.97
- Nearest Truck Parking: 4 miles (Mile Post 463)
- Nearest Passenger Vehicle Services: 2 miles (Kansas) 4 miles (Mile Post 463)

Additional Features:
- Number of Spaces (in use)
  - Passenger Cars: 13 (2)
  - Trucks: 6 (2)
  - Handicap Parking: 5

Predicted Usage: 37 vehicles/hr
Actual Usage: __________
Pueblo Northbound
Rest Area
I-25 Mile Marker 115

Year Built: 2005
Masonry
Grade: B

Rest Area Study
DRAFT
June 2016

Key Amenities:
- Restrooms
- Picnic Areas
- Handicap Access

Access: Partial
Adjacent ADT: 32,000
Adjacent Truck %: 11.9%
Annual Crash Rate: 0.80
Nearest Truck Parking: 11 miles (Mile Post 104)
13 miles (Mile Post 128)
Nearest Passenger Vehicle Services: 11 miles (Mile Post 104)
13 miles (Mile Post 128)

Additional Features:
- Vending Machines
- Pet Areas
- Utilities
- Lighting

Number of Spaces (in use)
- Passenger Cars: 47 (8)
- Trucks: 20 (5)
- Handicap Parking: 2 (0)

Predicted Usage: 570 vehicles/hr
Actual Usage: __________

Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorme,USGS, Intermap, Increment P Corp., NRCAN, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri (Thailand), MapmyIndia, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community.
**Pueblo Southbound Rest Area**
**I-25 Mile Marker 112**

**Year Built:** 2005*
**Masonry**
**Grade:** A

*Complete Rebuild 2014

**Rest Area Study**
**DRAFT**
**June 2016**

**Key Amenities:**
- Restrooms
- Picnic Areas
- Handicap Access

**Access:**
Partial

- **Adjacent ADT:** 32,000
- **Adjacent Truck %:** 11.9%
- **Annual Crash Rate:** 0.80

**Nearest Truck Parking:**
- 8 miles (Mile Post 104)
- 16 miles (Mile Post 128)

**Nearest Passenger Vehicle Services:**
- 8 miles (Mile Post 104)
- 16 miles (Mile Post 128)

**Additional Features:**
- Vending Machines
- Pet Areas
- Utilities
- Lighting

**Number of Spaces (in use):**
- **Passenger Cars:** 47 (16)
- **Trucks:** 30 (3)
- **Handicap Parking:** 3 (0)

**Predicted Usage:** 570 vehicles/hr
**Actual Usage:** __________

**Sources:** Esri, HERE, DeLorme, USGS, Mapinfo, Increment P Corp., NRCAN, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri (Thailand), Magikyoku 2
- OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community

---

**Rest Area Study**
**DRAFT**
**June 2016**

**Key Amenities:**
- Restrooms
- Picnic Areas
- Handicap Access

**Access:**
Partial

- **Adjacent ADT:** 32,000
- **Adjacent Truck %:** 11.9%
- **Annual Crash Rate:** 0.80

**Nearest Truck Parking:**
- 8 miles (Mile Post 104)
- 16 miles (Mile Post 128)

**Nearest Passenger Vehicle Services:**
- 8 miles (Mile Post 104)
- 16 miles (Mile Post 128)

**Additional Features:**
- Vending Machines
- Pet Areas
- Utilities
- Lighting

**Number of Spaces (in use):**
- **Passenger Cars:** 47 (16)
- **Trucks:** 30 (3)
- **Handicap Parking:** 3 (0)

**Predicted Usage:** 570 vehicles/hr
**Actual Usage:** __________

**Sources:** Esri, HERE, DeLorme, USGS, Mapinfo, Increment P Corp., NRCAN, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri (Thailand), Magikyoku 2
- OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community
Bair Ranch Rest Area
Glenwood Canyon
I-70 Mile Marker 128.5

Year Built: 1990
Masonry
Grade: C

Rest Area Study
DRAFT
June 2016

Key Amenities:
- Restrooms
- Picnic Areas
- Handicap Access
- Trailhead Access
- River Access

Access: Full
Adjacent ADT: 16,000
Adjacent Truck %: 13.1%
Annual Crash Rate: 1.20
Nearest Truck Parking: 18.5 miles (Mile Post 147)
66.5 miles (Mile Post 62)
Nearest Passenger Vehicle Services: 11.5 miles (Mile Post 140)
14.5 miles (Mile Post 114)

Additional Features:
- Vending Machines
- Pet Areas
- Visitor Info
- Utilities
- Lighting

Number of Spaces (in use):
- Passenger Cars: 20 (10)
- Trucks: 6 (0)
- Handicap Parking: 2 (0)

Predicted Usage: 285 vehicles/hr
Actual Usage: __________

Source: Esri, HERE, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, i-cubed, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community.
Edwards Rest Area
I-70 Mile Marker 163

Year Built: 1985
Masonry
Grade: C

Rest Area Study
DRAFT
June 2016

Key Amenities:
- Restrooms
- Picnic Areas
- Handicap Access
- Trailer Dump

Access:
- Full
- Adjacent ADT: 24,000
- Adjacent Truck %: 10.3%
- Annual Crash Rate: 1.33
- Nearest Truck Parking: 16 miles (Mile Post 147)
- Nearest Passenger Vehicle Services: 0 miles (Mile Post 163)

