

COLORADO

**Commercial Vehicle Safety Plan
for the
Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration's
Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program
Fiscal Years 2018 - 2020
Annual Update FY 2019**

Date of Approval: Jun 17, 2019

Final CVSP

Part 1 - MCSAP Overview

1 - Introduction

The Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program (MCSAP) is a Federal grant program that provides financial assistance to States to help reduce the number and severity of accidents and hazardous materials incidents involving commercial motor vehicles (CMV). The goal of the MCSAP is to reduce CMV-involved accidents, fatalities, and injuries through consistent, uniform, and effective CMV safety programs.

A State lead MCSAP agency, as designated by its Governor, is eligible to apply for grant funding by submitting a commercial vehicle safety plan (CVSP), in accordance with the provisions of [49 CFR 350.201](#) and [205](#). The lead agency must submit the State's CVSP to the FMCSA Division Administrator on or before August 1 of each year. For a State to receive funding, the CVSP needs to be complete and include all required documents. Currently, the State must submit a performance-based plan each year to receive MCSAP funds.

The FAST Act required the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA) to “prescribe procedures for a State to submit a multiple-year plan and annual updates thereto, under which the State agrees to assume responsibility for improving motor carrier safety by adopting and enforcing State regulations, standards, and orders that are compatible with the regulations, standards, and orders of the Federal Government on commercial motor vehicle safety and hazardous materials transportation safety.”

The online CVSP tool (eCVSP) outlines the State's CMV safety objectives, strategies, activities and performance measures and is organized into the following five parts:

- Part 1: MCSAP Overview
- Part 2: Crash Reduction and National Program Elements (FY 2018 - 2020)
- Part 3: National Emphasis Areas and State Specific Objectives (FY 2018 - 2020)
- Part 4: Financial Information (FY 2019)
- Part 5: Certifications and Documents

You will find that each of the five eCVSP parts listed above contains different subsections. Each subsection category will provide you with detailed explanation and instruction on what to do for completing the necessary tables and narratives.

The MCSAP program includes the eCVSP tool to assist States in developing and monitoring their grant applications. The eCVSP provides ease of use and promotes a uniform, consistent process for all States to complete and submit their plans. States and territories will use the eCVSP to complete the CVSP and to submit either a single year, a 3-year plan, or an Annual Update to a 3-year plan. As used within the eCVSP, the term ‘State’ means all the States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, American Samoa, Guam, and the Virgin Islands.

NEW FOR FY 2019:

Single Year and Multi-Year plans—For FY 2019, the primary difference in the single year and multi-year CVSP formats is that objectives, projected goals, and activities in the 3-year plan will cover an entire three-year period. The financial information and certifications will be updated each fiscal year.

Annual Updates for Multi-Year plans—Those States in Year 2 of a 3-year plan will be providing an Annual Update only. States will be able to review the project plan submitted in Year 1 and indicate whether anything needs to be updated for Year 2 via a Yes/No question provided in each Section of Parts 1-3. **NOTE: Answer carefully as there is one opportunity to check Yes/No and then the input is locked.**

- If Yes is indicated, the information provided for Year 1 will be editable and State users can make any necessary changes to their project plan.
- If No is indicated, the Year 1 information will not be editable and the user can move forward to the next section.
- The financial information and certifications will be updated each fiscal year.

All single year, multi-year, and annual update plans have been pre-populated with data and information from their FY 2018 plans. States must carefully review and update this information to reflect FY 2019 activities prior to submission to FMCSA.

In addition, States are reminded to **not** include any personally identifiable information (PII) in the CVSP. The final

CVSP approved by FMCSA is required to be posted to a public FMCSA website.

2 - Mission/Goal Statement

Please review the description of your State's lead CMV agency's goals or mission. Are there changes that need to be made for the upcoming fiscal year? Before selecting "yes," make sure there are changes to be made as once selected, this answer cannot be changed.

- ☐ Yes, the information in this section must be updated for this upcoming fiscal year. I understand that I must click "Save" to save any changes.
- ☒ No, the information in this section remains valid for the upcoming fiscal year and no updates are necessary.

Instructions:

Briefly describe the mission or goal of the lead State commercial motor vehicle safety agency responsible for administering this Commercial Vehicle Safety Plan (CVSP) throughout the State.

NOTE: Please do not include information on any other FMCSA grant activities or expenses in the CVSP.

The mission of the Colorado State Patrol is to ensure a safe and secure environment for all persons by utilizing the strengths of our members to provide professional law enforcement services that reflect our core values of Honor, Duty, and Respect.

Further the goal of the Colorado State Patrol Motor Carrier Safety Section is to provide a safe and secure environment in Colorado for all persons by reducing commercial vehicle related crashes, reducing hazardous materials incidents, and increased criminal interdiction activity in commercial motor vehicles.

Evaluation of data obtained from the Analysis and Information website (MCMIS data snapshot as of 06/30/17) indicates that from calendar year 2014 to calendar year 2015 there was an approximate 18% reduction in the number of fatal and non-fatal crashes occurring in the State of Colorado. On average from calendar year 2013 through calendar year 2016 there was a total of 1,979 fatal and non-fatal CMV crashes in the state of Colorado. Additionally, there was a 4% decrease during CY 2016 in the number of fatalities as a result of a crash as compared to CY 2014. The goal of the Colorado State Patrol, Motor Carrier Safety Section is to reduce the total number of fatal and non-fatal crashes by 2% each year during FY 2018-FY 2020 as compared to the average number of crashes occurring from 2013-2016.

Colorado: Summary Report					
Summary	CY 2013	CY 2014	CY 2015	CY 2016	CY 2017*
Number of vehicles involved in fatal & non-fatal crashes	1,970	2,339	1,913	2,094	339
# in fatal crashes	48	73	72	71	8
# in non-fatal crashes	1,922	2,266	1,841	2,023	331
Number of fatal & non-fatal Crashes	1,878	2,214	1,823	2,002	323
# of fatal crashes	46	68	64	67	7
# of non-fatal crashes	1,832	2,146	1,759	1,935	316
Number of Fatalities as a result of a crash	51	74	73	71	8
Number of Injuries as a result of a crash	586	624	258	564	90

3 - MCSAP Structure Explanation

Please review your State's CMV enforcement program description. Are there changes that need to be made for the upcoming fiscal year? Before selecting "yes," make sure there are changes to be made as once selected, this answer cannot be changed.

- ☐ Yes, the information in this section must be updated for this upcoming fiscal year. I understand that I must click "Save" to save any changes.
- ☐ No, the information in this section remains valid for the upcoming fiscal year and no updates are necessary.

Instructions:

Briefly describe the State's commercial motor vehicle (CMV) enforcement program funded by the MCSAP grant.

NOTE: Please do not include activities or expenses associated with any other FMCSA grant program.

In May 2013, a new section was created within the Motor Carrier Services Branch, the Motor Carrier Programs & Training Section (MCPT). The purpose of this section is to provide training and administrative program support to the other sections within the branch. While most job duties did not change, several personnel previously assigned to the Motor Carrier Safety Section were transferred to the new section. All training and grant management functions were transferred to the new section, including the MCSAP Grant Administrator and the Administrative Assistant responsible for the entry of inspections and CMV crash data. Additionally, three General Professionals that manage the various administrative aspects of MCSAP were also transferred to the new section. A new Captain was added to the section to provide oversight functions for the section. This position is funded by the Colorado State Patrol Highway Users Tax Fund at 50% and the Colorado Port of Entry Section at 50%. An additional Administrative Assistant was added to the Motor Carrier Safety Section to provide administrative support to the MCSAP Captain and to assist with the increase in telephone calls received in the branch. This position is also funded by the MCSAP Basic Grant at 50% and the Colorado Port of Entry Section at 50%.

In addition to the two Captains, there are currently 22 uniformed officers, 2 Port of Entry Officers (POE) who conduct safety audits, and four Sergeants assigned to the MCSAP and MCPT sections. The uniformed officers, POE officers, and sergeants are funded by the MCSAP Basic grant and HUTF at varying percentages based upon cost eligibility for the duties performed throughout the year. Each Officer inputs their time into the Patrol's Time Management System utilizing a specific function code for each grant program. Salaries are then adjusted the following month based upon the percentage of time dedicated to each function code/grant program. The grant managers in the MCPT section keep a record of the time worked by function code, as well as, paper copies for backup documentation. Each of the MCSAP officers conduct inspections, compliance reviews, and new entrant safety audits throughout the year, in addition to public outreach and education duties. Additionally, two of the 22 uniformed officers are responsible for coordinating and implementing MCSAP related training for all certified inspectors/officers within the Colorado State Patrol. To meet match and MOE requirements, of the uniformed officers assigned to the unit, the Colorado State Patrol directly funds 7 Troopers, 1 Sergeant, and 1/2 of a Captain utilizing Highway User Tax Funds.

All of the MCSAP and MCPT inspectors/investigators have received basic motor carrier safety inspection training, a bulk-packaging course, general hazardous material training, the motor coach course and the North American Standard Inspection Course Side A & B. In addition, training has been provided by the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration on the performance of CSA Compliance reviews and safety audits. Currently, several of the technicians have been certified to perform reviews and audits on commercial carriers. Since the organization of the section, the troopers involved in the program have undergone refresher training courses as well as a week of regular departmental in-service training annually. Additionally two inspectors have been trained to conduct Level VI radioactive highway route controlled substances inspections to assist with WIPP inspections when needed.

4 - MCSAP Structure

Please review your State's MCSAP structure information. Are there changes that need to be made for the upcoming fiscal year? Before selecting "yes," make sure there are changes to be made as once selected, this answer cannot be changed.

- ☐ Yes, the information in this section must be updated for this upcoming fiscal year. I understand that I must click "Save" to save any changes.
- ☐ No, the information in this section remains valid for the upcoming fiscal year and no updates are necessary.

Instructions:

Complete the following tables for the MCSAP lead agency, each subrecipient and non-funded agency conducting eligible CMV safety activities.

The tables below show the total number of personnel participating in MCSAP activities, including full time and part time personnel. This is the total number of non-duplicated individuals involved in all MCSAP activities within the CVSP. (The agency and subrecipient names entered in these tables will be used in the National Program Elements —Roadside Inspections area.)

The national program elements sub-categories represent the number of personnel involved in that specific area of enforcement. FMCSA recognizes that some staff may be involved in more than one area of activity.

Lead Agency Information	
Agency Name:	COLORADO STATE PATROL
Enter total number of personnel participating in MCSAP activities	528
National Program Elements	Enter # personnel below
Driver and Vehicle Inspections	528
Traffic Enforcement Activities	22
Investigations*	22
Public Education and Awareness	22
Data Collection and Reporting	22
* Formerly Compliance Reviews and Includes New Entrant Safety Audits	

Non-funded Agency Information	
Total number of agencies:	21
Total # of MCSAP Participating Personnel:	59

Part 2 - Crash Reduction and National Program Elements

1 - Overview

Part 2 allows the State to provide past performance trend analysis and specific goals for FY 2018 - 2020 in the areas of crash reduction, roadside inspections, traffic enforcement, audits and investigations, safety technology and data quality, and public education and outreach.

In past years, the program effectiveness summary trend analysis and performance goals were separate areas in the CVSP. Beginning in FY 2017, these areas have been merged and categorized by the National Program Elements as described in [49 CFR 350.109](#). This change is intended to streamline and incorporate this information into one single area of the CVSP based upon activity type.

Note: *For CVSP planning purposes, the State can access detailed counts of its core MCSAP performance measures. Such measures include roadside inspections, traffic enforcement activity, investigation/review activity, and data quality by quarter for the current and past two fiscal years using the State Quarterly Report and CVSP Data Dashboard, and/or the CVSP Toolkit on the A&I Online website. The Data Dashboard is also a resource designed to assist the State with preparing their MCSAP-related quarterly reports and is located at: <http://ai.fmcsa.dot.gov/StatePrograms/Home.aspx>. A user id and password are required to access this system.*

In addition, States can utilize other data sources available on the A&I Online website as well as internal State data sources. It is important to reference the data source used in developing problem statements, baselines and performance goals/ objectives.

2 - CMV Crash Reduction

Please review the description of your State's crash reduction problem statement, goals, program activities and monitoring. Are there changes that need to be made for the upcoming fiscal year? Before selecting "yes," make sure there are changes to be made as once selected, this answer cannot be changed.

- ☐ Yes, the information in this section must be updated for this upcoming fiscal year. I understand that I must click "Save" to save any changes.
- ☒ No, the information in this section remains valid for the upcoming fiscal year and no updates are necessary.

The primary mission of the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA) is to reduce crashes, injuries and fatalities involving large trucks and buses. MCSAP partners also share the goal of reducing commercial motor vehicle (CMV) related crashes.

Trend Analysis for 2012 - 2016

Instructions for all tables in this section:

Complete the tables below to document the State's past performance trend analysis over the past five measurement periods. All columns in the table must be completed.

- Insert the beginning and ending dates of the five most recent State measurement periods used in the Measurement Period column. The measurement period can be calendar year, Federal fiscal year, State fiscal year, or any consistent 12-month period for available data.
- In the Fatalities column, enter the total number of fatalities resulting from crashes involving CMVs in the State during each measurement period.
- The Goal and Outcome columns allow the State to show its CVSP goal and the actual outcome for each measurement period. The goal and outcome must be expressed in the same format and measurement type (e.g., number, percentage, etc.).
 - In the Goal column, enter the goal from the corresponding CVSP for the measurement period.
 - In the Outcome column, enter the actual outcome for the measurement period based upon the goal that was set.
- Include the data source and capture date in the narrative box provided below the tables.
- If challenges were experienced while working toward the goals, provide a brief narrative including details of how the State adjusted the program and if the modifications were successful.

ALL CMV CRASHES

Select the State's method of measuring the crash reduction goal as expressed in the corresponding CVSP by using the drop-down box options: (e.g. large truck fatal crashes per 100M VMT, actual number of fatal crashes, actual number of fatalities, or other). Other can include injury only or property damage crashes.

Goal measurement as defined by your State: Large Truck Fatal Crashes per 100M VMT

If you select 'Other' as the goal measurement, explain the measurement used in the text box provided:

Measurement Period (Include 5 Periods)		Fatalities	Goal	Outcome
Begin Date	End Date			
01/01/2016	12/31/2016	71	0.11	
01/01/2015	12/31/2015	74	0.11	0.14
01/01/2014	12/31/2014	67	0.11	0.14
01/01/2013	12/31/2013	61	0.11	0.13
01/01/2012	12/31/2012	62	0.11	0.13

MOTORCOACH/PASSENGER CARRIER CRASHES

Select the State's method of measuring the crash reduction goal as expressed in the corresponding CVSP by using the drop-down box options: (e.g. large truck fatal crashes per 100M VMT, actual number of fatal crashes, actual number of fatalities, other, or N/A).

Goal measurement as defined by your State: Other

If you select 'Other' or 'N/A' as the goal measurement, explain the measurement used in the text box provided:

Total number of fatal and non-fatal crashes for all buses.

Measurement Period (Include 5 Periods)		Fatalities	Goal	Outcome
Begin Date	End Date			
01/01/2016	12/31/2016	2	184	227
01/01/2015	12/31/2015	6	240	194
01/01/2014	12/31/2014	5	188	254
01/01/2013	12/31/2013	2	145	198
01/01/2012	12/31/2012	5	173	153

Hazardous Materials (HM) CRASH INVOLVING HM RELEASE/SPILL

Hazardous material is anything that is listed in the hazardous materials table or that meets the definition of any of the hazard classes as specified by Federal law. The Secretary of Transportation has determined that hazardous materials are those materials capable of posing an unreasonable risk to health, safety, and property when transported in commerce. The term hazardous material includes hazardous substances, hazardous wastes, marine pollutants, elevated temperature materials, and all other materials listed in the hazardous materials table.

For the purposes of the table below, HM crashes involve a release/spill of HM that is part of the manifested load. (This does not include fuel spilled from ruptured CMV fuel tanks as a result of the crash).

