

The Transportation Commission Workshops were Wednesday, May 15, 2019 and the regular meeting was Thursday, May 16, 2019. Both the workshops and the regular meeting took place at the Colorado Department of Transportation Headquarters at 2829 W. Howard Place, Denver, CO 80204.

Documents are posted at <https://www.codot.gov/about/transportation-commission/meeting-agenda.html> no less than 24 hours prior to the meeting. The documents are considered to be in draft form and for information only until final action is taken by the Transportation Commission.

Transportation Commission Workshops

Wednesday, May 15, 2019

1:00 pm – 5:00 pm

Attendance: All 10 Commissioners – Gifford, Thiebaut, Zink, Hofmeister, Hall, Gilliland, Stuart, Connell, Scott, and Peterson

Right of Way Workshop (Josh Laipply)

Purpose: The purpose of the workshop was to discuss eight right-of-way (ROW) acquisition projects (negotiations), four settlement affirmations & authorization requests, and one condemnation authorization request.

Action: Prepare to act on agreed upon proposed acquisitions, and settlements, and condemnation authorizations at the regular Transportation Commission (TC) meeting.

The eight projects with requests for authorization of property acquisitions that will be part of the consent agenda for at the regular TC meeting for May 2019 included:

- Region 1
 - SH 88 Arapahoe and Revere Signals, Project Code: 22637
 - I-25 Gap Project – Phase 4, Project Code: 21102
 - I-70 Central, Project Code: 19631
- Region 3
 - US 50 Blue Canyon-Windy Point, Project Code: 21723
- Region 4
 - I 25 North: SH 402 – SH 14, Project Code: 21506
 - US 34 Republican River Bridges, Project Code: 20865
 - I-76 and SH 52 Hudson Interchange, Project Code: 21432
 - I-25 Express Lanes SH 7 to SH 1, Project Code: 22831
- No comments on right-of-way acquisition requests were raised from the public or the Commission.

The four projects with requests for settlement affirmation & authorization that will be part of the consent agenda at the TC Regular Meeting for May 2019 included:

- Region 2
 - SH 167 overlay through Fowler, Project Code: 20754
 - Critical Culverts SH 101 and SH 109, Project Code: 21787
 - US 50-C overlay (4th to Baxter), Project Code: 20751
 - SH 71 Bridge Replacement L-22-JA; Project Code: 22289
- No comments on right-of-way settlement affirmation and authorization were raised from the public or the Commission.

The one project with a request for condemnation authorization that will be an action item at the TC Regular Meeting for May 2019 was:

- Region 1
 - I-70 Central, Project Code: 19631

Discussion:

- Josh Laipply, CDOT Chief Engineer, noted that the reason this property has gone to a condemnation request is that there has been no agreement on costs proposed to property owners. CDOT has not seen a certified appraisal on the property in question from the property owner.
- CDOT did take action to raise their offer to \$25,000 for this very small piece of property to keep the project moving.
- Kathy Young, from the Attorney General’s Office, noted that the property owner is a real estate broker and that the property owner’s issue is their discomfort with signing the CDOT forms.
- Commissioner Hofmeister commented that the size of the property in question could fit in a small area of the HQ auditorium, and expressed concerns that CDOT may be paying too much.
- Commissioner Scott and Josh Laipply both concurred that there is more to this issue, in terms of CDOT’s time and costs to invest in this acquisition to keep the project moving.
- Josh Laipply mentioned that a person was anticipated to be present today to comment on this property and that they may be present at tomorrow’s regular meeting.
- Modifications to the Policy Directive regarding TC approval of right-of-way acquisitions, settlements and condemnations are coming that will potentially require TC approval only for condemnation authorizations. CDOT staff plans to come back in June for TC action via resolution that would become effective July 1, 2019.

Budget Workshop (Jeff Sudmeier)

FY 2020-21 Budget Topics

Purpose: To present to the Transportation Commission (TC) several items relevant to the development of the FY 2020-21 Annual Budget, including proposed changes in the budget process and timeline, budget scenarios based on guidance from the Governor’s Office, and a new format for the One-Sheet Budget.

Action: No action required. Staff requests TC input on the budget process and timeline, approach to budget scenario development, and new budget format.