Additional Features:
- Vending Machines
- Pet Areas
- Utilities
- Lighting
- Recreation Access

Number of Spaces (in use):
- Passenger Cars: 44 (13)
- Trucks: 22 (6)
- Handicap Parking: 2 (0)

Predicted Usage: 429 vehicles/hr
Actual Usage: __________

Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorme, USGS, 
Intermap, Increment P Corp., NRCAN, Esri 
Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), 
Esri (Thailand), MapmyIndia, ©
OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS 
User Community
## Elk Springs Rest Area
### US40 Mile Marker 37

**Year Built:**

**Grade:**

---

### Rest Area Study

**DRAFT**

**July 2016**

---

### Key Amenities:

- Restrooms
- Picnic Areas
- Handicap Access

---

### Access:

- **Full**

### Additional Features:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Spaces (in use)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Cars: 0 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trucks: 0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicap Parking: 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Predicted Usage:

- 13 vehicles/hr

### Actual Usage:

- __________

### Additional Features:

- **Key Amenities:**
  - Restrooms
  - Picnic Areas
  - Handicap Access

---

###解釋

**Access:**
- **Full**

**Adjacent ADT:**
- 980

**Adjacent Truck %:**
- 19.5%

**Annual Crash Rate:**
- 33 miles (Mile Post 4)
- 54 miles (Mile Post 91)

**Nearest Truck Parking:**
- 33 miles (Mile Post 4)
- 54 miles (Mile Post 91)

**Nearest Passenger Vehicle Services:**
- 23 miles (Mile Post 60)
- 33 miles (Mile Post 4)

---

**Source:** Esri, HERE, DeLorme, USGS, US Census, increment P Corp., NRCAN, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri (Thailand), MapmyIndia, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community.
Rest Area Study
DRAFT
June 2016

Fruita Welcome Center
I-70 Mile Marker 19.5

Key Amenities:
- Restrooms
- Picnic Areas
- Handicap Access
- Trailer Dump
- Visitor Info
- Point of Interest

Access: Full
Adjacent ADT: 16,000
Adjacent Truck %: 17.4%
Annual Crash Rate: 0.57
Nearest Truck Parking: 0 miles (Mile Post 19)
7 miles (Mile Post 26)
Nearest Passenger Vehicle Services: 0 miles (Mile Post 19)
7 miles (Mile Post 26)

Additional Features:
- Pet Areas
- Utilities
- Lighting
- Shared Use

Number of Spaces (in use)
Passenger Cars: 33 (4)
Trucks: 6 (0)
Handicap Parking: 4 (0)

Predicted Usage: 170 vehicles/hr
Actual Usage: __________
Grizzly Creek
Rest Area
Glenwood Canyon
I-70 Mile Marker 121

Year Built: 1990
Masonry
Grade: C

Rest Area Study
DRAFT
June 2016

Key Amenities:
- Restrooms
- Picnic Areas
- Handicap Access
- Trailhead Access
- River Access
- Point of Interest

Access:
- Full
- Adjacent ADT: 16,000
- Adjacent Truck %: 13.1%
- Annual Crash Rate: 1.20

Nearest Truck Parking:
- 26 miles (Mile Post 147)
- 59 miles (Mile Post 62)

Nearest Passenger Vehicle Services:
- 7 miles (Mile Post 114)
- 19 miles (Mile Post 140)

Additional Features:
- Vending Machines
- Pet Areas
- Visitor Info
- Utilities
- Lighting

Number of Spaces (in use):
- Passenger Cars: 45 (4)
- Trucks: 10 (0)
- Handicap Parking: 2 (0)

Predicted Usage: 285 vehicles/hr
Actual Usage: __________
## Hanging Lake Rest Area
### Glenwood Canyon
I-70 Mile Marker 125

**Year Built:** 1990  
**Masonry Grade:** C

### Rest Area Study DRAFT  
**June 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Amenities:</th>
<th>Restrooms</th>
<th>Picnic Areas</th>
<th>Handicap Access</th>
<th>Trailhead Access</th>
<th>River Access</th>
<th>Point of Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Access:  Partial  
- **Adjacent ADT:** 16,000  
- **Adjacent Truck %:** 13.1%  
- **Annual Crash Rate:** 1.20  
- **Nearest Truck Parking:** 22 miles (Mile Post 147)  
- **Nearest Passenger Vehicle Services:** 11 miles (Mile Post 114)  
  15 miles (Mile Post 140)

### Additional Features:  
- Vending Machines  
- Pet Areas  
- Utilities  
- Lighting

### Number of Spaces (in use):  
- **Passenger Cars:** 55 (50)  
- **Trucks:** 0 (0)  
- **Handicap Parking:** 4 (0)

### Predicted Usage: 285 vehicles/hr  
### Actual Usage: 90 vehicles/hr
**Hayden Rest Area**
**US40 Mile Marker 101**

**Year Built:**

**Grade:**

---

**Rest Area Study**
**DRAFT**
**June 2016**

**Key Amenities:**
- Restrooms
- Picnic Areas
- Handicap Access

---

**Access:** Full
**Adjacent ADT:** 5,900
**Adjacent Truck %:** 9.0%
**Annual Crash Rate:** 1.86
**Nearest Truck Parking:** 10 miles (Mile Post 91)
**Nearest Passenger Vehicle Services:** 10 miles (Mile Post 91)