Select the State's method of measuring the crash reduction goal as expressed in the corresponding CVSP by using the drop-down box options: (e.g., large truck fatal crashes per 100M VMT, actual number of fatal crashes, actual number of fatalities, other, or N/A).

Goal measurement as defined by your State: Other

If you select 'Other' or 'N/A' as the goal measurement, explain the measurement used in the text box provided:

Total number of reportable Hazardous Material crashes

Measurement Period (Include 5 Periods)		Fatalities	Goal	Outcome
Begin Date	End Date			
01/01/2016	12/31/2016		39	54
01/01/2015	12/31/2015		18	41
01/01/2014	12/31/2014		20	19
01/01/2013	12/31/2013		40	21
01/01/2012	12/31/2012		35	42

Enter the data sources and capture dates of the data listed in each of the tables above.

A&I - State Level Commercial Motor Vehicle (CMV) Fatality Rate per 100 Million Total Vehicle Miles Traveled as of 07/25/17 ****2016 Data was not available as of July 25, 2017. Motorcoach/Passenger Carrier Data obtained via A&I Bus Crash Summary Report MCMIS snapshot as of 07/28/17, including crash records through 03/31/17. Total Hazardous materials crashes for the State of Colorado as reported in MCMIS snapshot as of 07/28/17, including crash records through 03/31/17

Narrative: Describe any difficulties achieving the goal, problems encountered, obstacles overcome, lessons learned, etc.

Through the implementation of a comprehensive MCSAP program within the state, including commercial vehicle safety inspections, CSA compliance reviews, interstate safety audits, targeted enforcement, and public education and awareness initiatives, the number of large trucks involved in crashes and the CMV fatality rate per 100 million vehicle miles traveled has remained 0.14 for the last several years after a decline from 0.15 in 2008. The population in Colorado continues to increase, resulting in increased road congestion and miles traveled. The goal of the Colorado State Patrol is to reduce crashes and fatalities, however, it is increasingly difficult to accomplish this goal as budgets and personnel have not increased proportionately to population.

The state's goal since 2009 has been to reduce the total number of passenger carrier crashes occurring in the state by 5% as compared to previous years.

On average, the number of reportable passenger carrier crashes represents 10% of the total reportable CMV crashes in the state. There were a total of 227 passenger carrier fatal and non-fatal crashes during calendar year 2016, while this is an increase in the total number of crashes as compared to calendar year 2015, the number of passenger carrier fatalities during calendar year 2016 decreased by 66% as compared to calendar year 2015.

The majority of passenger carrier crashes in the state occur within municipal boundaries, which limits the impact the State Patrol has on the prevention of these crashes. However, the partnership the Patrol has with the municipal law enforcement agencies within the state has made a positive impact on the passenger carrier crash occurrence within the state.

The state's goal since 2009 has been to reduce the total number of hazardous materials crashes occurring in the state by 5% as compared to previous years.

The transportation of hazardous materials poses a national threat to public safety. It is critical that those carriers transporting hazardous materials within the State of Colorado are aware of and take precautions to safely transport hazardous materials. The Colorado State Patrol has a section dedicated to the safe transportation of hazardous materials that is located within the Motor Carrier Services Branch. Officers within this unit also conduct CMV safety inspections and are responsible for clean up when a hazardous spill occurs, among other duties. Additionally, personnel within the MCSAP section conduct hazardous materials CMV inspections, as well as, compliance reviews/interventions and SCR's specific to the hazardous materials industry. The MCSAP, POE, and MCPT sections work closely with the Haz Mat section to educate hazardous materials carriers on the safety regulations related to hazardous materials transportation to ensure that hazardous materials carriers are in compliance with hazardous materials regulations.

Utilizing data available from A&I and the state's local Safetynet database, data indicates that the number of reportable CMV hazardous materials crashes represent approximately 3% of the total number of reportable CMV crashes within the state. Additionally between calendar years 2009 and 2013, of the reportable CMV hazardous materials crashes that occurred in the state, approximately 5 crashes were the fault of the CMV, which is 0.3% of the total reportable crashes that occurred during the same time period.

Based upon this data, the state would argue that while personnel will continue to conduct hazardous materials inspections, CR's, SCR's, and safety presentations, and will work closely with the CSP Hazardous Materials Section, the state does not have an identifiable problem in relation to reportable CMV hazardous materials crashes/transportation.

Narrative Overview for FY 2018 - 2020**Instructions:**

The State must include a reasonable crash reduction goal for their State that supports FMCSA's mission to reduce the national number of crashes, injuries and fatalities involving commercial motor vehicles. The State has flexibility in setting its goal and it can be based on raw numbers (e.g., total number of fatalities or CMV crashes), based on a rate (e.g., fatalities per 100 million VMT), etc.

Problem Statement Narrative: Describe the identified problem, include baseline data and identify the measurement method.

The most current data available from the Analysis and Information Website indicates that from CY 2013 through CY 2016 there were on average a total of 1,979* fatal and non-fatal CMV crashes in the State of Colorado. The following top five crash causation factors** were also identified: Inattentive to Driving, Exceeded Safe Speed, Lane Violations, Following too Closely, and Failed to yield R-O-W. Additionally, the majority of crashes related to these causation factors occurred in Denver, Adams, Weld, Jefferson and Arapahoe counties. Targeted enforcement efforts will be increased with a focus on the identified crash causation factors and counties, to change driving behaviors related to these crash causation factors and to reduce the number of reportable CMV fatal and non-fatal crashes in the state.

Enter the data source and capture date:

* FMCSA Motor Carrier Management Information System (MCMIS) data snapshot as of 07/28/2017, including crash records through 03/31/17. **State Safetynet Database - July 2017

Projected Goal for FY 2018 - 2020:

In the table below, state the crash reduction goal for each of the three fiscal years. The method of measurement should be consistent from year to year. For example, if the overall crash reduction goal for the three year period is 12 percent, then each annual goal could be 4 percent.

Fiscal Year	Annual Crash Reduction Goals
2018	2
2019	2
2020	2

To reduce the baseline average number of fatal and non-fatal crashes occurring between CY 2013 and CY 2016, which is 1,979.

Program Activities for FY 2018 - 2020: States must indicate the activities, and the amount of effort (staff hours, inspections, traffic enforcement stops, etc.) that will be resourced directly for the program activities purpose.

All MCSAP officers will conduct three (3) multi-day saturation patrols, per fiscal year, in high crash corridors/counties, focusing on the identified crash causation factors. Additionally, saturation patrols will place an emphasis on counties with active oilfield operations, as well as, non-CMV's operating around CMV's in addition to general CMV safety and compliance. All MCSAP troopers participate in the saturation patrols, dedicating an average of 20 hours per trooper to each event. The number and type of contacts varies widely during each event, dependent upon the focus area.

Performance Measurements and Monitoring: The State will monitor the effectiveness of its CMV Crash Reduction Goal quarterly and annually by evaluating the performance measures and reporting results in the required Standard Form - Performance Progress Reports (SF-PPRs).

Describe how the State will conduct ongoing monitoring of progress in addition to quarterly reporting.

The state will report the number of multi-day operations conducted. The emphasis of the operation. The County where the saturation patrols occurred. The number of CMV's contacted during the saturation patrols. The number of CMV inspections conducted during the saturation patrols. The number and type of citations issued during the saturation patrols as related to the top five (5) crash causation factors. The number of driver violations. The number of OOS driver violations. The number of vehicle violations. The number of OOS vehicle violations. The number of non-CMV's contacted. The number of non-CMV citations issued.

3 - Roadside Inspections

Please review the description of your State's overall inspection program and identify if changes are needed for the upcoming fiscal year. You must also update the projected roadside inspection goals for the upcoming fiscal year. You must select "yes" to make changes.

- ☒ Yes, the information in this section must be updated for this upcoming fiscal year. I understand that I must click "Save" to save any changes.
- ☐ No, the information in this section remains valid for the upcoming fiscal year and no updates are necessary.

In this section, provide a trend analysis, an overview of the State's roadside inspection program, and projected goals for FY 2018 - 2020.

Note: In completing this section, do NOT include border enforcement inspections. Border Enforcement activities will be captured in a separate section if applicable.

Trend Analysis for 2012 - 2016

Inspection Types	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Level 1: Full	9075	12061	11410	12647	11246
Level 2: Walk-Around	4463	4992	4965	5360	7563
Level 3: Driver-Only	16828	20303	27893	31780	32098
Level 4: Special Inspections	115	233	422	175	88
Level 5: Vehicle-Only	425	439	415	522	584
Level 6: Radioactive Materials	395	380	128	4	1
Total	31301	38408	45233	50488	51580

Narrative Overview for FY 2018 - 2020

Overview:

Describe components of the State's general Roadside and Fixed-Facility Inspection Program. Include the day-to-day routine for inspections and explain resource allocation decisions (i.e., number of FTE, where inspectors are working and why).

Enter a narrative of the State's overall inspection program, including a description of how the State will monitor its program to ensure effectiveness and consistency.

Colorado's roadside program is multifaceted in that it incorporates fixed and mobile sites in conjunction with patrolling. The Colorado State Patrol has a policy that all uniformed officers (Troopers and Port of Entry Officers) must be Level III certified upon completion of their training at the Academy. As part of the Patrol's mentorship and professional development initiatives, MCSAP hosts two Level I North America Standard (NAS) schools each year. These schools are available to all uniformed officers and each Troop Commander / District Supervisor is encouraged to send those officers who meet all minimum requirements. The Patrol currently has 149 certified Level I inspectors. Additionally, there are 32 certified Level II inspectors and 347 certified Level III inspectors, for a total of 528 certified inspectors within the Colorado State Patrol. Through a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) Agreement, the Patrol currently has 21 local agencies with active, certified commercial vehicle (CMV) inspectors. These inspectors work with Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program (MCSAP) Troopers and POE offices to enhance the state's CMV safety program. Each of these officers receive their initial and all refresher training from the Patrol. This is to ensure all CMV inspections conducted are consistent and uniform. There are currently 59 local inspectors the majority of which are Level III certified. MCSAP currently has 22 troopers assigned to different areas of the State. Assigned areas are determined by CMV crash occurrence and commercial vehicle traffic flow. When a position becomes available due to a vacancy, MCSAP leadership conducts an extensive assessment of the area. A determination is then made as whether the position will remain in the current locale or moved to another area with a greater need or an increase in unsafe driving or CMV involved crashes. All MCSAP and Port of

Entry (POE) officers utilized both fixed and mobile sites when conducting inspections. POE officers station their mobile sites in areas with a high percentage of CMV involved crashes (data from State Safety Net). The MCSAP troopers utilizes this same method when setting up mobile sites and when patrolling. Each officer begins their shift with a review of the crash data for their area of responsibility. This information is then utilized to determine if either a mobile setup or for the MCSAP Trooper if routine patrolling will be the most effective in addressing CMV safety. Through the use of these multifaceted techniques, CSP officers ensure enforcement action is initiated in "problem" areas.

All uniformed State Patrol Officers (Troopers and Port of Entry officers) conduct inspections to satisfy match requirements. These inspections are in addition to the inspections performed by MCSAP funded officers. While the inspections conducted by the match officers comply with CVSA and FMCSA requirements, the Level of inspection conducted is contingent upon the current certification of each individual officer. There are more Level III certified "match" officers within the CSP than there are Level I, as such, these officers in total will complete more Level III inspections.

In comparison, MCSAP funded officers are projected to conduct a total of 8700 inspections, which includes a projected 28% at Level I and 46% at Level III.

Projected Goals for FY 2018 - 2020

Instructions for Projected Goals:

Complete the following tables in this section indicating the number of inspections that the State anticipates conducting during Fiscal Years 2018 - 2020. For FY 2019, there are separate tabs for the Lead Agency, Subrecipient Agencies, and Non-Funded Agencies—enter inspection goals by agency type. Enter the requested information on the first three tabs (as applicable). The Summary table totals are calculated by the eCVSP system.

To modify the names of the Lead or Subrecipient agencies, or the number of Subrecipient or Non-Funded Agencies, visit [Part 1, MCSAP Structure](#).

Note: Per the [MCSAP Comprehensive Policy](#), States are strongly encouraged to conduct at least 25 percent Level 1 inspections and 33 percent Level 3 inspections of the total inspections conducted. If the State opts to do less than these minimums, provide an explanation in space provided on the Summary tab.

MCSAP Lead Agency

Lead Agency is: COLORADO STATE PATROL

Enter the total number of certified personnel in the Lead agency: 528

Projected Goals for FY 2019 - Roadside Inspections					
Inspection Level	Non-Hazmat	Hazmat	Passenger	Total	Percentage by Level
Level 1: Full	11998	838	26	12862	23.27%
Level 2: Walk-Around	6013	1275	0	7288	13.19%
Level 3: Driver-Only	34298	0	0	34298	62.06%
Level 4: Special Inspections	178	0	0	178	0.32%
Level 5: Vehicle-Only	343	0	269	612	1.11%
Level 6: Radioactive Materials	0	25	0	25	0.05%
Sub-Total Lead Agency	52830	2138	295	55263	

MCSAP subrecipient agency

Complete the following information for each MCSAP subrecipient agency. A separate table must be created for each subrecipient.

You have not entered any subrecipient information. Visit Part 1, MCSAP Structure to add subrecipient information.

Non-Funded Agencies

Total number of agencies:	21
Enter the total number of non-funded certified officers:	59
Enter the total number of inspections projected for FY 2019:	523

Summary

Projected Goals for FY 2019 - Roadside Inspections Summary

Projected Goals for FY 2019 Summary for All Agencies					
MCSAP Lead Agency: COLORADO STATE PATROL					
# certified personnel: 528					
Subrecipient Agencies:					
# certified personnel: 0					
Number of Non-Funded Agencies: 21					
# certified personnel: 59					
# projected inspections: 523					
Inspection Level	Non-Hazmat	Hazmat	Passenger	Total	Percentage by Level
Level 1: Full	11998	838	26	12862	23.27%
Level 2: Walk-Around	6013	1275	0	7288	13.19%
Level 3: Driver-Only	34298	0	0	34298	62.06%
Level 4: Special Inspections	178	0	0	178	0.32%
Level 5: Vehicle-Only	343	0	269	612	1.11%
Level 6: Radioactive Materials	0	25	0	25	0.05%
Total ALL Agencies	52830	2138	295	55263	

Note: If the minimum numbers for Level 1 and Level 3 inspections are less than described in the [MCSAP Comprehensive Policy](#), briefly explain why the minimum(s) will not be met.

Projected Goals for FY 2019 Roadside Inspections	Lead Agency	Subrecipients	Non-Funded	Total
Enter total number of projected inspections	56368	0	533	56901
Enter total number of certified personnel	528	0	59	587
Projected Goals for FY 2020 Roadside Inspections				
Enter total number of projected inspections	57495	0	544	58039
Enter total number of certified personnel	528	0	59	587

4 - Investigations

Please review your State's investigation goals, program activities and monitoring. Are there changes that need to be made for the upcoming fiscal year? Before selecting "yes," make sure there are changes to be made as once selected, this answer cannot be changed.

- ☐ Yes, the information in this section must be updated for this upcoming fiscal year. I understand that I must click "Save" to save any changes.
- ☐ No, the information in this section remains valid for the upcoming fiscal year and no updates are necessary.

Describe the State's implementation of FMCSA's interventions model for interstate carriers. Also describe any remaining or transitioning compliance review program activities for intrastate motor carriers. Include the number of personnel assigned to this effort. Data provided in this section should reflect interstate and intrastate investigation activities for each year.



The State does not conduct investigations. If this box is checked, the tables and narrative are not required to be completed and won't be displayed.