---

**Additional Features:**
- **Number of Spaces (in use)**
  - Passenger Cars: 0 (2)
  - Trucks: 0 (0)
  - Handicap Parking: 0 (0)

**Predicted Usage:** 110 vehicles/hr
**Actual Usage:** __________
Meeker Rest Area
SH13 Mile Marker 27

Key Amenities:
- Restrooms
- Picnic Areas
- Handicap Access

Prepared for:
Rest Area Study
DRAFT
July 2016

Access:
- Full
- 2,600
- 11 miles (Mile Post 38)
- 27 miles (Mile Post 0)

Adjacent ADT:
- 16%
- 11 miles (Mile Post 38)
- 27 miles (Mile Post 0)

Nearest Truck Parking:
- 11 miles (Mile Post 38)
- 27 miles (Mile Post 0)

Predicted Usage:
- 37 vehicles/hr

Additional Features:
- Number of Spaces (in use)
  - Passenger Cars: 0 (0)
  - Trucks: 0 (1)
  - Handicap Parking: 0 (0)

Actual Usage:
- __________

Annual Crash Rate:
- 11 miles (Mile Post 38)
- 27 miles (Mile Post 0)

Nearest Truck Parking:
- 11 miles (Mile Post 38)
- 27 miles (Mile Post 0)

Key Amenities:
- Restrooms
- Picnic Areas
- Handicap Access

Sources: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, i-cubed, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerogrid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community.

Notes:
- © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community
- © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community
- © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community
- © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community

Legend:
- Restrooms
- Picnic Areas
- Handicap Access
### Access
- Full
- Adjacent ADT: 17,000
- Adjacent Truck %: 12.7%
- Annual Crash Rate: 1.20

### Nearest Truck Parking:
- 28 miles (Mile Post 147)
- 57 miles (Mile Post 62)

### Nearest Passenger Vehicle Services:
- 5 miles (Mile Post 114)
- 21 miles (Mile Post 140)

### Key Amenities:
- Restrooms
- Picnic Areas
- Handicap Access
- Trailhead Access
- River Access
- Point of Interest

### No Name Rest Area
- Glenwood Canyon
- I-70 Mile Marker 119
- Year Built: 1990
- Masonry
- Grade: C

### Rest Area Study
- DRAFT
- June 2016

### Handicap Access
- 0

### Trailhead Access
- 15 30 60 90 120 Feet

### River Access
- 25 70 160 £ ¤ 40

### Point of Interest
- 25 70 160 £ ¤ 40

### Additional Features:
- Vending Machines
- Pet Areas
- Utilities
- Lighting

### Number of Spaces (in use)
- Passenger Cars: 55 (15)
- Trucks: 0 (0)
- Handicap Parking: 3 (0)

### Predicted Usage:
- 303 vehicles/hr

### Actual Usage:
- __________

### Sources:
- Esri, HERE, DeLorme, USGS, Intermap, Infomap P Corp., NRCAN, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri (Thailand), Magenta, I2 OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community.
Rifle Rest Area
I-70 Mile Marker 90

Year Built: 1983
Steel Frame
Grade: C

Rest Area Study
DRAFT
June 2016

Key Amenities:
- Restrooms
- Picnic Areas
- Handicap Access
- Trailer Dump
- Visitor Info

Access: Full
Adjacent ADT: 15,000
Adjacent Truck %: 15.2%
Annual Crash Rate: 0.79
Nearest Truck Parking: 28 miles (Mile Post 62)
57 miles (Mile Post 147)
Nearest Passenger Vehicle Services: 0 miles (Mile Post 90)
15 miles (Mile Post 75)

Additional Features:
- Vending Machines
- Pet Areas
- Utilities
- Lighting
- Recreation Access
- Shared Use

Number of Spaces (in use)
- Passenger Cars: 53 (1)
- Trucks: 7 (2)
- Handicap Parking: 6 (0)

Predicted Usage: 266 vehicles/hr
Actual Usage: __________
Vail Pass Rest Area
I-70 Mile Marker 189

Year Built: 1980
Masonry
Grade: C

Rest Area Study
DRAFT
June 2016

Key Amenities:
- Restrooms
- Picnic Areas
- Handicap Access
- Trailhead Access

Access:
- Full
  - Adjacent ADT: 20,000
  - Adjacent Truck %: 10.9%
  - Annual Crash Rate: 1.33
  - Nearest Truck Parking: 43 miles (Mile Post 147)
  - Nearest Passenger Vehicle Services: 1 mile (Mile Post 190)
  - 76 miles (Mile Post 266)

Additional Features:
- Vending Machines
- Pet Areas
- Visitor Info
- Utilities
- Lighting
- Phones

Number of Spaces (in use):
- Passenger Cars: 37 (4)
- Trucks: 6 (2)
- Handicap Parking: 4 (0)