Trend Analysis for 2012 - 2016

Investigative Types - Interstate	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Compliance Investigations	218	194		8	26
Cargo Tank Facility Reviews					
Non-Rated Reviews (Excludes CSA & SCR)					
CSA Off-Site			25	29	6
CSA On-Site Focused/Focused CR			54	47	49
CSA On-Site Comprehensive			34	37	42
Total Investigations	218	194	113	121	123
Total Security Contact Reviews	8	7	0	7	10
Total Terminal Investigations					

Investigative Types - Intrastate	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Compliance Investigations				4	8
Cargo Tank Facility Reviews					
Non-Rated Reviews (Excludes CSA & SCR)					
CSA Off-Site			11	8	3
CSA On-Site Focused/Focused CR			41	33	23
CSA On-Site Comprehensive			50	37	37
Total Investigations	0	0	102	82	71
Total Security Contact Reviews			2	1	1
Total Terminal Investigations					

Narrative Overview for FY 2018 - 2020**Instructions:**

Describe the State's implementation of FMCSA's interventions model to the maximum extent possible for interstate carriers and any remaining or transitioning compliance review program activities for intrastate motor carriers. Include the number of personnel assigned to this effort.

Projected Goals for FY 2018 - 2020

Complete the table below indicating the number of investigations that the State anticipates conducting during FY 2018 - 2020.

Projected Goals for FY 2018 - 2020 - Investigations						
Investigation Type	FY 2018		FY 2019		FY 2020	
	Interstate	Intrastate	Interstate	Intrastate	Interstate	Intrastate
Compliance Investigations	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cargo Tank Facility Reviews	0	0	0	0	0	0
Non-Rated Reviews (Excludes CSA & SCR)	0	0	0	0	0	0
CSA Off-Site	25	17	25	17	25	17
CSA On-Site Focused/Focused CR	40	20	40	20	40	20
CSA On-Site Comprehensive	34	24	34	24	34	24
Total Investigations	99	61	99	61	99	61
Total Security Contact Reviews	2	0	2	0	2	0
Total Terminal Investigations	0	0	0	0	0	0

Add additional information as necessary to describe the carrier investigation estimates.

Due to an increased emphasis on inspections and a re-alignment of resources, the estimated number of carrier investigations will remain static from 2018-2020.

Program Activities: Describe components of the State's carrier investigation activities. Include the number of personnel participating in this activity.

Colorado has implemented a comprehensive compliance review program, and was one of the CSA 100% states. The compliance reviews are only conducted by Colorado State Patrol MCSAP Troopers and no other members. The program consists of one Sergeant who serves as program administrator, and who is the single point of contact for reviews and is the liaison with the FMCSA. Reviews completed by the CSP are sent to the administering Sergeant, who reviews work products prior to the close out of the review and enforcement actions. The Colorado State Patrol program has 7 full time investigators, whose primary responsibility is complex, comprehensive reviews in the major metropolitan areas. There are also 5 other MCSAP Troopers stationed in various locations who conduct reviews on a smaller scale than the full time investigators. The CSP has a great working relationship with the FMCSA Denver office. When the 7 full time investigators are not working active investigations they are expected to be conducting inspections at stationary locations, and through traffic enforcement. The other 5 MCSAP Troopers who conduct compliance reviews also conduct safety audits and inspections. Reviews are assigned by geographic region, and based on need. Investigators may be required to travel to certain locations in the State based on need and program initiatives. Reviews are assigned and not limited to: serious accidents, formal complaints, roadside inspections, egregious violations of the FMCSR, and deficient BASICS.

Performance Measurements and Monitoring: Describe all measures the State will use to monitor progress toward the annual goals. Further, describe how the State measures qualitative components of its carrier investigation program, as well as outputs.

Reviews are assigned as the result of complaints received, CSA scores, roadside inspections and carriers involved in fatal crashes. The intervention/investigation manager assigns all investigations and closely monitors the number of investigations and completeness of each investigation on a monthly basis. The manager also provides information related to the number and type of investigations conducted for the quarterly report that is submitted to FMCSA.

5 - Traffic Enforcement

Please review the description of your State's traffic enforcement program, projected goals and monitoring. Are there changes that need to be made for the upcoming fiscal year? Before selecting "yes," make sure there are changes to be made as once selected, this answer cannot be changed.

- ☒ Yes, the information in this section must be updated for this upcoming fiscal year. I understand that I must click "Save" to save any changes.
- ☐ No, the information in this section remains valid for the upcoming fiscal year and no updates are necessary.

Traffic enforcement means documented enforcement activities of State or local officials. This includes the stopping of vehicles operating on highways, streets, or roads for moving violations of State or local motor vehicle or traffic laws (e.g., speeding, following too closely, reckless driving, and improper lane changes).

Trend Analysis for 2012 - 2016

Instructions:

Please refer to the [MCSAP Comprehensive Policy](#) for an explanation of FMCSA's traffic enforcement guidance. Complete the tables below to document the State's safety performance goals and outcomes over the past five measurement periods.

1. Insert the beginning and end dates of the measurement period being used, (e.g., calendar year, Federal fiscal year, State fiscal year or any consistent 12-month period for which data is available).
2. Insert the total number CMV traffic enforcement stops with an inspection, CMV traffic enforcement stops without an inspection, and non-CMV stops in the tables below.
3. Insert the total number of written warnings and citations issued during the measurement period. The number of warnings and citations are combined in the last column.

State/Territory Defined Measurement Period (Include 5 Periods)		Number of Documented CMV Traffic Enforcement Stops with an Inspection	Number of Citations and Warnings Issued
Begin Date	End Date		
01/01/2016	12/31/2016	1755	1694
01/01/2015	12/31/2015	1639	2189
01/01/2014	12/31/2014	1517	
01/01/2013	12/31/2013	3935	
01/01/2012	12/31/2012	3352	

☐ The State does not conduct CMV traffic enforcement stops without an inspection. If this box is checked, the "CMV Traffic Enforcement Stops without an Inspection" table is not required to be completed and won't be displayed.

State/Territory Defined Measurement Period (Include 5 Periods)		Number of Documented CMV Traffic Enforcement Stops without Inspection	Number of Citations and Warnings Issued
Begin Date	End Date		
01/01/2016	12/31/2016	686	346
01/01/2015	12/31/2015	267	265
01/01/2014	12/31/2014		
01/01/2013	12/31/2013		
01/01/2012	12/31/2012		

☐ **The State does not conduct documented non-CMV traffic enforcement stops and was not reimbursed by the MCSAP grant (or used for State Share or MOE). If this box is checked, the "Non-CMV Traffic Enforcement Stops" table is not required to be completed and won't be displayed.**

State/Territory Defined Measurement Period (Include 5 Periods)		Number of Documented Non-CMV Traffic Enforcement Stops	Number of Citations and Warnings Issued
Begin Date	End Date		
01/01/2016	12/31/2016	843	931
01/01/2015	12/31/2015	831	988
01/01/2014	12/31/2014		
01/01/2013	12/31/2013		
01/01/2012	12/31/2012		

Enter the source and capture date of the data listed in the tables above.

* All table data is the total for only those officers assigned to the MCSAP section. Data for the number of CMV traffic enforcement stops with an inspection has been added from the state's Safetynet database, however, it should be noted that while the state does conduct Non-CMV traffic enforcement, current and past data collection methods are either inaccurate or do not provide complete and identifiable data. Specifically, inspectors were incorrectly checking the traffic enforcement box during an inspection. The section has addressed this issue by offering additional training related to the criteria necessary when checking the traffic enforcement inspection box during an inspection. Additionally, the State Patrol as a whole does not collect TE data specific to what is requested in this template, as a result, MCSAP will manually collect and hand tally results beginning in FFY 2015. An electronic data repository for this data does not currently exist at the state level (except for # of CMV traffic stops with an inspection), so there is the possibility for error since the data will be collected manually. Beginning in FFY 2015 the state implemented procedures to collect this data to ensure it is available for use in future planning years, and it has been reported for CY 2015 only. All data collected through June 30, 2017 has been reported to FMCSA as part of the quarterly narrative reports the state submits.

Narrative Overview for FY 2018 - 2020

Instructions:

Describe the State's proposed level of effort (number of personnel) to implement a statewide CMV (in conjunction with and without an inspection) and/or non-CMV traffic enforcement program. If the State conducts CMV and/or non-CMV traffic enforcement activities only in support of the overall crash reduction goal, describe how the State allocates traffic enforcement resources. Please include number of officers, times of day and days of the week, specific corridors or general activity zones, etc. Traffic enforcement activities should include officers who are not assigned to a dedicated commercial vehicle enforcement unit, but who conduct eligible commercial vehicle/driver enforcement activities. If the State conducts non-CMV traffic enforcement activities, the State must conduct these activities in accordance with the [MCSAP Comprehensive Policy](#).

To be eligible for reimbursement of traffic enforcement activities, the FAST Act requires that Colorado maintain 95% of the State's average 2004/2005 activity levels, which is 66,734 activities. The state currently cannot meet these levels as the program

has dramatically changed over the last 12 years. During 2004 and 2005 (and prior years), Colorado's program was vastly different. In 2004 and 2005 the MCSAP grant funded personnel from the Colorado State Patrol (CSP), which is a part of the Department of Public Safety, and the grant also funded 8 full-time inspectors from the Port of Entry (POE), which at the time was a part of the Colorado Department of Revenue. Grant funded personnel within the Colorado State Patrol performed inspections, compliance reviews and new entrant safety audits, while the personnel funded from the Port of Entry conducted inspections only. During FY 2005 State Patrol officers funded by the MCSAP grant conducted 5,157 inspections, 227 compliance reviews and 393 safety audits, in addition to CMV education and traffic enforcement activities. In contrast, the POE officers funded by the MCSAP grant conducted 10,979 inspections. It should be noted that all CSP field officers are required to conduct 32 inspections per year to fulfill match and MOE requirements. The total number of inspections conducted by all officers within the State Patrol and Port of Entry during FY 2005 was 61,456 per state Safetynet Data. Approximately 50% of the total inspections were conducted by the POE.

The structure of Colorado's MCSAP program was modified in August of 2010, as a result of legislative change, when the Port of Entry lost their ability to conduct inspections. As a result of this change, the POE did not receive MCSAP funding, and more importantly the program lost the approximately 30,727 inspections the agency conducted, which included inspections conducted by both MCSAP funded and non-MCSAP funded POE officers. As a result of the change in funding the State Patrol MCSAP did add several additional officers, however, due to the large pay discrepancies between a State Patrol Trooper and a Port of Entry Officer, the section was not able to add officers on a 1 to 1 basis. Additionally, due to the increase in program requirements, the Colorado State Patrol established a training section, staffed by three uniformed officers and one Sergeant. While these officers are required to maintain minimum inspection and CR certification, their primary responsibility is to provide CMV-MCSAP training to all CMV inspectors and investigators throughout the State of Colorado.

Available Safetynet data indicates that before the legislative change in 2010, Colorado uploaded on average 59,524 inspections per year. After the POE lost the ability to conduct inspections, the average number of inspections uploaded dropped to 33,625, an average loss of 25,899 inspections per year. As indicated by FMCSA during FY 2016, the state is approximately 21,720 "activities" short of the 2004/2005 requirement. Based upon the data provided it is apparent that this difference was a direct result of the legislative change in 2010.

On July 1, 2012, with the passage of HB 12-1019, the Port of Entry was transferred from the Colorado Department of Revenue to the Colorado Department of Public Safety, Colorado State Patrol. While the transfer was primarily made to increase the state's operational efficiencies through a programmatic consolidation, POE officers did not immediately regain the ability to conduct inspections. This change has been a gradual process, as it required training and certifying POE inspectors to conduct inspections. Additionally, the 8 dedicated full-time POE inspectors were not reinstated and there are currently a fewer number of POE officers conducting inspections overall as well. With the transfer, responsibilities have changed for POE officers and they are not capable, at this time, of producing the number of inspections they had in 2004/2005. Additionally, the POE is historically understaffed due to the lengthy hiring and training process personnel are now required to undergo after transfer to a law enforcement entity.

The MCSAP program has evolved since 2004/2005 and as a result the CR process is much more time consuming than it was. A dramatic increase in pay for all CSP officers over the last 12 years, as mandated by state law, has also inhibited the ability of the program to expand, as MCSAP has not received an increase commensurate with pay increases. Increasingly, MCSAP officers are required to do more with less, which overall affects the outputs of the program in conjunction with the change that occurred in 2010.

A & I data indicates that during FY 2016, as a whole, inspectors within the state conducted 51,529 which was an approximate increase of 2.25% as compared to FY 2015. Additionally, CSP MCSAP funded officers conducted 474 new entrant safety audits, and 191 compliance reviews. The FAST Act requires that the state conduct 66,374 total activities to be eligible for reimbursement of traffic enforcement activities during FY 2018, based upon currently available FY 2016 data, the state completed a total of 52,194 activities, approximately, 14,180 activities short of this requirement.

The Colorado MCSAP program implemented a plan in FY 2017 to mitigate the shortfall. Before the plan was implemented all MCSAP funded officers conducted CR's, inspections and new entrant safety audits, in addition to traffic enforcement and education activities. To ensure that the state maintain the integrity of the program, through quality inspections and thorough investigations the following changes were made. Officers were divided into an inspection team and a compliance review team. Six officers were assigned to the compliance review team with the expectation that they will complete approximately 200 inspections each, as well as, 160 compliance reviews total. An additional 15 officers were assigned to the inspection team, with the expectation that they will complete approximately 500 inspections per officer, as well as, the minimum number of CR's needed to maintain certification. The inspection team will conduct new entrant safety audits as assigned and the CR team will conduct all educational safety talks. It was expected that there would be an approximate 58% increase in the number of inspections completed by MCSAP funded officers as compared to FY 2015. Additionally, in cooperation with the leadership in the Port of Entry, there

was an increase in the number of POE officers who receive training and therefore have the ability to conduct Level III inspections, resulting in an increase in the number of inspections completed by the Port of Entry. It is anticipated, that the change to offsite safety audits once training for all officer is completed, will reduce the amount of time it takes to complete a safety audit, therefore resulting in an increase in other activities as well.

During FY 2018 the section added 2 Port of Entry officers, whose primary duty is to conduct Safety Audits. It is anticipated that this change will again increase the amount of time MCSAP officers have to conduct other activities, thereby, increasing the total number of activities. After adjusting inspection numbers to reflect actual numbers completed, (based upon A&I data), the addition of 2 POE officers to conduct Safety Audits, the anticipated increase in inspections by MCSAP funded officers, increasing the number of officers conducting Level III inspections within the POE, and adjusting the compliance review numbers to reflect program changes, it is anticipated that the total number of anticipated activities for FY 2019 is 56,471.

The State did apply for FY 2018 high priority funding, requesting funds to pay 10 - Port of Entry officers to conduct inspections, which should increase the final estimate of activities by approximately 12,000 inspections if HP funds are awarded. **The number of inspections these officers will conduct has not been included in the FY 2018-FY 2020 estimate, as the hiring of these officers is contingent on several factors and is therefore, not an absolute. However, if funds are received it is anticipated that the total number of inspections completed would increase by 12,000 for a total of 67,786 inspections once these officers are hired.**

Changes made during FY 2018 (and explained above in red) have resulted in an increase of 6,768 inspections as compared to FY 2017. Safetynet data as of October 16, 2018, indicates officers conducted a total of 58,147 inspections during FY 2018, approximately 1,676 more inspections than projected in FY 2019. While the state has not received official notification as to the status of the High Priority Grant, inspectors within the the state conducted inspection "waves" in August and September to increase inspection numbers. If necessary the state will continue these inspections operations utilizing OT (up to allowable amount) to increase inspection numbers to the required levels.

Due to the fact that this estimate is short of the required number, members of the Patrol's Management Team met with members of FMCSA's Colorado and Service Center Management team on August 7, 2017. The above issues were discussed, as well as the Patrol's inability to increase activities to the 2004/2005 level due to legislative changes that have occurred since 2004/2005. The state received the following response from Brandon Poarch via Tom Wilcoxon on August 8, 2017:

"Provided CSP includes a full explanation of the circumstances and a good faith action plan in their CVSP, the State can continue to conduct non-CMV traffic enforcement (when it impacts CMV safety) each year during the period of the CVSP provided those activities do not exceed 10% of the total program total budget. This action plan must address how the State will return its activities to 2004/2005 levels during the course of the three year plan (even if success is highly dependent on the funding for, hiring of, and successful training of POE officers). This has no impact on the amount of funding the State can dedicate to traffic enforcement on CMVs (with or without an inspection), however, that component of the State's program is still subject to normal CVSP review during the technical review panel."