Predicted Usage: 434 vehicles/hr
Actual Usage: 300 vehicles/hr

Source:
- Esri, HERE, DeLorme, USGS, 3D Realscape, Inc., NRCAN, EPSI, Japan METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri (Thailand), MapmyIndia, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community
Arriba Rest Area
I-70 Mile Marker 383.3

Year Built: 1995
Masonry
Grade: C

Rest Area Study
DRAFT
June 2016

Key Amenities:
- Restrooms
- Picnic Areas
- Handicap Access

Access: Full
Adjacent ADT: 9,100
Annual Crash Rate: 0.43
Nearest Truck Parking: 12 miles (Mile Post 395)
22 miles (Mile Post 361)
Nearest Passenger Vehicle Services: 12 miles (Mile Post 395)
22 miles (Mile Post 361)

Additional Features:
- Vending Machines
- Pet Areas
- Utilities
- Lighting

Number of Spaces (in use)
- Passenger Cars: 25 (8)
- Trucks: 9 (3)
- Handicap Parking: 2 (0)

Predicted Usage: 205 vehicles/hr
Actual Usage: 60 vehicles/hr
Burlington Rest Area
I-70 Mile Marker 437.6

Year Built: 1997*
Masonry
Grade: A

*Interior Finish Upgrade in 2013

Rest Area Study
DRAFT
June 2016

Key Amenities:
- Restrooms
- Picnic Areas
- Handicap Access
- Trailer Dump
- Visitor Info
- Point of Interest

Prepared for:
COLORADO
Department of Transportation

Additional Features:
- Vending Machines
- Pet Areas
- Utilities
- Lighting
- Recreation Access

Access:
- Partial
- Adjacent ADT: 9,300
- Adjacent Truck %: 29.4%
- Annual Crash Rate: 0.43

Nearest Truck Parking:
- 0 miles (Mile Post 438)
- 1 miles (Mile Post 437)

Nearest Passenger Vehicle Services:
- 0 miles (Mile Post 438)
- 1 miles (Mile Post 437)

Number of Spaces (in use):
- Passenger Cars: 50 (6)
- Trucks: 13 (3)
- Handicap Parking: 8 (0)

Predicted Usage: 209 vehicles/hr
Actual Usage: __________
Deer Trail Rest Area
I-70 Mile Marker 332

Year Built: 1972
Masonry
Grade: C

Rest Area Study
DRAFT
June 2016

Key Amenities:
- Restrooms
- Picnic Areas
- Handicap Access

Access:
- Partial
- Adjacent ADT: 11,000
- Adjacent Truck %: 28.8%
- Annual Crash Rate: 0.60
- Nearest Truck Parking: 27 miles (Mile Post 359), 28 miles (Mile Post 304)
- Nearest Passenger Vehicle Services: 16 miles (Mile Post 316), 27 miles (Mile Post 359)

Additional Features:
- Pet Areas
- Visitor Info
- Utilities
- Lighting
- Phones

Number of Spaces (in use)
- Passenger Cars: 44 (20)
- Trucks: 12 (5)
- Handicap Parking: 4 (0)

Predicted Usage: 214 vehicles/hr
Actual Usage: __________

Source: Esri, HERE, DeLorme, USGS, Intermap, InCREMENT P Corp., NRCAN, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri (Thailand), MapmyIndia, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community.
# Rest Area Study DRAFT
## June 2016

**Julesburg Rest Area**

**I-76 Mile Marker 180.5**

**Year Built:** 1995*

**Wood Frame**

**Grade:** B

*Exterior Painted 2012

## Key Amenities:
- Restrooms
- Picnic Areas
- Handicap Access
- Trailer Dump
- Visitor Info
- Point of Interest

## Prepared for:
**COLORADO**
Department of Transportation

## Sources:
- Esri, HERE, DeLorme, USGS, NPS, National Geographic Society,suppress, increment P Corp., NRCAN, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri (Thailand), MappyInc., I2 OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community

---

### Access:
- **Full**

### Adjacent ADT:
- 6,400

### Adjacent Truck %:
- 28.9%

### Annual Crash Rate:
- 0.52

### Nearest Truck Parking:
- 15 miles (Mile Post 165)
- 28 miles (Mile Post 9)

### Nearest Passenger Vehicle Services:
- 0 miles (Mile Post 180)
- 15 miles (Mile Post 165)

### Additional Features:
- Vending Machines
- Pet Areas
- Utilities
- Lighting
- Shared Use

### Number of Spaces (in use):
- Passenger Cars: 40 (8)
- Trucks: 10 (2)
- Handicap Parking: 3 (0)

### Predicted Usage:
- 144 vehicles/hr

### Actual Usage:
- __________

### Key Amenities:

---

### Predicted Usage:
- 144 vehicles/hr

### Actual Usage:
- __________
Poudre Rest Area
I-25 Mile Marker 268

Year Built: 2007
Steel Frame
Grade: B

Rest Area Study
DRAFT
June 2016

Key Amenities:
- Restrooms
- Picnic Areas
- Handicap Access
- Visitor Info
- Point of Interest

Access:
- Full
- Adjacent ADT: 59,000
- Adjacent Truck %: 11.0%
- Annual Crash Rate: 1.31

Nearest Truck Parking:
- 13 miles (Mile Post 5)
- 14 miles (Mile Post 254)

Nearest Passenger Vehicle Services:
- 1 miles (Mile Post 269)
- 3 miles (Mile Post 265)

Additional Features:
- Vending Machines
- Pet Areas
- Utilities
- Lighting
- Phones

Number of Spaces (in use):
- Passenger Cars: 40 (6)
- Trucks: 34 (8)
- Handicap Parking: 4 (0)

Predicted Usage: 1279 vehicles/hr
Actual Usage: __________
## Sterling Rest Area
I-76 Mile Marker 125

### Key Amenities:
- Restrooms
- Picnic Areas
- Handicap Access
- Trailer Dump
- Visitor Info
- Trailhead Access
- River Access
- Point of Interest

### Prepared for:
COLORADO Department of Transportation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Full</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent ADT</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent Truck %</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Crash Rate</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearest Truck Parking</td>
<td>0 miles (Mile Post 125)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearest Passenger Vehicle Services</td>
<td>0 miles (Mile Post 125)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Features</th>
<th>Number of Spaces (in use)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vending Machines</td>
<td>Passenger Cars: 41 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pet Areas</td>
<td>Trucks: 18 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>Handicap Parking: 3 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>Predicted Usage: 135 vehicles/hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Use</td>
<td>Actual Usage: __________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Key Amenities:
- Restrooms
- Picnic Areas
- Handicap Access
- Trailer Dump
- Visitor Info
- Trailhead Access
- River Access
- Point of Interest

**Sources:** Esri, HERE, DeLorme, USGS, AEX, Geospatial Solutions, Getmapping, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, MapmyIndia, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community.
Virginia Dale
Rest Area
SH287 Mile Marker 383

Year Built: 1965
Steel Frame
Grade: F

Rest Area Study
DRAFT
June 2016

Prepared for:

Access: Full
Adjacent ADT: 3,600
Adjacent Truck %: 15.2%
Annual Crash Rate: 0.93
Nearest Truck Parking: 26 miles (Mile Post 24)
35 miles (Mile Post 348)
Nearest Passenger Vehicle Services: 19 miles (Mile Post 364)
26 miles (Mile Post 24)

Additional Features:
Maintenance Shed
Utilities
Pet Area

Number of Spaces (in use)
Passenger Cars: 21 (4)
Trucks: 0 (1)
Handicap Parking: 2 (0)

Predicted Usage: 68 vehicles/hr
Actual Usage: __________

Source: Esri, HERE, DeLorme, USGS, Mapbox, TomTom, INCREMENT P Corp., NRCAN, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri (Thailand), MangoArcGIS, OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community
Wiggins Rest Area
I-76 Mile Marker 66

Year Built: 2001
Steel Frame
Grade: B

Rest Area Study
DRAFT
June 2016

Key Amenities:
- Restrooms
- Picnic Areas
- Handicap Access

Access:
- Full
- Adjacent ADT: 12,000
- Adjacent Truck %: 21.0%
- Annual Crash Rate: 0.63

Nearest Truck Parking:
- 0 miles (Mile Post 66)
- 16 miles (Mile Post 82)

Nearest Passenger Vehicle Services:
- 0 miles (Mile Post 66)
- 14 miles (Mile Post 80)

Additional Features:
- Vending Machines
- Pet Areas
- Utilities
- Lighting

Number of Spaces (in use):
- Passenger Cars: 41 (8)
- Trucks: 20 (3)
- Handicap Parking: 2 (0)

Predicted Usage: 230 vehicles/hr
Actual Usage: __________
Cortez Rest Area
Sleeping Ute Mountain
US160 Mile Marker 46

Year Built: 1980
Masonry
Grade: C

Rest Area Study
DRAFT
June 2016

Key Amenities:
- Restrooms
- Picnic Areas
- Handicap Access

Access:
- Full
- Adjacent ADT: 7,300
- Adjacent Truck %: 6.3%
- Annual Crash Rate: 1.65

Nearest Truck Parking:
- 21 miles (Mile Post 25)
- 38 miles (Mile Post 84)

Nearest Passenger Vehicle Services:
- 7 miles (Mile Post 39)
- 10 miles (Mile Post 56)

Additional Features:
- Number of Spaces (in use)
  - Passenger Cars: 38 (5)
  - Trucks: 6 (1)
  - Handicap Parking: 4

Predicted Usage: 135 vehicles/hr
Actual Usage: __________
Shaw Creek Rest Area
US160 Mile Marker 191

Year Built: 1979
Masonry
Grade: C

Rest Area Study
DRAFT
June 2016

Key Amenities:
- Restrooms
- Picnic Areas
- Handicap Access
- Visitor Info

Access:
- Full
- Adjacent ADT: 4,900
- Adjacent Truck %: 10.3%
- Annual Crash Rate: 1.32

Nearest Truck Parking:
- 39 miles (Mile Post 220)
- 89 miles (Mile Post 102)

Nearest Passenger Vehicle Services:
- 39 miles (Mile Post 220)
- 89 miles (Mile Post 102)

Additional Features:
- Passenger Cars: 22 (7)
- Trucks: 10 (0)
- Handicap Parking: 3

Number of Spaces (in use):
- Predicted Usage: 91 vehicles/hr
- Actual Usage: __________

Visitor Info:

Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorme, USGS, Intermap, increment P Corp., NRCAN, Esri Japan, METI, Esri (Thailand), MapmyIndia, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community.
Appendix D
Field Log Database
Rest Areas can be grouped into 3 tiers with similar uses. These groupings, based on use, direct the ownership, maintenance, and revenue generating opportunities available.