Projected Goals for FY 2018 - 2020

Using the radio buttons in the table below, indicate the traffic enforcement activities the State intends to conduct in FY 2018 - 2020. The projected goals are based on the number of traffic stops, not tickets or warnings issued. These goals are NOT intended to set a quota.

			Enter Projected Goals (Number of Stops only)		
Yes	No	Traffic Enforcement Activities	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020
☒	☐	CMV with Inspection	1200	1300	1300
☒	☐	CMV without Inspection	100	100	100
☒	☐	Non-CMV	250	250	250
☒	☐	Comprehensive and high visibility in high risk locations and corridors (special enforcement details)	825	925	925

In order to be eligible to utilize Federal funding for Non-CMV traffic enforcement, the [FAST Act](#) requires that the State must maintain an average number of safety activities which include the number of roadside inspections, carrier investigations, and new entrant safety audits conducted in the State for Fiscal Years 2004 and 2005.

The table below displays the information you input into this plan from the roadside inspections, investigations, and new entrant safety audit sections. Your planned activities must at least equal the average of your 2004/2005 activities.

FY 2019 Planned Safety Activities				
Inspections	Investigations	New Entrant Safety Audits	Sum of FY 2019 Activities	Average 2004/05 Activities
55786	160	534	56480	66734

The sum of your planned FY 2019 safety activities must equal or exceed the average number of 2004/2005 activities to be reimbursed for non-CMV traffic enforcement activities. Update the number of FY 2019 roadside inspections, investigations, and/or new entrant safety audits to be eligible for reimbursement.

Describe how the State will monitor its traffic enforcement efforts to ensure effectiveness, consistency, and correlation to FMCSA's national traffic enforcement priority.

The Colorado State Patrol MCSAP unit (22 Troopers and 4 Sergeants) will implement a TACT like traffic enforcement model. Five primary violations from both CMV's and non-CMV's will be targeted. These violations include; Lane Violations, Following Too Closely, Exceeded Safe Speed / Speeding, Failed to Yield Right of Way, and Improper Passing. Additionally, 20% or at least 1,000, of the inspections conducted by MCSAP funded officers will be as the result of a proactive traffic contact. To support the crash reduction goal, data has been analyzed to determine the busiest hours of the day and days of the week. Each Officer's schedule have or will be modified to concur with these times in support of the Traffic Enforcement goals. In conjunction with the changed schedule times, Colorado State Patrol MCSAP wide effort will include five different "Surge Events." During these events, MCSAP Troopers will partner with local HAZMAT Troopers and Port of Entry staff to help in the Traffic Enforcement arena. The MCSAP section officers will continue to utilize intelligence led policing methods including the analyzation of data trends. During FFY 2018 targeted focus will remain in the Weld County region, which includes the counties of Weld, Larimer, Morgan, and Adams. As previously stated MCSAP officers will focus on the Weld County region and its oilfield operations through targeted enforcement and there will also be targeted high visibility enforcement on the I-70 corridor specific to the locations between Golden and Gypsum Colorado.

6 - Safety Technology

Please verify your State's safety technology compliance levels, responsible agencies, and narrative overview. Are there changes that need to be made for the upcoming fiscal year? Before selecting "yes," make sure there are changes to be made as once selected, this answer cannot be changed.

- ☐ Yes, the information in this section must be updated for this upcoming fiscal year. I understand that I must click "Save" to save any changes.
- ☐ No, the information in this section remains valid for the upcoming fiscal year and no updates are necessary.

The FAST Act made Performance and Registration Information Systems Management (PRISM) a condition for MCSAP eligibility in [49 CFR 350.201 \(aa\)](#). States must achieve full participation by October 1, 2020. FMCSA defines "fully participating" in PRISM, for the purpose of determining eligibility for MCSAP funding, as when a State's or Territory's International Registration Plan (IRP) or CMV registration agency suspends or revokes and denies registration if the motor carrier responsible for safety of the vehicle is under any Federal OOS order and denies registration if the motor carrier possess an inactive or de-active USDOT number for motor carriers operating CMVs in commerce that have a Gross Vehicle Weight (GVW) of 26,001 pounds or more. Further information regarding full participation in PRISM can be found in the MCP Section 4.3.1.

Under certain conditions, the FAST Act allows MCSAP lead agencies to use MCSAP funds for Operations and Maintenance (O&M) costs associated with Innovative Technology Deployment (ITD) and the PRISM ([49 CFR 350.201\(aa\) \(cc\)](#)). For PRISM, O&M costs are eligible expenses subject to FMCSA approval. For ITD, if the State agrees to comply with ITD program requirements and has complied with all MCSAP requirements, including achievement of full participation in PRISM, O&M costs are eligible expenses. O&M expenses must be included and described in the Spending Plan section per the method these costs are handled in the State's accounting system (e.g., contractual costs, other costs, etc.).

Safety Technology Compliance Status

Please verify the current level of compliance for your State in the table below using the drop-down menu. If the State plans to include O&M costs in this year's CVSP, please indicate that in the table below. Additionally, details must be in this section and in your Spending Plan.

Technology Program	Current Compliance Level	Include O & M Costs?
ITD	Core CVISN Compliant	No
PRISM	Exceeds Full Participation	No

Available data sources:

- [FMCSA website ITD information](#)
- [FMCSA website PRISM information](#)

Enter the agency name responsible for ITD in the State, if other than the Lead MCSAP Agency: Colorado State Patrol

Enter the agency name responsible for PRISM in the State, if other than the Lead MCSAP Agency: Colorado Department of Revenue

Narrative Overview for FY 2018 - 2020

Problem Statement Narrative and Projected Goal:

If the State's PRISM compliance is less than full participation, describe activities your State plans to implement to achieve full participation in PRISM.

Program Activities for FY 2018 - 2020: Describe any actions that will be taken to implement full participation

in PRISM.

Performance Measurements and Monitoring: Describe all performance measures that will be used and include how the State will conduct ongoing monitoring of progress in addition to quarterly SF-PPR reporting.

7 - Public Education and Outreach

Please review the description of your State's public education and outreach activities, projected goals and monitoring. Are there changes that need to be made for the upcoming fiscal year? Before selecting "yes," make sure there are changes to be made as once selected, this answer cannot be changed.

- ☐ Yes, the information in this section must be updated for this upcoming fiscal year. I understand that I must click "Save" to save any changes.
- ☒ No, the information in this section remains valid for the upcoming fiscal year and no updates are necessary.

A public education and outreach program is designed to provide information on a variety of traffic safety issues related to CMVs and non-CMV's that operate around large trucks and buses.

Trend Analysis for 2012 - 2016

In the table below, provide the number of public education and outreach activities conducted in the past 5 years.

Public Education and Outreach Activities	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Carrier Safety Talks	121	103	192	144	130
CMV Safety Belt Education and Outreach				127	97
State Trucking Association Meetings				8	17
State-Sponsored Outreach Events					
Local Educational Safety Events				4	5
Teen Safety Events				4	4

Narrative Overview for FY 2018 - 2020

Performance Objective: To increase the safety awareness of the motoring public, motor carriers and drivers through public education and outreach activities such as safety talks, safety demonstrations, etc.

Describe the type of activities the State plans to conduct, including but not limited to passenger transportation, hazardous materials transportation, and share the road safety initiatives. Include the number of personnel that will be participating in this effort.

To provide commercial vehicle educational materials and safety presentations to the public to promote highway safety and to reduce the number of reportable commercial vehicle involved crashes by 2% as compared to the average number of crashes occurring from calendar year 2013 through calendar year 2016. The uniformed officers and sergeants assigned to the MCSAP and MCPT sections conduct public education and awareness activities. To provide commercial vehicle enforcement training and guidance to Colorado law enforcement agencies and the citizens of Colorado.

Personnel will provide educational CMV safety information to members of the CMV industry and the public to ensure that adequate safety precautions are recognized and placed into practice before, during, and after the operation of a CMV, to include non-CMV's and pedestrians operating around a CMV. Outreach activities are varied, some events are conducted at large scale venues, such as the Budweiser Events Center, while others are completed at the carrier's principal place of business, or hotel conference rooms and insurance offices. Additionally, officers conduct safety talks at the Colorado Motor Carriers Association offices in Denver and Grand Junction. In addition to specific topics, officers address distracted driving, impaired driving, seatbelt usage, and driving behavior which has shown to lead to CMV involved crashes when conducting safety talks. Teen safety events are conducted during school events targeting new drivers and how they interact in and around CMV traffic. Additionally, talks target elementary and school age children, as it is believed that children can impact and advocate safe driving behavior for adults driving around CMV's. Personnel within the MCSAP section will develop and implement a unified carrier outreach program which will include detailed information related to compliance with the FMCSR's and applicable state statute.

Projected Goals for FY 2018 - 2020

In the table below, indicate if the State intends to conduct the listed program activities, and the estimated number, based on the descriptions in the narrative above.

			Performance Goals		
Yes	No	Activity Type	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020
☒	☐	Carrier Safety Talks	100	125	125
☒	☐	CMV Safety Belt Education and Outreach	4	4	4
☒	☐	State Trucking Association Meetings	20	20	20
☒	☐	State-Sponsored Outreach Events	4	4	4
☒	☐	Local Educational Safety Events	4	4	4
☒	☐	Teen Safety Events	1	1	1

Performance Measurements and Monitoring: Describe all performance measures and how the State will conduct monitoring of progress. States must report the quantity, duration and number of attendees in their quarterly SF-PPR reports.

Colorado State Patrol personnel will continue to promote safe commercial vehicle driving behaviors through educational safety presentations. As a result, the number and type of safety presentations will be reported to FMCSA on the SF-PPR each quarter as required.

Additionally personnel via the MCSAP section website, will distribute a power point presentation detailing compliance information related to the FMCSR's and applicable state statute. Training including the power point data will be conducted for identified carriers on a quarterly basis and results will be included in the quarterly report submitted to FMCSA.

8 - State Safety Data Quality (SSDQ)

Please verify your State's SSDQ compliance levels and narrative overview. Are there changes that need to be made for the upcoming fiscal year? Before selecting "yes," make sure there are changes to be made as once selected, this answer cannot be changed.

- ☒ Yes, the information in this section must be updated for this upcoming fiscal year. I understand that I must click "Save" to save any changes.
- ☐ No, the information in this section remains valid for the upcoming fiscal year and no updates are necessary.

The FAST Act allows MCSAP lead agencies to use MCSAP funds for Operations and Maintenance (O&M) costs associated with Safety Data Systems (SSDQ) if the State meets accuracy, completeness and timeliness measures regarding motor carrier safety data and participates in the national data correction system (DataQs).

SSDQ Compliance Status

Please verify the current level of compliance for your State in the table below using the drop-down menu. If the State plans to include O&M costs in this year's CVSP, select Yes. These expenses must be included in the Spending Plan section per the method these costs are handled in the State's accounting system (e.g., contractual costs, other costs, etc.).

Technology Program	Current Compliance Level	Include O & M Costs?
SSDQ	Good	No

Available data sources:

- [FMCSA website SSDQ information](#)

In the table below, use the drop-down menus to indicate the State's current rating within each of the State Safety Data Quality categories, and the State's goal for FY 2018 - 2020.

SSDQ Category	Current SSDQ Rating	Goal for FY 2018	Goal for FY 2019	Goal for FY 2020
Crash Record Completeness	Good	Good	Good	Good
Fatal Crash Completeness	Good	Good	Good	Good
Crash Timeliness	Fair	Good	Good	Good
Crash Accuracy	Good	Good	Good	Good
Crash Consistency	No Flag	No Flag	No Flag	No Flag
Inspection Record Completeness	Good	Good	Good	Good
Inspection VIN Accuracy	Good	Good	Good	Good
Inspection Timeliness	Good	Good	Good	Good
Inspection Accuracy	Good	Good	Good	Good

Enter the date of the A & I Online data snapshot used for the "Current SSDQ Rating" column.

State Data Data-driven safety systems are vital to informing decisions that improve safety on the Nation's roads—FMCSA relies on the States for accurate and comprehensive data on eligible crashes and inspections to focus resources to further reduce crashes. We can't do it without you. Each month, States are rated on reporting of safety data—this page provides States with a robust resource to view their ratings and measures, and learn how to improve data quality performance. Select your State to view your rating: Data current as of May 25, 2018

Narrative Overview for FY 2018 - 2020

Problem Statement Narrative: Describe any issues encountered for any SSDQ category not rated as "Good" in the Current SSDQ Rating category column above (i.e., problems encountered, obstacles overcome, lessons learned, etc.). If the State is "Good" in all categories, no further narrative or explanation is necessary.

During State Fiscal Year 2018 the Colorado State Patrol implemented a new data collection system for crash reports

and enforcement data (NICHE), and the Colorado Department of Revenue updated the current crash reporting system (DRIVES). The combination of these changes affected the ability of the State Patrol to upload all crash records completed by State Patrol Troopers into DRIVES. Previously, staff in the MCSAP section obtain CMV crash data from DOR for upload into Safetynet. Upon implementation of the changes by CSP and DOR, MCSAP did not receive complete CMV crash data from DOR. The issue was discovered in May 2018, at which time, members of MCSAP contacted staff in the the Patrol's Crime Analysis Unit (CAU). It was determined that the Patrol's Statistical Analyst would provide a weekly report to MCSAP staff including all CMV crash data, at which time, staff in MCSAP would manually query the DRIVES system to obtain the crash report for entry into Safetynet until the issue with NICHE uploads was corrected. Upon implementation of this process, it was determined after several weeks, that CAU did not provide complete crash data to MCSAP staff. As such, numerous CMV crashes were not identified and entered into Safetynet within the 90 day data entry requirement.

As of today's date, July 3, 2018, the crash upload issue between CSP and DOR has not been resolved, nor has the issue with CAU related to incomplete data been resolved. As such, staff members in MCSAP must manually query ALL crashes in the NICHE system, identify those that are CMV related, print identified reports, then manually enter into Safetynet. As the Patrol covers hundreds of crashes this is a time consuming process.

MCSAP Management continues to work daily with the CSP Information Technology and CAU to fix the NICHE to DRIVES crash upload issue. However, until a fix is implemented, MCSAP staff will continue to manually query, print, and enter all CMV crash data, which will affect CMV crash timeliness.

Program Activities for FY 2018 - 2020: Describe any actions that will be taken to achieve a "Good" rating in any category not currently rated as "Good," including measurable milestones.

Continue collaboration and planning with the Patrol's Crime Analysis Unit to ensure the CSP crash upload issue is corrected as soon as possible. In the interim, MCSAP staff will continue to manually query, print, and enter all CMV reportable crash data from NICHE for entry into Safetynet.

Performance Measurements and Monitoring: Describe all performance measures that will be used and include how the State will conduct ongoing monitoring of progress in addition to quarterly SF-PPR reporting.

MCSAP staff will monitor monthly data quality reports on the Analysis and Information website and will report pertinent data on quarterly reports.

9 - New Entrant Safety Audits

Please review the agency responsible for conducting New Entrant activities and the description of your State's strategies, activities and monitoring. Are there changes that need to be made for the upcoming fiscal year? Before selecting "yes," make sure there are changes to be made as once selected, this answer cannot be changed.

- ☐ Yes, the information in this section must be updated for this upcoming fiscal year. I understand that I must click "Save" to save any changes.
- ☐ No, the information in this section remains valid for the upcoming fiscal year and no updates are necessary.

The FAST Act states that conducting interstate New Entrant safety audits is now a requirement to participate in the MCSAP ([49 CFR 350.201](#).) The Act allows a State to conduct intrastate New Entrant safety audits at the State's discretion. States that choose to conduct intrastate safety audits must not negatively impact their interstate new entrant program.

Note: The FAST Act also says that a State or a third party may conduct New Entrant safety audits. If a State authorizes a third party to conduct safety audits on its behalf, the State must verify the quality of the work conducted and remains solely responsible for the management and oversight of the New Entrant activities.