Goal: Promote the safety and comfort of drivers in Colorado by providing amenities
Goal: Promote the safety and comfort of drivers in Colorado by providing amenities

To achieve this goal, the project considered safety, comfort, and amenities. To continue the comfort and amenities at the rest areas, the project is considering sustainable revenue generating opportunities to offset the maintenance costs of the rest areas.

### Rest Area Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>CDOT Region</th>
<th>Rest Area Name</th>
<th>Adjacent Roadway</th>
<th>Mile Marker</th>
<th>ADT (2014)</th>
<th>Accident Rate</th>
<th>Truck Percentage</th>
<th>Predicted Usage (vehicles per hour)</th>
<th>Actual Usage</th>
<th>Date Constructed</th>
<th>Average Annual Maintenance Cost** (2011 - 2012)</th>
<th>Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Region 2</td>
<td>Cuerno Verde Rest Area</td>
<td>I-25</td>
<td>74.39</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>320</td>
<td></td>
<td>$85,834.81</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Region 2</td>
<td>El Morro Welcome Center</td>
<td>I-25</td>
<td>17.27</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>248</td>
<td></td>
<td>$80,226.34</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Region 2</td>
<td>Gobblers Knob Rest Area</td>
<td>SH 287</td>
<td>55.20</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td>$30,254.37</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Region 2</td>
<td>Holly Rest Area</td>
<td>US 50</td>
<td>467.39</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>$48,675.01</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Region 2</td>
<td>Pueblo (Northbound) Rest Area</td>
<td>I-25</td>
<td>114.99</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>285</td>
<td></td>
<td>$105,491.06</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Region 2</td>
<td>Pueblo (Southbound) Rest Area</td>
<td>I-25</td>
<td>111.69</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>285</td>
<td></td>
<td>$109,128.98</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Region 3</td>
<td>Bair Ranch Trailhead</td>
<td>I-70</td>
<td>128.50</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>285</td>
<td></td>
<td>$67,375.71</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Region 3</td>
<td>Edwards Rest Area</td>
<td>I-70</td>
<td>163.00</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>429</td>
<td></td>
<td>$21,362.94</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Region 3</td>
<td>Elk Springs Rest Area</td>
<td>US 40</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$13</td>
<td></td>
<td>$84,236.36</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Region 3</td>
<td>Fruita Welcome Center</td>
<td>I-70</td>
<td>19.50</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
<td>$91,374.28</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Region 3</td>
<td>Grizzly Creek Trailhead</td>
<td>I-70</td>
<td>121.02</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>285</td>
<td></td>
<td>$91,374.28</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Region 3</td>
<td>Hanging Lake Trailhead</td>
<td>I-70</td>
<td>125.13</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>285</td>
<td></td>
<td>$91,374.28</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Region 3</td>
<td>Hayden Rest Area</td>
<td>US 40</td>
<td>101.00</td>
<td>5,900</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td>$17,207.88</td>
<td>Seasonal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Region 3</td>
<td>Meeker Rest Area</td>
<td>SH 13</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$37</td>
<td></td>
<td>$43,545.30</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Region 3</td>
<td>No Name Trailhead</td>
<td>I-70</td>
<td>119.00</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>303</td>
<td></td>
<td>$124,059.91</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Region 3</td>
<td>Rifle Rest Area</td>
<td>I-70</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>266</td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,454.30</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Region 3</td>
<td>Vail Pass Rest Area</td>
<td>I-70</td>
<td>190.00</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>434</td>
<td></td>
<td>$272,055.84</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Region 4</td>
<td>Arriba Rest Area</td>
<td>I-70</td>
<td>383.00</td>
<td>9,100</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>205</td>
<td></td>
<td>$127,250.73</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Region 4</td>
<td>Burlington Welcome Center</td>
<td>I-70</td>
<td>437.60</td>
<td>9,300</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>209</td>
<td></td>
<td>$75,896.00</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Region 4</td>
<td>Deer Trail Rest Area</td>
<td>I-70</td>
<td>331.01</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>157</td>
<td></td>
<td>$151,316.98</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Region 4</td>
<td>Julesburg Welcome Center</td>
<td>I-76</td>
<td>180.00</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
<td>$120,727.47</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Region 4</td>
<td>Poudre Welcome Center</td>
<td>I-25</td>
<td>268.00</td>
<td>59,000</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>1279</td>
<td></td>
<td>$77,310.16</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Region 4</td>
<td>Sterling Rest Area</td>
<td>I-76</td>
<td>125.00</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
<td>$123,045.27</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Region 4</td>
<td>Virginia Dale Rest Area</td>
<td>SH 287</td>
<td>383.50</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td>$36,981.32</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Region 4</td>
<td>Wiggins Rest Area</td>
<td>I-76</td>
<td>66.00</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>230</td>
<td></td>
<td>$112,460.23</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Region 5</td>
<td>Cortez Rest Area</td>
<td>US 160</td>
<td>46.42</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
<td>$85,792.10</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Region 5</td>
<td>Shaw Creek Rest Area</td>
<td>US 160</td>
<td>191.39</td>
<td>4,900</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td>$102,649.02</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Totals: **Inventory Items: 27