Yes	No	Question
☐	☐	Does your State conduct Offsite safety audits in the New Entrant Web System (NEWS)? NEWS is the online system that carriers selected for an Offsite Safety Audit use to submit requested documents to FMCSA. Safety Auditors use this same system to review documents and communicate with the carrier about the Offsite Safety Audit.
☐	☐	Does your State conduct Group safety audits at non principal place of business locations?
☐	☐	Does your State intend to conduct intrastate safety audits and claim the expenses for reimbursement, state match, and/or Maintenance of Effort on the MCSAP Grant?

Trend Analysis for 2012 - 2016

In the table below, provide the number of New Entrant safety audits conducted in the past 5 years.

New Entrant Safety Audits	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Interstate	661	512	525	453	474
Intrastate					
Total Audits	661	512	525	453	474

Note: Intrastate safety audits will not be reflected in any FMCSA data systems—totals must be derived from State data sources.

Narrative Overview for FY 2018 - 2020

Enter the agency name conducting New Entrant activities, if other than the Lead MCSAP Agency:

Program Goal: Reduce the number and severity of crashes, injuries, and fatalities involving commercial motor vehicles by reviewing interstate new entrant carriers. At the State's discretion, intrastate motor carriers are reviewed to ensure they have effective safety management programs.

Program Objective: Statutory time limits for processing and completing interstate safety audits are:

- If entry date into the New Entrant program (as shown in FMCSA data systems) September 30, 2013 or earlier—safety audit must be completed within 18 months.
- If entry date into the New Entrant program (as shown in FMCSA data systems) October 1, 2013 or later—safety audit must be completed within 12 months for all motor carriers and 120 days for motor carriers of passengers.

Projected Goals for FY 2018 - 2020

For the purpose of completing the table below:

- **Onsite safety audits** are conducted at the carrier's principal place of business.
- **Offsite safety audit** is a desktop review of a single New Entrant motor carrier's basic safety management controls and can be conducted from any location other than a motor carrier's place of business. Offsite audits are conducted by States that have completed the FMCSA New Entrant training for offsite audits.
- **Group audits** are neither an onsite nor offsite audit. Group audits are conducted on multiple carriers at an alternative location (i.e., hotel, border inspection station, State office, etc.).

Projected Goals for FY 2018 - 2020 - New Entrant Safety Audits						
	FY 2018		FY 2019		FY 2020	
Number of Safety Audits/Non-Audit Resolutions	Interstate	Intrastate	Interstate	Intrastate	Interstate	Intrastate
# of Safety Audits (Onsite)	37	0	38	0	39	0
# of Safety Audits (Offsite)	488	0	496	0	502	0
# Group Audits	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL Safety Audits	525	0	534	0	541	0
# of Non-Audit Resolutions	250	0	251	0	254	0

Strategies: Describe the strategies that will be utilized to meet the program objective above. Provide any challenges or impediments foreseen that may prevent successful completion of the objective.

Data obtained from MCMIS indicates that during the past 5 years, there has been an average of 525 New Entrant Audits conducted by Colorado State Patrol MCS officers. MCMIS data also indicated there was an average of 701 Interstate carriers added to MCMIS. Utilizing these averages, the proposed number of audits to be assigned in FFY 2018 is 775. Using a 2% increase each year, in FFY 2019 it is proposed that there will be 785 audits assigned and 795 in FFY 2020.

Utilizing a 3 year average, approximately 32% of audits assigned are resolved by non-audit resolutions. Based on this information, it is anticipated that in FY 2018 250 assigned audits will be resolved by non audit resolution, in FY 2019, 251 and in FY 2020, 254. Due to the implementation of the offsite audit process, it is not anticipated that any group safety audits will be necessary. Colorado does not intend to perform any intrastate safety audits.

Activity Plan for FY 2018 - 2020: Include a description of the activities proposed to help achieve the objectives. If group audits are planned, include an estimate of the number of group audits.

To ensure that all New Entrant assignments are resolved by means of a safety audit or through non-audit resolution, the New Entrant Coordinator will assign audits on a weekly basis. Additionally, expedited audits will be assigned immediately and resolved within 60 days of assignment. To ensure that there are no overdue carriers, we will be hiring and training 2 Port of Entry officers to conduct audits. Furthermore, to ensure that all New Entrant motor carriers are able to demonstrate compliance with applicable Motor Carrier Safety and Hazardous Materials Regulations, and to reduce the New Entrant carrier safety audit failure rate by 1% each FFY, an informational packet including an Educational and Technical Assistance packet will be provided to every carrier.

Performance Measurement Plan: Describe how you will measure progress toward meeting the objective, such as quantifiable and measurable outputs (staffing, work hours, carrier contacts, inspections, etc.). The

measure must include specific benchmarks to be reported on in the quarterly progress report, or as annual outputs.

The number of New Entrant assignments resolved. The number of New Entrant carriers that pass the safety audit.

Part 3 - National Emphasis Areas and State Specific Objectives

FMCSA establishes annual national priorities (emphasis areas) based on emerging or continuing issues, and will evaluate CVSPs in consideration of these national priorities. Part 3 allows States to address the national emphasis areas/priorities outlined in the Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) and any State-specific objectives as necessary. Specific goals and activities must be projected for the three fiscal year period (FYs 2018 - 2020).

1 - Enforcement of Federal OOS Orders during Roadside Activities

Please review your State's Federal OOS catch rate during roadside enforcement activities, projected goals, program activities and monitoring. Are there changes that need to be made for the upcoming fiscal year? Before selecting "yes," make sure there are changes to be made as once selected, this answer cannot be changed.

- ☒ Yes, the information in this section must be updated for this upcoming fiscal year. I understand that I must click "Save" to save any changes.
- ☐ No, the information in this section remains valid for the upcoming fiscal year and no updates are necessary.

Instructions:

FMCSA has established an Out-of-Service (OOS) catch rate of 85 percent for carriers operating while under an OOS order. In this part, States will indicate their catch rate is at least 85 percent by using the check box or completing the problem statement portion below.

Check this box if:

☐ As evidenced by the data provided by FMCSA, the State identifies at least 85 percent of carriers operating under a Federal OOS order during roadside enforcement activities and will not establish a specific reduction goal. However, the State will maintain effective enforcement of Federal OOS orders during roadside inspections and traffic enforcement activities.

Narrative Overview for FY 2018 - 2020

Enter your State's OOS Catch Rate percentage if below 85 percent: 67%

Projected Goals for FY 2018 - 2020: Enter a description of the State's performance goals.

Fiscal Year	Goal (%)
2018	85
2019	85
2020	85

To increase the State of Colorado's "catch rate" for carriers operating in violation of an OOS order for Imminent Hazard and Unsat=Unfit from 67%* to >=85% during FY 2018, FY 2019, and FY 2020.

*Reported via annual report inspections on OOS Carriers from FMCSA for inspections completed May 1, 2017 through April 30, 2018.

Program Activities for FY 2018 - 2020: Describe policies, procedures, and/or technology that will be utilized to

identify OOS carriers at roadside. Include how you will conduct quality assurance oversight to ensure that inspectors are effectively identifying OOS carriers and preventing them from operating.

The state will continue to require all Colorado State Patrol inspectors to clear vehicles through Query Central to verify OOS status. All inspectors have access to CVIEW and Aspen 3.0 enabling officers to double-check OOS status when conducting inspections. During FFY 2015 and FFY 2016, inspectors have received training in the use of C-VIEW and the system has been made available to all certified inspectors within the state. It is anticipated that the training that has occurred and increased access to this system will continue to positively affect the identification of those carriers contacted and labeled as imminent hazard and unsat. There are issues with connectivity in remote areas of the state, and occasionally officers are unable to verify OOS status which will affect the percentage identified. It should also be noted, that from May 1, 2016 through December 21, 2016 a total of 8 inspections were conducted on OOS carriers, of those 4 were identified. The total number of inspections conducted on OOS carriers is less than 0.0002% of the total number of inspections conducted.

Performance Measurements and Monitoring: Describe all performance measures and how the State will conduct ongoing monitoring of progress in addition to quarterly SF-PPR reporting.

Continued monitoring of OOS reports produced by FMCSA, all anomalies will be investigated and inspecting officers contacted when necessary. The number of officers contacted will be reported on quarterly reports. Additionally, current OOS identification rates will be reported quarterly.

2 - Passenger Carrier Enforcement

Please review your State's passenger carrier transportation goals, problem statement narrative, program activities and monitoring. Are there changes that need to be made for the upcoming fiscal year? Before selecting "yes," make sure there are changes to be made as once selected, this answer cannot be changed.

- ☐ Yes, the information in this section must be updated for this upcoming fiscal year. I understand that I must click "Save" to save any changes.
- ☐ No, the information in this section remains valid for the upcoming fiscal year and no updates are necessary.

Instructions:

FMCSA requests that States conduct enhanced investigations for motor carriers of passengers and other high risk carriers. Additionally, States are asked to allocate resources to participate in the enhanced investigations training being offered by FMCSA. Finally, States are asked to continue partnering with FMCSA in conducting enhanced investigations and inspections at carrier locations.

Check this box if:

☐ As evidenced by the trend analysis data, the State has not identified a significant passenger transportation safety problem. Therefore, the State will not establish a specific passenger transportation goal in the current fiscal year. However, the State will continue to enforce the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations (FMCSRs) pertaining to passenger transportation by CMVs in a manner consistent with the [MCSAP Comprehensive Policy](#) as described either below or in the roadside inspection section.

Narrative Overview for FY 2018 - 2020

Problem Statement Narrative: Describe the problem as identified by performance data and include the baseline data.

As reported by the Analysis and Information website*, there were a total of 227 fatal and non-fatal crashes involving buses occurring in the State of Colorado during CY 2016. On average from CY 2013 to CY 2016 there were a total of 226 passenger vehicle fatal and non-fatal crashes. Additionally, during CY 2016 there were a total of 2 fatalities as a result of a passenger vehicle crash, which is 67% decrease in fatalities as compared to CY 2015.

A review of the state's Safetynet crash data during CY 2016 indicates that a significant number of reportable passenger carrier crashes involve carriers located within the counties of Denver, Arapahoe, and Adams. The Colorado State Patrol will work with local law enforcement and members of the passenger carrier industry operating within these counties to educate both motorists and pedestrians of the proper safety precautions and driving behaviors that should be instituted in conjunction with passenger carrier vehicles.

*Data snapshot as of July 28, 2017

** State Safetynet database as of August 29, 2017

Projected Goals for FY 2018 - 2020: Enter the performance goal for the three year CVSP period for the State's passenger carrier enforcement initiative. Annual passenger carrier enforcement benchmarks for FY 2018, 2019 and 2020 must also be included.

To reduce the total number of passenger carrier crashes occurring within the State of Colorado during FY 2018, 2019, and 2020 by 2% per year as compared to the average number of crashes occurring from CY 2013 to CY 2016 (226). To reduce the total number of reportable passenger carrier crashes occurring within the counties of Denver, Arapahoe, and Adams, by 2% as compared to CY 2016.

Program Activities for FY 2018 - 2020: Provide additional information regarding how these activities will be implemented.

Personnel will conduct 150 inspections per year on motorcoach and passenger carriers during FY 2018, FY 2019, and FY 2020. Inspections will be performed in conjunction with team operations and special operations, such as, Quickstrike, and through

regular inspection activities. Inspections will be performed with an emphasis on terminal and destination inspections and the identified counties when feasible. Additionally, personnel will conduct 15 CSA on-site comprehensive reviews per year from FY 2018 through FY 2020 on passenger carriers identified through the Safety Management System.

Performance Measurements and Monitoring: Describe all performance measures and how the State will conduct ongoing monitoring of progress in addition to quarterly SF-PPR reporting.

The number of motorcoach/passenger carrier inspections completed by CSP MCSAP inspectors. The number of team operations conducted. The number of driver violations. The number of OOS driver violations. The number of vehicle violations. The number of OOS vehicle violations.

The number of and results of CSA on-site comprehensive reviews conducted on passenger carriers. The number of total and acute/critical violations discovered. The number of enforcement actions taken as a result of reviews.

3 - State Specific Objectives – Past

No updates are required for this section.

Instructions:

Describe any State-specific CMV problems that were addressed with FY2017 MCSAP funding. Some examples may include hazardous materials objectives, Electronic Logging Device (ELD) implementation, and crash reduction for a specific segment of industry, etc. Report below on year-to-date progress on each State-specific objective identified in the FY 2018 CVSP.

Progress Report on State Specific Objectives(s) from the FY 2018 CVSP

Please enter information to describe the year-to-date progress on any State-specific objective(s) identified in the State's FY 2018 CVSP. Click on "Add New Activity" to enter progress information on each State-specific objective.

Activity #1

Activity: Describe State-specific activity conducted from previous year's CVSP.

To identify potential data collection and consistency issues through the review of RDR's within the DataQ's system and the monitoring and examination of CMV inspection reports; and to provide training and education to inspectors when issues are identified. From October 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016, on average a total of 70% of RDR's received were closed within 0-9 days.

Goal: Insert goal from previous year CVSP (#, %, etc., as appropriate).

The number and type of RDR's received and closed during each quarter, ensuring that all RDR's are resolved to the satisfaction of all parties and that $\geq 80\%$ of all RDR's are closed within 0-9 days.

Actual: Insert year to date progress (#, %, etc., as appropriate).

From October 1, 2016 through August 29, 2017 a total of 1,150 RDR's were received. Of the 1,150 RDR's received, 955 or 83% were closed within 0-7 days.

Narrative: Describe any difficulties achieving the goal, problems encountered, obstacles overcome, lessons learned, etc.

Consistency and data quality during the inspection process are key issues in the State of Colorado. While all inspectors receive MCS training and updates throughout the year, there are inconsistencies during the inspection process due to individual inspector interpretation and discretion. Officer discretion is encouraged, however, it is imperative for the state to provide on-going training and monitoring to ensure that all inspectors are aware of programs goals and objectives; that they accurately and completely document violations during roadside inspections; and that all officers have access to, and correctly utilize the inspection selection process.

4 - State Specific Objectives – Future

Please review your State specific objectives and narrative overview. Are there changes that need to be made for the upcoming fiscal year? Before selecting "yes," make sure there are changes to be made as once selected, this answer cannot be changed.

- ☐ Yes, the information in this section must be updated for this upcoming fiscal year. I understand that I must click "Save" to save any changes.
- ☐ No, the information in this section remains valid for the upcoming fiscal year and no updates are necessary.

Instructions:

The State may include additional objectives from the national priorities or emphasis areas identified in the NOFO as applicable. In addition, the State may include any State-specific CMV problems identified in the State that will be addressed with MCSAP funding. Some examples may include hazardous materials objectives, Electronic Logging Device (ELD) implementation, and crash reduction for a specific segment of industry, etc.

Describe any State-specific objective(s) identified for FY 2018 - 2020. Click on "Add New Activity" to enter information on each State-specific objective. This is an optional section and only required if a State has identified a specific State problem planned to be addressed with grant funding.

State Objective #1

Enter the title of your State-Identified Objective.

Inspection Data Collection & Consistency

Narrative Overview for FY 2018 - 2020

Problem Statement Narrative: Describe problem identified by performance data including baseline data.

Consistency and data quality during the inspection process are key issues in the State of Colorado. While all inspectors receive MCS training and updates throughout the year, there are inconsistencies during the inspection process due to individual inspector interpretation and discretion. Officer discretion is encouraged, however, it is imperative for the state to provide on-going training and monitoring to ensure that all inspectors are aware of programs goals and objectives; that they accurately and completely document violations during roadside inspections; and that all officers have access to, and correctly utilize the inspection selection process.

Projected Goals for FY 2018 - 2020:

Enter performance goal.

>=80% of all RDR's are closed within 0-9 days.

Program Activities for FY 2018 - 2020: Describe the activities that will be implemented including level of effort.

Monitor the number and type of RDR's received to ensure that issues are adequately researched in a timely manner and communicated to the MCP&T Sergeant for inclusion in the training bulletin when applicable.

Performance Measurements and Monitoring: Describe all performance measures and how the State will conduct ongoing monitoring of progress in addition to quarterly SF-PPR reporting.

The number and type of RDR's received and closed during each quarter, ensuring that all RDR's are resolved to the satisfaction of all parties and that >=80% of all RDR's are closed within 0-9 days.