$2,235,287.33

* Recent refurbishment, Burlington(upgrade of all interior finishings) - 2013, Julesburg (exterior painting) - 2012, Pinon (Pueblo south)(complete rebuild) - 2014
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>CDOT Region</th>
<th>Rest Area Name</th>
<th>Adjacent Roadway</th>
<th>Mile Marker</th>
<th>ADT (2014)</th>
<th>Accident Rate</th>
<th>Truck Percentage</th>
<th>Predicted Usage (vehicles per hour)</th>
<th>Actual Usage</th>
<th>Date Constructed</th>
<th>Average Annual Maintenance Cost* (2011 - 2015)</th>
<th>Access</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

** Average Annual Maintenance Costs are sources from CDOT’s MLOS system. Not included in these costs are capital expenditures or monthly utility costs.
### Rest Area Policy Statement

CDOT should ensure that public rest area facilities or acceptable alternatives are available with reasonable spacing along interstates and key corridors within the state for the safety, comfort, convenience, and information needs of motorists. Rest area parking and comfort stations should be free of charge and accessible at all hours. Rest areas at key entrances to the state should be provided to help drive tourism and economic vitality. CDOT should pursue partnerships at rest areas to maximize both effectiveness and funding opportunities, and to promote safety and sustainability.

### Attributes

| Item # | CDOT Region | Rest Area Name | Adjacent Roadway | Usage²/AAOT | Existing Tier³ (approx) | Parking Spaces | Distance/Direction to Closest Service (Opposite Direction) | Distance/Direction to Closest Service | Average Annual Maintenance Cost** | Date Constructed | Access | Recreational Site⁶ | Existing Partnership⁷ | Interstate or Key Corridor⁸ | Minimum Required Distance to Acceptable Alternatives (Safety/Comfort/Convenience) | Key Entrance to the State | Safety⁹ | Other? |
| 1 | Region 2 | Cuerno Verde Rest Area | I-25 | / 16000 | Tier 2 | 10 (P) 21 (T) | 0 (B) / South | 10 (P) 22 (T) / North | $ 95,634.82 | 10/10/2017 | X | X |
| 2 | Region 2 | El Morro Rest Area | I-25 | / 11000 | Tier 2 | 10 (P) 20 (T) | 4 (P) 7 (T) / South | 16 (B) / North | $ 80,226.34 | 10/10/2017 | X | X | X |
| 3 | Region 2 | Pueblo (Northbound) Rest Area | I-25 | / 32000 | Tier 2 | 10 (P) 20 (T) | 11 (B) / South | 13 (B) / North | $ 105,491.05 | 10/10/2017 | X | | |
| 4 | Region 2 | Pueblo (Southbound) Rest Area | I-25 | / 32000 | Tier 2 | 10 (P) 30 (T) | 8 (B) / South | 16 (B) / North | $ 105,128.98 | 10/10/2017 | X | | |
| 5 | Region 2 | Goodnight Knob Rest Area | SH 287 | / 3800 | Tier 3 | 16 (P) 6 (T) | 27 (B) / North | 30 (B) / South | $ 30,254.37 | 10/10/2017 | X | | |
| 6 | Region 2 | Rioy Rest Area | US 50 | / 1800 | Tier 3 | 18 (P) 6 (T) | 4 (B) / West | 1 (P) 10 (T) / East | $ 48,675.01 | 10/10/2017 | X | |
| 7 | Region 3 | Bari Ranch Trailhead² | I-70 | / 16000 | Recreational | 20 (P) 6 (T) | 15.5 (P) 14.5 (T) / East | 14.5 (P) 16.5 (T) / West | $ 61,575.71 | 10/10/2017 | Full | X | X | X |
| 8 | Region 3 | Edwards Rest Area | I-70 | / 14000 | Tier 2 | 10 (P) 32 (T) | 0 (P) 16 (T) / West | 6 (P) 103 (T) / East | $ 21,302.94 | 10/10/2017 | Full | X | X | X |
| 9 | Region 3 | Fruita Welcome Center | I-70 | / 7000 | Tier 1 | 37 (P) 6 (T) | 0 (B) / West | 7 (B) / East | $ 84,236.36 | 10/10/2017 | Full | X | X | X |
| 10 | Region 3 | Crispid Creek Trailhead¹ | I-70 | / 16000 | Recreational | 45 (P) 10 (T) | 7 (P) 24 (T) / East | 15 (P) 59 (T) / West | $ 91,374.28 | 10/10/2017 | Full | X | | X |
| 11 | Region 3 | Hanging Lake Trailhead¹ | I-70 | / 16000 | Recreational | 55 (P) 0 (T) | 11 (P) 22 (T) / East | 15 (P) 63 (T) / West | $ 59,120.23 | 10/10/2017 | Partial | X | | X |
| 12 | Region 3 | No Name Trailhead¹ | I-70 | / 17000 | Recreational | 55 (P) 0 (T) | 5 (P) 28 (T) / East | 21 (P) 57 (T) / West | $ 124,059.91 | 10/10/2017 | Full | X | | X |
| 13 | Region 3 | Rifle Rest Area | I-70 | / 15000 | Tier 2 | 59 (P) 7 (T) | 10 (P) 18 (T) / West | 15 (P) 57 (T) / East | $ 25,645.09 | 10/10/2017 | Full | X | | X |
| 14 | Region 3 | Ute Pass Rest Area | I-70 | / 20000 | Tier 2 | 41 (P) 4 (T) | 1 (P) 43 (T) / West | 16 (P) 76 (T) / East | $ 273,015.84 | 10/10/2017 | Full | X | | X |
| 15 | Region 3 | US 60 Rest Area | US 60 | / 1150 | Tier 3 | - | 23 (P) 33 (T) / East | 13 (P) 54 (T) / West | $ - | 10/10/2017 | Full | X | | |
| 16 | Region 3 | Hayden Rest Area | US 60 | / 5700 | Tier 3 | - | 10 (B) / West | 11 (B) / East | $ 17,207.88 | 10/10/2017 | Seasonal | X | | |
| 17 | Region 3 | Meeker Rest Area | SH 13 | / 2500 | Tier 3 | - | 11 (B) / North | 27 (B) / South | $ - | 10/10/2017 | Full | X | | |
CDOT should ensure that public rest area facilities or acceptable alternatives are available with reasonable spacing along interstates and key corridors within the state for the safety, comfort, convenience, and information needs of motorists.