Part 4 - Financial Information

1 - Overview

The Spending Plan is an explanation of each budget component, and should support the cost estimates for the proposed work. The Spending Plan should focus on how each item will achieve the proposed project goals and objectives, and explain how costs are calculated. The Spending Plan must be clear, specific, detailed, and mathematically correct. Sources for assistance in developing the Spending Plan include [2 CFR part 200](#), [2 CFR part 1201](#), [49 CFR part 350](#) and the [MCSAP Comprehensive Policy](#).

Before any cost is billed to or recovered from a Federal award, it must be allowable ([2 CFR §200.403](#), [2 CFR §200 Subpart E – Cost Principles](#)), reasonable and necessary ([2 CFR §200.403](#) and [2 CFR §200.404](#)), and allocable ([2 CFR §200.405](#)).

- **Allowable** costs are permissible under the OMB Uniform Guidance, DOT and FMCSA regulations and directives, MCSAP policy, and all other relevant legal and regulatory authority.
- **Reasonable and Necessary** costs are those which a prudent person would deem to be judicious under the circumstances.
- **Allocable** costs are those that are charged to a funding source (e.g., a Federal award) based upon the benefit received by the funding source. Benefit received must be tangible and measurable.
 - For example, a Federal project that uses 5,000 square feet of a rented 20,000 square foot facility may charge 25 percent of the total rental cost.

What's New for FY 2019

The Spending Plan budget activity tables have been restructured to permit Maintenance of Effort (MOE) expenditures to be added on each line item of the budget activity tables. In the FY 2018 eCVSP, States indicated MOE costs as a single cost in each budget activity area. Please review the FY 2019 changes and instructions below prior to completing your Spending Plan.

- A new column (% of Time on MCSAP Grant) has been added in each of the budget activity tables to capture the percentage of time each item entered is dedicated to the MCSAP grant.
- A new column (MOE) has been added in each of the budget activity tables to capture MOE amounts. This allows users the ability to add MOE expenditures by each line item. MOE expenditures must not be included in the calculation of Total Project Costs, Federal share, or State share.

Instructions

The Spending Plan should include costs for FY 2019 only. This applies to States completing a single-year CVSP, multi-year CVSP, or an Annual Update to their multi-year CVSP.

The Spending Plan data tables are displayed by budget category (Personnel, Fringe Benefits, Travel, Equipment, Supplies, Contractual and Subaward, and Other Costs). You may add additional lines to each table, as necessary. Please include clear, concise explanations in the narrative boxes regarding the reason for each cost, how costs are calculated, why they are necessary, and specific information on how prorated costs were determined.

The following definitions describe Spending Plan terminology.

- **Federal Share** means the portion of the total project costs paid by Federal funds. Federal share is 85 percent of the total project costs for this FMCSA grant program.
- **State Share** means the portion of the total project costs paid by State funds. State share is 15 percent of the total project costs for this FMCSA grant program. A State is only required to contribute up to 15 percent of the total project costs of all budget categories combined as State share. A State is NOT required to include a 15 percent State share for each line item in a budget category. The State has the flexibility to select the budget categories and line items where State match will be shown.
- **Total Project Costs** means total allowable costs incurred under a Federal award and all required cost sharing (sum of the Federal share plus State share), including third party contributions.
- **Maintenance of Effort (MOE)** means the level of effort Lead State Agencies are required to maintain each fiscal year in accordance with [49 CFR § 350.301](#). The State has the flexibility to select the budget categories and line items where MOE will be shown. Additional information regarding MOE can be found in the MCSAP

Comprehensive Policy (MCP) in section 3.6.

Expansion of On Screen Messages

The system performs a number of edit checks on Spending Plan data inputs to ensure calculations are correct, and values are as expected. When anomalies are detected, alerts will be displayed on screen.

- **Calculation of Federal and State Shares**

Total Project Costs are determined for each line based upon user-entered data and a specific budget category formula. Federal and State shares are then calculated by the system based upon the Total Project Costs and are added to each line item.

The system calculates an 85 percent Federal share and 15 percent State share automatically and populates these values in each line. Federal share is the product of Total Project Costs x .85. State share equals Total Project Costs minus Federal share. If Total Project Costs are updated based upon user edits to the input values, the 85 and 15 percent values will not be recalculated by the system and should be reviewed and updated by users as necessary.

States may edit the system-calculated Federal and State share values at any time to reflect actual allocation for any line item. For example, States may allocate a different percentage to Federal and State shares. States must ensure that the sum of the Federal and State shares equals the Total Project Costs for each line before proceeding to the next budget category.

An error is shown on line items where Total Project Costs does not equal the sum of the Federal and State shares. Errors must be resolved before the system will allow users to 'save' or 'add' new line items.

Territories must insure that Total Project Costs equal Federal share for each line in order to proceed.

- **MOE Expenditures**

States may enter MOE on individual line items in the Spending Plan tables. The Personnel, Fringe Benefits, Equipment, Supplies, and Other Costs budget activity areas include edit checks on each line item preventing MOE costs from exceeding allowable amounts.

- If "Percentage of Time on MCSAP grant" equals 100%, then MOE must equal \$0.00.
- If "Percentage of Time on MCSAP grant" equals 0%, then MOE may equal up to Total Project Costs as expected at 100%.
- If "Percentage of Time on MCSAP grant" > 0% AND < 100%, then the MOE maximum value cannot exceed "100% Total Project Costs" minus "system-calculated Total Project Costs".

An error is shown on line items where MOE expenditures are too high. Errors must be resolved before the system will allow users to 'save' or 'add' new line items.

The Travel and Contractual budget activity areas do not include edit checks for MOE costs on each line item. States should review all entries to ensure costs reflect estimated expenditures.

- **Financial Summary**

The Financial Summary is a summary of all budget categories. The system provides warnings to the States on this page if the projected State Spending Plan totals are outside FMCSA's estimated funding amounts. States should review any warning messages that appear on this page and address them prior to submitting the eCVSP for FMCSA review.

The system will confirm that:

- Overtime value does not exceed the FMCSA limit.
- Planned MOE Costs equal or exceed FMCSA limit.
- States' proposed Federal and State share totals are each within \$5 of FMCSA's Federal and State share estimated amounts.
- Territories' proposed Total Project Costs are within \$5 of \$350,000.

ESTIMATED Fiscal Year Funding Amounts for MCSAP			
	85% Federal Share	15% State Share	Total Estimated Funding
Total	\$4,909,223.00	\$865,654.00	\$5,774,877.00

Summary of MCSAP Funding Limitations	
Allowable amount for Overtime without written justification (15% of MCSAP Award Amount):	\$865,654.00
MOE Baseline:	\$309,041.47

2 - Personnel

Personnel costs are salaries for employees working directly on a project.

Note: Do not include any personally identifiable information (PII) in the CVSP. The final CVSP approved by FMCSA is required to be posted to a public FMCSA website.

List grant-funded staff who will complete the tasks discussed in the narrative descriptive sections of the CVSP. Positions may be listed by title or function. It is not necessary to list all individual personnel separately by line. The State may use average or actual salary and wages by personnel category (e.g., Trooper, Civilian Inspector, Admin Support, etc.). Additional lines may be added as necessary to capture all your personnel costs.

The percent of each person's time must be allocated to this project based on the amount of time/effort applied to the project. For budgeting purposes, historical data is an acceptable basis.

Note: Reimbursement requests must be based upon documented time and effort reports. Those same time and effort reports may be used to estimate salary expenses for a future period. For example, a MCSAP officer's time and effort reports for the previous year show that he/she spent 35 percent of his/her time on approved grant activities. Consequently, it is reasonable to budget 35 percent of the officer's salary to this project. For more information on this item see [2 CFR §200.430](#).

In the salary column, enter the salary for each position.

Total Project Costs equal the Number of Staff x Percentage of Time on MCSAP grant x Salary for both Personnel and Overtime (OT).

If OT will be charged to the grant, only OT amounts for the Lead MCSAP Agency should be included in the table below. If the OT amount requested is greater than the 15 percent limitation in the MCSAP Comprehensive Policy (MCP), then justification must be provided in the CVSP for review and approval by FMCSA headquarters.

Activities conducted on OT by subrecipients under subawards from the Lead MCSAP Agency must comply with the 15 percent limitation as provided in the MCP. Any deviation from the 15 percent limitation must be approved by the Lead MCSAP Agency for the subrecipients.

Summary of MCSAP Funding Limitations

Allowable amount for Lead MCSAP Agency Overtime without written justification (15% of MCSAP Award Amount):	\$865,654.00
--	--------------

Personnel: Salary and Overtime Project Costs							
Salary Project Costs							
Position(s)	# of Staff	% of Time on MCSAP Grant	Salary	Total Project Costs (Federal + State)	Federal Share	State Share	MOE
Uniformed Officers	22	100.0000	\$95,904.00	\$2,109,888.00	\$1,438,560.00	\$671,328.00	\$0.00
MCSAP Captain	1	100.0000	\$124,119.00	\$124,119.00	\$124,119.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
MCP&T Captain	1	50.0000	\$122,636.00	\$61,318.00	\$0.00	\$61,318.00	\$0.00
POE Officers	2	100.0000	\$53,343.00	\$106,686.00	\$106,686.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Civilians	6	100.0000	\$59,692.00	\$358,152.00	\$349,201.00	\$8,951.00	\$0.00
MCSAP Sergeant	4	100.0000	\$108,651.00	\$434,604.00	\$325,953.00	\$108,651.00	\$0.00
State Funded Level I Inspections	3000	0.0000	\$102,300.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$102,300.00
State Funded Level II-V Inspections	13560	0.0000	\$308,219.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$308,219.00
Civilian Match	1	100.0000	\$15,406.00	\$15,406.00	\$0.00	\$15,406.00	\$0.00
Subtotal: Salary				\$3,210,173.00	\$2,344,519.00	\$865,654.00	\$410,519.00
Overtime Project Costs							
Uniformed Officers	22	11.5000	\$175,053.00	\$442,884.09	\$442,884.09	\$0.00	\$0.00
Subtotal: Overtime				\$442,884.09	\$442,884.09	\$0.00	\$0.00
TOTAL: Personnel				\$3,653,057.09	\$2,787,403.09	\$865,654.00	\$410,519.00
Accounting Method:	Accrual						

Enter a detailed explanation of how the personnel costs were derived and allocated to the MCSAP project.

Calculations are based on current salary derived directly from the state payroll system as of June 30, 2018 plus an additional 3% raise that will be effective July 1, 2018 for all personnel. As previously indicated, there are 2 Captains, 22 uniformed officers, 4 Sergeants, 2 POE officers, and 5.5 civilian staff assigned to the MCSAP and MCPT sections. All of the uniformed officers in the section conduct inspections, compliance reviews, safety audits, and public outreach and education duties. Additionally, several officers are responsible for coordinating and implementing MCSAP related training for all certified inspectors/officers within the State of Colorado.

To satisfy MOE requirements, all Colorado State Patrol uniformed personnel are required to perform 32 inspections per year. These time spent conducting these inspections, is paid 100% by State HUTF funds. It is estimated that these officers will conduct at least 3,000 Level I inspections (45 minutes per inspection) and 13,560 Level II-V (30 minutes per inspection) inspections at an average hourly rate of \$42.14. The following calculation was used for the MOE Expenditures.

Level 1 - 3000 inspections x \$45.46 x 45 minutes (average time per inspection) = \$102,300.00

Level II-V - 13560 inspections x \$45.46 x 30 minutes = \$308,219.00

3 - Fringe Benefits

Fringe costs are benefits paid to employees, including the cost of employer's share of FICA, health insurance, worker's compensation, and paid leave. Only non-Federal grantees that use the **accrual basis** of accounting may have a separate line item for leave, and is entered as the projected leave expected to be accrued by the personnel listed within Part 4.2 – Personnel. Reference [2 CFR §200.431\(b\)](#).

Show the fringe benefit costs associated with the staff listed in the Personnel section. Fringe costs may be estimates, or based on a fringe benefit rate approved by the applicant's Federal cognizant agency for indirect costs. If using an approved rate, a copy of the indirect cost rate agreement must be provided through grants.gov. For more information on this item see [2 CFR §200.431](#).

Show how the fringe benefit amount is calculated (i.e., actual fringe benefits, rate approved by HHS Statewide Cost Allocation or cognizant agency). Include a description of the specific benefits that are charged to a project and the benefit percentage or total benefit cost.

The cost of fringe benefits are allowable if:

- Costs are provided under established written policies.
- Costs are equitably allocated to all related activities, including Federal awards.
- Accounting basis (cash or accrual) selected for each type of leave is consistently followed by the non-Federal entity or specified grouping of employees.

Depending on the State, there are fixed employer taxes that are paid as a percentage of the salary, such as Social Security, Medicare, State Unemployment Tax, etc.

- For each of these standard employer taxes, under Position you may list "All Positions," the benefits would be the respective standard employer taxes, followed by the respective rate with a base being the total salaries for Personnel in Part 4.2.
- The base multiplied by the respective rate would give the total for each standard employer tax. Workers' Compensation is rated by risk area. It is permissible to enter this as an average, usually between sworn and unsworn—any grouping that is reasonable and clearly explained in the narrative is allowable.
- Health Insurance and Pensions can vary greatly and can be averaged; and like Workers' Compensation, can sometimes be broken into sworn and unsworn.

In the Position column include a brief position description that is associated with the fringe benefits.

The **Fringe Benefit Rate** is:

- The rate that has been approved by the State's cognizant agency for indirect costs; or a rate that has been calculated based on the aggregate rates and/or costs of the individual items that your agency classifies as fringe benefits.
- For example, your agency pays 7.65 percent for FICA, 42.05 percent for health/life/dental insurance, and 15.1 percent for retirement. The aggregate rate of 64.8 percent (sum of the three rates) may be applied to the salaries/wages of personnel listed in the table.

The **Base Amount** is:

- The salary/wage costs within the proposed budget to which the fringe benefit rate will be applied.
- For example, if the total wages for all grant-funded staff is \$150,000 and the percentage of time on the grant is 50 percent, then that is the amount the fringe rate of 64.8 (from the example above) will be applied. The calculation is: $\$150,000 \times 64.8 \times 50\% / 100 = \$48,600$ Total Project Costs.

Total Project Costs equal the Fringe Benefit Rate x Percentage of Time on MCSAP grant x Base Amount divided by 100.

Fringe Benefits Project Costs							
Position(s)	Fringe Benefit Rate	% of Time on MCSAP Grant	Base Amount	Total Project Costs (Federal + State)	Federal Share	State Share	MOE
Uniformed Officers	37.0000	100.0000	\$1,438,560.00	\$532,267.20	\$532,267.20	\$0.00	\$0.00
MCSAP Captain	38.0000	100.0000	\$124,119.00	\$47,165.22	\$47,165.22	\$0.00	\$0.00
MCP&T Captain	38.0000	50.0000	\$122,636.00	\$23,300.84	\$23,300.84	\$0.00	\$0.00
MCSAP Sergeant	37.0000	100.0000	\$325,953.00	\$120,602.61	\$120,602.61	\$0.00	\$0.00
POE Officers	40.0000	100.0000	\$106,686.00	\$42,674.40	\$42,674.40	\$0.00	\$0.00
Civilians	37.0000	100.0000	\$336,512.00	\$124,509.44	\$124,509.44	\$0.00	\$0.00
State Funded Level I Inspections	37.0000	0.0000	\$102,300.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$37,851.00
State Funded Level II-V Inspections	37.0000	0.0000	\$295,490.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$109,331.00
Uniformed Fringe MOE	37.0000	0.0000	\$671,328.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$248,391.36
MCSAP Sergeant MOE	37.0000	0.0000	\$108,651.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$40,200.87
Civilian MOE	37.0000	0.0000	\$30,592.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$11,319.00
TOTAL: Fringe Benefits				\$890,519.71	\$890,519.71	\$0.00	\$447,093.23

Enter a detailed explanation of how the fringe benefit costs were derived and allocated to the MCSAP project.

Fringe benefits are variable as they are based upon the salary, class, and position of each individual employee within the State of Colorado. Fringe benefits are pre-determined based upon individual class and position, are required by State Law and can and do change annually based upon legislative recommendations.

Following is the current breakdown of fringe benefits for retirement, short-term disability, and medicare.

Retirement	STD	Medicare
Uniformed - 19.25%	0.190%	1.45%
Civilian - 16.55%	0.190%	1.45%

Payment of medical, dental, and life insurance benefits will depend on the individual employee selections and these amounts generally increase on an annual basis at the beginning of the new State Fiscal Year based upon recommendations from the Governor and State Legislature. Following is information for State Fiscal Year 2018-2019:

Plan	Tier	Total Premium	State Contribution	Employee Contribution
HDHP with HSA-qualified option (UnitedHealthcare)	Employee Only	\$545.18	\$526.26	\$18.92
	Employee + Spouse	\$1,127.18	\$989.74	\$137.44
	Employee + Child(ren)	\$1,026.24	\$980.00	\$46.24
	Ee + Sp + Child(ren)	\$1,606.08	\$1,395.74	\$210.34
Co-Pay Choice Plus (UnitedHealthcare)	Employee Only	\$671.04	\$530.48	\$140.56
	Employee + Spouse	\$1,391.46	\$998.60	\$392.86

	Employee + Child(ren)	\$1,265.36	\$988.02	\$277.34
	Ee + Sp + Child(ren)	\$1,983.64	\$1,408.40	\$575.24
HDHP with HSA-qualified option (Kaiser Permanente) (Den/Bou, SoCo, NorCo & MtCo)	Employee Only	\$503.94	\$469.06	\$34.88
	Employee + Spouse	\$1,045.00	\$879.68	\$165.32
	Employee + Child(ren)	\$945.16	\$871.40	\$73.76
	Ee + Sp + Child(ren)	\$1,487.54	\$1,239.64	\$247.90
DHMO Co-Pay (Kaiser Permanente) (Den/Bou, SoCo, NorCo & MtCo)	Employee Only	\$620.26	\$531.06	\$89.20
	Employee + Spouse	\$1,288.20	\$1,007.98	\$280.22
	Employee + Child(ren)	\$1,164.52	\$987.50	\$177.02
	Ee + Sp + Child(ren)	\$1,834.98	\$1,422.24	\$412.74

Plan	Tier	Total Premium	State Contribution	Employee Contribution
Dental Basic	Employee Only	\$30.20	\$25.92	\$4.28
	Employee + Spouse	\$58.38	\$42.62	\$15.76
	Employee + Child(ren)	\$61.20	\$46.44	\$14.76
	Ee + Sp + Child(ren)	\$89.36	\$62.22	\$27.14
Dental Basic Plus	Employee Only	\$44.30	\$25.92	\$18.38
	Employee + Spouse	\$86.54	\$42.62	\$43.92
	Employee + Child(ren)	\$90.76	\$46.44	\$44.32
	Ee + Sp + Child(ren)	\$133.02	\$62.22	\$70.80

4 - Travel

Itemize the positions/functions of the people who will travel. Show the estimated cost of items including but not limited to, lodging, meals, transportation, registration, etc. Explain in detail how the MCSAP program will directly benefit from the travel.

Travel costs are funds for field work or for travel to professional meetings.

List the purpose, number of persons traveling, number of days, percentage of time on MCSAP Grant, and total project costs for each trip. If details of each trip are not known at the time of application submission, provide the basis for estimating the amount requested. For more information on this item see [2 CFR §200.474](#).

Total Project Costs should be determined by State users, and manually input in the table below. There is no system calculation for this budget category.

Travel Project Costs							
Purpose	# of Staff	# of Days	% of Time on MCSAP Grant	Total Project Costs (Federal + State)	Federal Share	State Share	MOE
Routine MCSAP Related In-State Travel	26	3	100.0000	\$37,000.00	\$37,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Mileage	31	0	100.0000	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
National Grants Management Workshop	2	5	100.0000	\$4,000.00	\$4,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
FMCSA IT Workshop	3	5	100.0000	\$6,000.00	\$6,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Challenge Competition	1	5	100.0000	\$2,000.00	\$2,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
CVSA Spring Conference	2	5	100.0000	\$4,000.00	\$4,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
CVSA Fall Conference	2	5	100.0000	\$4,000.00	\$4,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
TOTAL: Travel				\$58,000.00	\$58,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

Enter a detailed explanation of how the travel costs were derived and allocated to the MCSAP project.

Routine MCSAP-Related Travel

In-state travel is necessary to enable the Colorado State Patrol to provide adequate coverage within the State of Colorado. In order to provide coverage to the entire State in a cost efficient manner, a number of overnight stays are necessary. Travel is necessary, at times, to perform compliance reviews, saturation patrols, team operations in high crash corridors, and safety audits within the State. Reimbursement is based upon the current per diem rates and current state fiscal rules in regards to in and out times and the number of miles traveled. Following are the Per Diem Rates for the State of Colorado:

	Total Per Diem	Breakfast	Lunch	Dinner	Incidental
Standard Rate	\$51.00	\$11.00	\$12.00	\$23.00	\$5.00
High Cost Rates	\$54.00	\$12.00	\$13.00	\$24.00	\$5.00
	\$59.00	\$13.00	\$15.00	\$26.00	\$5.00
	\$64.00	\$15.00	\$16.00	\$28.00	\$5.00
	\$69.00	\$16.00	\$17.00	\$31.00	\$5.00
	\$74.00	\$17.00	\$18.00	\$34.00	\$5.00

Mileage

Mileage reimbursement is approved for staff that do not have an assigned state vehicle or access to a state vehicle. Travel to meetings and required alternate work locations are examples of reimbursable mileage, however, state policy determines mileage reimbursement. Current mileage reimbursement rate is established by Colorado Revised Statute (CRS) 24-9-104(2), and was effective January 1, 2017.

	Cents Per Mile
--	----------------

	<i>Effective</i> <i>1/1/2018</i>	<i>Effective</i> <i>1/1/2017</i>
IRS Rate	54.5	53.5
State of Colorado		
2WD	49	48
4WD	52	51

5 - Equipment

Equipment is tangible or intangible personal property. It includes information technology systems having a useful life of more than one year, and a per-unit acquisition cost that equals or exceeds the lesser of the capitalization level established by the non-Federal entity (i.e., the State) for financial statement purposes, or \$5,000.

- If your State's equipment capitalization threshold is below \$5,000, check the box below and provide the threshold amount. See [§200.12](#) Capital assets, [§200.20](#) Computing devices, [§200.48](#) General purpose equipment, [§200.58](#) Information technology systems, [§200.89](#) Special purpose equipment, and [§200.94](#) Supplies.

Show the total cost of equipment and the percentage of time dedicated for MCSAP related activities that the equipment will be billed to MCSAP. For example, you intend to purchase a server for \$5,000 to be shared equally among five programs, including MCSAP. The MCSAP portion of the total cost is \$1,000. If the equipment you are purchasing will be capitalized (depreciated), you may only show the depreciable amount, and not the total cost ([2 CFR §200.436](#) and [2 CFR §200.439](#)). If vehicles or large IT purchases are listed here, the applicant must disclose their agency's capitalization policy.

Provide a description of the equipment requested. Include the quantity, the full cost of each item, and the percentage of time this item will be dedicated to MCSAP grant.

Total Project Costs equal the Number of Items x Full Cost per Item x Percentage of Time on MCSAP grant.

Equipment Project Costs							
Item Name	# of Items	Full Cost per Item	% of Time on MCSAP Grant	Total Project Costs (Federal + State)	Federal Share	State Share	MOE
TOTAL: Equipment				\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Equipment threshold is greater than \$5,000.							

Enter a detailed explanation of how the equipment costs were derived and allocated to the MCSAP project.

6 - Supplies

Supplies means all tangible property other than that described in [§200.33](#) Equipment. A computing device is a supply if the acquisition cost is less than the lesser of the capitalization level established by the non-Federal entity for financial statement purposes or \$5,000, regardless of the length of its useful life. See also [§200.20](#) Computing devices and [§200.33](#) Equipment.

Estimates for supply costs may be based on the same allocation as personnel. For example, if 35 percent of officers' salaries are allocated to this project, you may allocate 35 percent of your total supply costs to this project. A different allocation basis is acceptable, so long as it is reasonable, repeatable and logical, and a description is provided in the narrative.

Provide a description of each unit/item requested, including the quantity of each unit/item, the unit of measurement for the unit/item, the cost of each unit/item, and the percentage of time on MCSAP grant.

Total Project Costs equal the Number of Units x Cost per Unit x Percentage of Time on MCSAP grant.

Supplies Project Costs							
Item Name	# of Units/ Unit of Measurement	Cost per Unit	% of Time on MCSAP Grant	Total Project Costs (Federal + State)	Federal Share	State Share	MOE
Office Supplies	1 Year	\$30,876.85	100.0000	\$30,876.85	\$30,876.85	\$0.00	\$0.00
Uniform Supplies	1 Year	\$26,000.00	100.0000	\$26,000.00	\$26,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Computers	13 Computer/Laptop	\$4,000.00	100.0000	\$52,000.00	\$52,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Inspection/Police Supplies	1 Year	\$25,000.00	100.0000	\$25,000.00	\$25,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
ADP Expense	1 Year	\$6,300.00	100.0000	\$6,300.00	\$6,300.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Reproduction/Printing Expense	1 Year	\$8,000.00	100.0000	\$8,000.00	\$8,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
TOTAL: Supplies				\$148,176.85	\$148,176.85	\$0.00	\$0.00

Enter a detailed explanation of how the supply costs were derived and allocated to the MCSAP project.

Office Supplies

Includes items that are necessary for the day to day operations of the MCSAP and MCPT office. Includes, but is not limited to, pens, pencils, staples, paper, paper clips, chairs, filing supplies, filing cabinets, and all other miscellaneous office supplies. This total also includes copy machine costs.

Uniform and Other Related Supplies

Costs include uniforms to be worn by personnel dedicated 100% to MCSAP. Costs includes replacement or purchase of any required or approved part of the uniform authorized to be worn while on duty. Includes, but is not limited to, collar brass, badges, patches, shoes, leather gear, etc.

Computers

Purchase of computers/laptops and related equipment for use by MCSAP personnel to conduct MCSAP related activities.

Restricted by state Office of Information Technology purchasing and issuance requirements, the state has purchased 22 computers over the last two grant cycles. There are a total of 34 uniformed and civilian personnel (Patrol and grant funded) assigned to conduct MCSAP activities within the Patrol, all require a laptop or desktop computer dedicated 100% to MCSAP.

Inspection/Police Supplies

Costs includes all necessary equipment required to perform inspections, including but not limited to chocks, creepers, tire gauges, etc. Additionally, costs included in this category include those operational supplies used in the performance of the duties of a peace officer, including but not limited to, ammunition, flashlights, batteries, evidence

kits, accident investigation supplies, ticket books, clipboards, cameras, video equipment, first aid supplies, fusees, etc.

Automated Data Processing Supplies

Costs include but are not limited to repair costs for existing equipment, costs to upgrade computer hardware, printer cartridges and ink, and miscellaneous data processing supplies such as cables, printers, back up drives, etc.

Reproduction and Printing Expenses

Includes artwork and reproduction costs associated with updating and providing copies of Driver/Vehicle inspection reports; and costs to develop and print educational and informational materials to be distributed to the motoring public and CMV industry. Printing costs are estimated based on previous year's expenditures and vary depending on the type of document printed, the number of pages, whether the document is in color or black and white, type of binding if applicable, number of copies needed, etc. All printing is completed through the state print shop, Integrated Document Services (IDS). It is mandatory that all agencies within the state use IDS unless a specific service is unavailable, at which time, the agency would request a waiver to have items sent to a commercial vendor for printing.

7 - Contractual and Subaward

This section includes contractual costs and subawards to subrecipients. Use the table below to capture the information needed for both contractual agreements and subawards. The definitions of these terms are provided so the instrument type can be entered into the table below.

Contractual – A contract is a legal instrument by which a non-Federal entity purchases property or services needed to carry out the project or program under a Federal award ([2 CFR §200.22](#)). All contracts issued under a Federal award must comply with the standards described in [2 CFR §200 Procurement Standards](#).

Note: Contracts are separate and distinct from subawards; see [2 CFR §200.330](#) for details.

Subaward – A subaward is an award provided by a pass-through entity to a subrecipient for the subrecipient to carry out part of a Federal award received by the pass-through entity. It does not include payments to a contractor or payments to an individual that is a beneficiary of a Federal program. A subaward may be provided through any form of legal agreement, including an agreement that the pass-through entity considers a contract ([2 CFR §200.92](#) and [2 CFR §200.330](#)).

Subrecipient - Subrecipient means a non-Federal entity that receives a subaward from a pass-through entity to carry out part of a Federal program, but does not include an individual who is a beneficiary of such program. A subrecipient may also be a recipient of other Federal awards directly from a Federal awarding agency ([2 CFR §200.93](#)).

Enter the legal name of the vendor or subrecipient if known. If unknown at this time, please indicate 'unknown' in the legal name field. Include a description of services for each contract or subaward listed in the table. Entering a statement such as "contractual services" with no description will not be considered meeting the requirement for completing this section.

Enter the DUNS or EIN number of each entity. There is a drop-down option to choose either DUNS or EIN, and then the State must enter the corresponding identification number.

Select the Instrument Type by choosing either Contract or Subaward for each entity.

Total Project Costs should be determined by State users and input in the table below. The tool does not automatically calculate the total project costs for this budget category.

Operations and Maintenance-If the State plans to include O&M costs that meet the definition of a contractual or subaward cost, details must be provided in the table and narrative below.

Please describe the activities these costs will be using to support (i.e., ITD, PRISM, SSDQ or other services.)

Contractual and Subaward Project Costs							
Legal Name	DUNS/EIN Number	Instrument Type	% of Time on MCSAP Grant	Total Project Costs (Federal + State)	Federal Share	State Share	MOE
Vehicle Lease	DUNS 878046747	Contract	100.0000	\$276,318.96	\$276,318.96	\$0.00	\$0.00
Description of Services: Vehicles for use by MCSAP Officers							
TOTAL: Contractual and Subaward				\$276,318.96	\$276,318.96	\$0.00	\$0.00

Enter a detailed explanation of how the contractual and subaward costs were derived and allocated to the MCSAP project.

Vehicle Lease

Lease costs as determined by the State of Colorado Fleet Management Unit, as well as, mileage and usage charges, pre-determined by State of Colorado Fleet Management to fund gasoline, repair, and maintenance for vehicles. Additional costs include radio usage charges as determined by Fleet Management. Costs for each vehicle are dependent upon, year, make and model of each vehicle, as well as vehicle usage. Costs included in the proposal are an annual average of total costs since cost per individual vehicle will vary. Vehicles funded by the MCSAP Basic Grant are 100% dedicated to MCSAP activities and any non-eligible activities are incidental to routine law enforcement actions. **While there are 22 troopers assigned to the unit, there are 4 Sergeants, 2 Captains, and 2**

POE officers that are 100% dedicated to the MCSAP Unit. Each of the Sergeants and Captains have been assigned a vehicle and the two POE officers will share one vehicle.

<u>Item</u>	<u># of Vehicles</u>	<u>Cost Per Item</u>	<u>Total Cost</u>
Vehicles	29	\$9528.24	\$276,318.96

8 - Other Costs

Other Costs are those not classified elsewhere and are allocable to the Federal award. These costs must be specifically itemized and described. The total costs and allocation bases must be explained in the narrative. Examples of Other Costs may include utilities and/or leased equipment, employee training tuition, meeting registration costs, etc. The quantity, unit of measurement (e.g., monthly, annually, each, etc.), unit cost, and percentage of time on MCSAP grant must be included.

Operations and Maintenance—If the State plans to include O&M costs that do not meet the definition of a contractual or subaward cost, details must be provided in the table and narrative below. Please identify these costs as ITD O&M, PRISM O&M, or SSDQ O&M. Sufficient detail must be provided in the narrative that explains what components of the specific program are being addressed by the O&M costs.