Rest area parking and comfort stations should be free of charge and accessible at all hours. Rest areas at key entrances to the state should be provided to help drive tourism and economic vitality. CDOT should pursue partnerships at rest areas to maximize both effectiveness and funding opportunities, and to promote safety and sustainability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Rest Area</th>
<th>Usage</th>
<th>Tier</th>
<th>Parking</th>
<th>Passenger Vehicle Parking</th>
<th>Truck Parking</th>
<th>Parking Location</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Full</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Poudre Rest Area</td>
<td>1-25 / 50000</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>46 (P) 34 (T)</td>
<td>1 (P) 13 (T)</td>
<td>1 (P) 14 (T)</td>
<td>South $ 77,310.16</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Airport Rest Area</td>
<td>I-70 / 9100</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>27 (P) 9 (T)</td>
<td>12 (B)</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>$ 127,250.73</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Burlington Welcome Center</td>
<td>I-70 / 9300</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td>58 (P) 9 (T)</td>
<td>0 (B)</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>1 (B)</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>$ 75,896.06</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Deer Trail Rest Area</td>
<td>I-70 / 9300 Tier 2</td>
<td>46 (P) 12 (T)</td>
<td>16 (P)</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>27 (P) 28 (T)</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>$ 151,316.98</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Ludlow Welcome Center</td>
<td>I-76 / 6400 Tier 1</td>
<td>43 (P) 10 (T)</td>
<td>0 (P) 15 (T)</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>15 (P) 28 (T)</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>$ 120,727.47</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Sterling Rest Area</td>
<td>I-76 / 7000 Tier 1</td>
<td>44 (P) 18 (T)</td>
<td>0 (B)</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>10 (B)</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>$ 123,045.27</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Zigzag Rest Area</td>
<td>I-76 / 12000 Tier 2</td>
<td>45 (P) 20 (T)</td>
<td>0 (B)</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>14 (P) 16 (T)</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>$ 112,400.23</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Virginia Dale Rest Area</td>
<td>I-76 / 3600 Winter Seasonal</td>
<td>23 (P) – (T)</td>
<td>26 (B)</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>33 (H)</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>$ 36,981.32</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Colorado Rest Area</td>
<td>US 100 / 7300 Tier 2</td>
<td>43 (P) 6 (T)</td>
<td>7 (P) 25 (T)</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>10 (P) 38 (T)</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>$ 95,702.18</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Shaw Creek Rest Area</td>
<td>US 100 / 4900 Tier 2</td>
<td>25 (P) 10 (T)</td>
<td>39 (B)</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>69 (B)</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>$ 102,649.02</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS**

**INVENTORY ITEMS:** 27

(T) - Truck Parking  (P) - Passenger Vehicle Parking  (B) - Both Truck and Passenger Vehicle Parking

Black Text = Rest Area located on Interstate  Blue Text = Rest Area located off Interstate

1. Actual usage data unavailable
2. Recreational site is defined as rest areas where the primary purpose is to serve recreational uses (e.g.trailhead)
3. Existing partnership is defined as facilities where a financial commitment exists between CDOT and another entity
4. A key corridor is defined as "Non-Interstate critical freight corridors as identified in the Colorado Freight Plan and/or a critical recreational corridor that warrants a rest area for demonstrable safety reasons."
5. See Safety Analysis Worksheet in Appendix A.
6. See Rest Area Policy Statement with Definitions Document