Enter a description of each requested Other Cost.

Enter the number of items/units, the unit of measurement, the cost per unit/item, and the percentage of time dedicated to the MCSAP grant for each Other Cost listed. Show the cost of the Other Costs and the portion of the total cost that will be billed to MCSAP. For example, you intend to purchase air cards for \$2,000 to be shared equally among five programs, including MCSAP. The MCSAP portion of the total cost is \$400.

Total Project Costs equal the Number of Units x Cost per Item x Percentage of Time on MCSAP grant.

Indirect Costs

Information on Indirect Costs ([2 CFR §200.56](#)) is captured in this section. This cost is allowable only when an approved indirect cost rate agreement has been provided. Applicants may charge up to the total amount of the approved indirect cost rate multiplied by the eligible cost base. Applicants with a cost basis of salaries/wages and fringe benefits may only apply the indirect rate to those expenses. Applicants with an expense base of modified total direct costs (MTDC) may only apply the rate to those costs that are included in the MTDC base ([2 CFR §200.68](#)).

- **Cost Basis** — is the accumulated direct costs (normally either total direct salaries and wages or total direct costs exclusive of any extraordinary or distorting expenditures) used to distribute indirect costs to individual Federal awards. The direct cost base selected should result in each Federal award bearing a fair share of the indirect costs in reasonable relation to the benefits received from the costs.
- **Approved Rate** — is the rate in the approved Indirect Cost Rate Agreement.
- **Eligible Indirect Expenses** — means after direct costs have been determined and assigned directly to Federal awards and other activities as appropriate. Indirect costs are those remaining to be allocated to benefitted cost objectives. A cost may not be allocated to a Federal award as an indirect cost if any other cost incurred for the same purpose, in like circumstances, has been assigned to a Federal award as a direct cost.
- **Total Indirect Costs** equal Approved Rate x Eligible Indirect Expenses divided by 100.

Your State will claim reimbursement for Indirect Costs.

Indirect Costs					
Cost Basis	Approved Rate	Eligible Indirect Expenses	Total Indirect Costs	Federal Share	State Share
Salaries, Wages and Fringe (SWF)	19.20	\$3,577,880.69	\$686,953.09	\$686,953.09	\$0.00
TOTAL: Indirect Costs			\$686,953.09	\$686,953.09	\$0.00

Other Costs Project Costs							
Item Name	# of Units/ Unit of Measurement	Cost per Unit	% of Time on MCSAP Grant	Total Project Costs (Federal + State)	Federal Share	State Share	MOE
Training	1 Year	\$6,000.00	100.0000	\$6,000.00	\$6,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
CVSA Decals	10000 Decal	\$0.28	100.0000	\$2,800.00	\$2,800.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Registration/Conference Costs	1 Year	\$4,000.00	100.0000	\$4,000.00	\$4,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Communications	1 Year	\$34,951.30	100.0000	\$34,951.30	\$34,951.30	\$0.00	\$0.00
Postage	1 Year	\$2,500.00	100.0000	\$2,500.00	\$2,500.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Dues and Memberships	1 Year	\$10,400.00	100.0000	\$10,400.00	\$10,400.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Software	1 Year	\$1,200.00	100.0000	\$1,200.00	\$1,200.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
TOTAL: Other Costs				\$61,851.30	\$61,851.30	\$0.00	\$0.00

Enter a detailed explanation of how the 'other' costs were derived and allocated to the MCSAP project.

*****Indirect Costs**

Signed agreement has not been received from the cognizant agency as of date of eCVSP submission, however, the provisional rate as established by the agreement is 19.2%. Once the agreement has been received by the Colorado State Patrol it will be submitted to FMCSA.

Training

Includes costs incurred for MCSAP related training courses, such as, training materials, costs of tests, etc.

CVSA Decals

10,000 * 0.28 = \$2,800.00

Registration/Conference Costs

Includes department authorized MCSAP training and/or seminars. Includes registration fees for CVSA workshops, as well as, registration fees for any other conferences/training seminars.

Communications

Includes:

1. Office telephone equipment lease costs and line charges.
2. Cellular phones, lease, and air time charges to make MCSAP related telephone calls.
3. Hotspot and airtime charges related to MCSAP funded activities.
4. Long distance, toll charges, conference calls

Each MCSAP officer has been assigned a cellular phone that also provides network access when at the roadside. This function is necessary to access the FMCSA systems at the roadside and to transfer ASPEN reports and compliance reviews.

Postage

Includes costs of US Postal Services, UPS and Fed/Ex type shipping and freights costs for MCSAP related activities, such as, correspondence with carriers, as well as, shipping to MCSAP officers stationed outside of the Denver Metro Area.

Dues and Memberships

Costs include:

CVSA membership - \$10,400

Software

Includes purchase of new software, and/or updates for existing software to support MCSAP related activities. Software purchases/upgrades include Crystal Reports, Adobe Pro, etc.

9 - Comprehensive Spending Plan

The Comprehensive Spending Plan is auto-populated from all line items in the tables and is in read-only format. Changes to the Comprehensive Spending Plan will only be reflected by updating the individual budget category table(s).

ESTIMATED Fiscal Year Funding Amounts for MCSAP

	85% Federal Share	15% State Share	Total Estimated Funding
Total	\$4,909,223.00	\$865,654.00	\$5,774,877.00

Summary of MCSAP Funding Limitations

Allowable amount for Overtime without written justification (15% of Basic Award Amount):	\$865,654.00
MOE Baseline:	\$309,041.47

Estimated Expenditures

Personnel

	Federal Share	State Share	Total Project Costs (Federal + Share)	MOE
Uniformed Officers	\$1,438,560.00	\$671,328.00	\$2,109,888.00	\$0.00
MCSAP Captain	\$124,119.00	\$0.00	\$124,119.00	\$0.00
MCP&T Captain	\$0.00	\$61,318.00	\$61,318.00	\$0.00
POE Officers	\$106,686.00	\$0.00	\$106,686.00	\$0.00
Civilians	\$349,201.00	\$8,951.00	\$358,152.00	\$0.00
MCSAP Sergeant	\$325,953.00	\$108,651.00	\$434,604.00	\$0.00
State Funded Level I Inspections	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$102,300.00
State Funded Level II-V Inspections	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$308,219.00
Civilian Match	\$0.00	\$15,406.00	\$15,406.00	\$0.00
Salary Subtotal	\$2,344,519.00	\$865,654.00	\$3,210,173.00	\$410,519.00
Uniformed Officers	\$442,884.09	\$0.00	\$442,884.09	\$0.00
Overtime subtotal	\$442,884.09	\$0.00	\$442,884.09	\$0.00
Personnel total	\$2,787,403.09	\$865,654.00	\$3,653,057.09	\$410,519.00

Fringe Benefits

	Federal Share	State Share	Total Project Costs (Federal + State)	MOE
Uniformed Officers	\$532,267.20	\$0.00	\$532,267.20	\$0.00
MCSAP Captain	\$47,165.22	\$0.00	\$47,165.22	\$0.00
MCP&T Captain	\$23,300.84	\$0.00	\$23,300.84	\$0.00
MCSAP Sergeant	\$120,602.61	\$0.00	\$120,602.61	\$0.00
POE Officers	\$42,674.40	\$0.00	\$42,674.40	\$0.00
Civilians	\$124,509.44	\$0.00	\$124,509.44	\$0.00
State Funded Level I Inspections	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$37,851.00
State Funded Level II-V Inspections	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$109,331.00
Uniformed Fringe MOE	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$248,391.36
MCSAP Sergeant MOE	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$40,200.87
Civilian MOE	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$11,319.00
Fringe Benefits total	\$890,519.71	\$0.00	\$890,519.71	\$447,093.23

Travel				
	Federal Share	State Share	Total Project Costs (Federal + State)	MOE
Routine MCSAP Related In-State Travel	\$37,000.00	\$0.00	\$37,000.00	\$0.00
Mileage	\$1,000.00	\$0.00	\$1,000.00	\$0.00
National Grants Management Workshop	\$4,000.00	\$0.00	\$4,000.00	\$0.00
FMCSA IT Workshop	\$6,000.00	\$0.00	\$6,000.00	\$0.00
Challenge Competition	\$2,000.00	\$0.00	\$2,000.00	\$0.00
CVSA Spring Conference	\$4,000.00	\$0.00	\$4,000.00	\$0.00
CVSA Fall Conference	\$4,000.00	\$0.00	\$4,000.00	\$0.00
Travel total	\$58,000.00	\$0.00	\$58,000.00	\$0.00

Equipment				
	Federal Share	State Share	Total Project Costs (Federal + State)	MOE
Equipment total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

Supplies				
	Federal Share	State Share	Total Project Costs (Federal + State)	MOE
Office Supplies	\$30,876.85	\$0.00	\$30,876.85	\$0.00
Uniform Supplies	\$26,000.00	\$0.00	\$26,000.00	\$0.00
Computers	\$52,000.00	\$0.00	\$52,000.00	\$0.00
Inspection/Police Supplies	\$25,000.00	\$0.00	\$25,000.00	\$0.00
ADP Expense	\$6,300.00	\$0.00	\$6,300.00	\$0.00
Reproduction/Printing Expense	\$8,000.00	\$0.00	\$8,000.00	\$0.00
Supplies total	\$148,176.85	\$0.00	\$148,176.85	\$0.00

Contractual and Subaward				
	Federal Share	State Share	Total Project Costs (Federal + State)	MOE
Vehicle Lease	\$276,318.96	\$0.00	\$276,318.96	\$0.00
Contractual and Subaward total	\$276,318.96	\$0.00	\$276,318.96	\$0.00

Other Costs				
	Federal Share	State Share	Total Project Costs (Federal + State)	MOE
Training	\$6,000.00	\$0.00	\$6,000.00	\$0.00
CVSA Decals	\$2,800.00	\$0.00	\$2,800.00	\$0.00
Registration/Conference Costs	\$4,000.00	\$0.00	\$4,000.00	\$0.00
Communications	\$34,951.30	\$0.00	\$34,951.30	\$0.00
Postage	\$2,500.00	\$0.00	\$2,500.00	\$0.00
Dues and Memberships	\$10,400.00	\$0.00	\$10,400.00	\$0.00
Software	\$1,200.00	\$0.00	\$1,200.00	\$0.00
Other Costs total	\$61,851.30	\$0.00	\$61,851.30	\$0.00

Total Costs				
	Federal Share	State Share	Total Project Costs (Federal + State)	MOE
Subtotal for Direct Costs	\$4,222,269.91	\$865,654.00	\$5,087,923.91	\$857,612.23
Indirect Costs	\$686,953.09	\$0.00	\$686,953.09	NA
Total Costs Budgeted	\$4,909,223.00	\$865,654.00	\$5,774,877.00	\$857,612.23

10 - Financial Summary

The Financial Summary is auto-populated by the system by budget category. It is a read-only document and can be used to complete the SF-424A in Grants.gov. Changes to the Financial Summary will only be reflected by updating the individual budget category table(s).

- The system will confirm that percentages for Federal and State shares are correct for Total Project Costs. The edit check is performed on the **"Total Costs Budgeted"** line only.
- The system will confirm that Planned MOE Costs equal or exceed FMCSA funding limitation. The edit check is performed on the **"Total Costs Budgeted"** line only.
- The system will confirm that the Overtime value does not exceed the FMCSA funding limitation. The edit check is performed on the **"Overtime subtotal"** line.

ESTIMATED Fiscal Year Funding Amounts for MCSAP			
	85% Federal Share	15% State Share	Total Estimated Funding
Total	\$4,909,223.00	\$865,654.00	\$5,774,877.00

Summary of MCSAP Funding Limitations	
Allowable amount for Overtime without written justification (15% of Basic Award Amount):	\$865,654.00
MOE Baseline:	\$309,041.47

Estimated Expenditures				
	Federal Share	State Share	Total Project Costs (Federal + State)	Planned MOE Costs
Salary Subtotal	\$2,344,519.00	\$865,654.00	\$3,210,173.00	\$410,519.00
Overtime Subtotal	\$442,884.09	\$0.00	\$442,884.09	\$0.00
Personnel Total	\$2,787,403.09	\$865,654.00	\$3,653,057.09	\$410,519.00
Fringe Benefits Total	\$890,519.71	\$0.00	\$890,519.71	\$447,093.23
Travel Total	\$58,000.00	\$0.00	\$58,000.00	\$0.00
Equipment Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Supplies Total	\$148,176.85	\$0.00	\$148,176.85	\$0.00
Contractual and Subaward Total	\$276,318.96	\$0.00	\$276,318.96	\$0.00
Other Costs Total	\$61,851.30	\$0.00	\$61,851.30	\$0.00
	85% Federal Share	15% State Share	Total Project Costs (Federal + State)	Planned MOE Costs
Subtotal for Direct Costs	\$4,222,269.91	\$865,654.00	\$5,087,923.91	\$857,612.23
Indirect Costs	\$686,953.09	\$0.00	\$686,953.09	NA
Total Costs Budgeted	\$4,909,223.00	\$865,654.00	\$5,774,877.00	\$857,612.23

Part 5 - Certifications and Documents

Part 5 includes electronic versions of specific requirements, certifications and documents that a State must agree to as a condition of participation in MCSAP. The submission of the CVSP serves as official notice and certification of compliance with these requirements. State or States means all of the States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, American Samoa, Guam, and the Virgin Islands.

If the person submitting the CVSP does not have authority to certify these documents electronically, then the State must continue to upload the signed/certified form(s) through the "My Documents" area on the State's Dashboard page.

1 - State Certification

The State Certification will not be considered complete until the four questions and certification declaration are answered. Selecting 'no' in the declaration may impact your State's eligibility for MCSAP funding.

1. What is the name of the person certifying the declaration for your State? Jonathan Barba
2. What is this person's title? Major
3. Who is your Governor's highway safety representative? Michael P. Lewis
4. What is this person's title? Executive Director

The State affirmatively accepts the State certification declaration written below by selecting 'yes'.

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ Yes, uploaded certification document
- ☐ No

State Certification declaration:

I, Jonathan Barba, Major , on behalf of the State of COLORADO, as requested by the Administrator as a condition of approval of a grant under the authority of [49 U.S.C. § 31102](#), as amended, certify that the State satisfies all the conditions required for MCSAP funding, as specifically detailed in [49 C.F.R. § 350.211](#).

If there are any exceptions that should be noted to the above certification, include an explanation in the text box below.

2 - Annual Review of Laws, Regulations, Policies and Compatibility Certification

You must answer all three questions and indicate your acceptance of the certification declaration. Selecting 'no' in the declaration may impact your State's eligibility for MCSAP funding.

1. What is the name of your certifying State official? Raymond Fisher
2. What is the title of your certifying State official? Captain
3. What are the phone # and email address of your State official? raymond.fisher@state.co.us 303-886-4741

The State affirmatively accepts the compatibility certification declaration written below by selecting 'yes'.

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ Yes, uploaded certification document
- ☐ No

I, Raymond Fisher, certify that the State has conducted the annual review of its laws and regulations for compatibility regarding commercial motor vehicle safety and that the State's safety laws remain compatible with the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations (49 CFR parts 390-397) and the Hazardous Materials Regulations (49 CFR parts 107 (subparts F and G only), 171-173, 177, 178, and 180) and standards and orders of the Federal government, except as may be determined by the Administrator to be inapplicable to a State enforcement program. For the purpose of this certification, Compatible means State laws or regulations pertaining to interstate commerce that are identical to the FMCSRs and HMRs or have the same effect as the FMCSRs and identical to the HMRs and for intrastate commerce rules identical to or within the tolerance guidelines for the FMCSRs and identical to the HMRs.

If there are any exceptions that should be noted to the above certification, include an explanation in the text box below.

3 - New Laws/Legislation/Policy Impacting CMV Safety

Has the State adopted/enacted any new or updated laws (i.e., statutes) impacting CMV safety since the last CVSP or annual update was submitted?

☐ Yes ☒ No

Has the State adopted/enacted any new administrative actions or policies impacting CMV safety since the last CVSP?

☐ Yes ☒ No