Process and Timeline

Approach to Budget Scenario Development

On March 5, Governor Polis distributed a memo to his cabinet on Budget Guidance for FY 2020-21 outlining his budget goals for that fiscal year, including:

- Identifying ongoing “base” spending that is unnecessary or no longer meeting the state’s commitment to Coloradans
- Reassessing and updating old assumptions about program costs
- Realigning unproductive appropriations to advance current priorities

In order to accomplish these goals, the governor has directed each department to submit two scenarios to the Office of State Planning and Budgeting (OSP) by July 1: One showing a reduction of 5% (\$89 million) from the FY 2019-20 baseline and one showing an increase of 2% (\$36 million). The FY 2019- 2020 baseline for CDOT was based on the FY 2019-2020 Budget, excluding Bridge Enterprise, HPTE, and one-time general fund transfers

provided under Senate Bill (SB) 18-001 and SB 19-262. The objective of this scenario development is not to force a reduction in budget, but rather to support the goals described above by taking a fresh, critical look at budget allocations.

The Division of Accounting and Finance (DAF) is conducting an in-depth analysis to identify opportunities to reduce allocations within the budget, as well opportunities associated with an increase in funding. In examining opportunities to reduce allocations within the budget, DAF is accelerating the timeline for the Division/Region/Office level work plan budget process and performing an in-depth assessment of budget programs that includes:

- Identifying opportunities to reduce non-mission critical expenditures
- Reviewing under-utilized or under-performing programs
- Reviewing unspent funds for more efficient allocation
- Identifying opportunities to use Toll Credits in place of state match in programs such as HSIP,
- Rail-Highway Crossings, National Highway Freight Programs, SPR, etc.
- Consolidating, simplifying or redirecting program budgets based on strategic priorities

DAF will also identify scenarios associated with a 2% increase in base levels of funding, for example, increases to underfunded asset programs, or expansions to transit services. Staff will review scenarios with the TC in June, prior to the July 1 deadline to submit to OSPB. These scenarios will then be used to inform development of the draft FY 2020-2021 budget this summer and fall.

New Budget Format

The new format incorporates some additional elements, including roll forward, prior budgeted amounts, and estimated expenditures. It also removes some elements in the interest of streamlining and simplifying. For example, information on funding sources and decision making authority will be removed and incorporated into secondary reports included in the full Budget Allocation Plan.

Budget programs are organized into the following core categories:

- Capital Construction
- Maintenance and Operations
- Multimodal Services
- Sub-allocated Programs
- Administration and Agency Operations
- Debt Service
- Contingency Reserve
- Other Programs

These core categories represent the four primary types of activities delivered by the Department – construction, maintenance and operations, multimodal services, and sub-allocated programs, and four categories of support activities. The four delivery categories are further subdivided between Asset Management, Safety, and Mobility (or in the case of Sub-allocated Programs, by mode).

Budget Timeline

DAF is proposing to accelerate the budget process for FY 2020-21. The new timeline associated with the accelerated process entails completing the first draft of the FY 2020-21 Budget in June. The accelerated process will also allow the TC to approve the Budget Allocation Plan in October, syncing this process with the submission of the Legislative Budget on November 1.

This workshop overviewed a proposal surrounding a Budget Allocation Plan and Amendments to the FY 2019-2020 Budget.

See: <https://www.codot.gov/about/transportation-commission/meeting-agenda.html>

For more details.

Quarterly Budget Report

Purpose: To provide the Commission with a quarterly report providing a comprehensive and current view of the CDOT budget for FY 2018-2019.

Action: No action requested.

The Fiscal Year 2018-2019 3rd Quarter Report (July 2018 – March 2019) is available at:

<https://www.codot.gov/business/budget/cdot-budget/current-budget-documents/fy-2018-19-quarterly-budgetreport/view>

Discussion:

- Commissioner Thiebaut asked about if this review of CDOT expenses includes appropriated funds to CDOT.
- Jeff Sudmeier, CDOT Chief Financial Officer, responded, yes. CDOT does have less flexibility to reduce funds than other agencies for varying funding sources, but will look at reductions across the board.
- Commissioner Thiebaut noted that he interprets this harmonizing with new Statewide Planning process and multimodal systems to see where our priorities are. At the Prowers County Meeting, county representatives noted that they have had the same transportation priorities for 20 years, but these priorities have yet to be funded.
- Jeff Sudmeier explained that the submitted baseline budget to go to the Governor is the budget less enterprises and SB 1 funds. The process is to identify where CDOT can reduce expenditures by 5% (\$89million) and where place 2% (\$36 million)?
- This process is a good exercise to prepare for when reduced revenues occur. We examine cut backs we don't want to do, but would provide opportunities to cut spending to allow flexibility. Identify the none mission critical expenditures, and consider how to fund under-performing programs. There has been much coordination with the Office of State Budget (OSB) and CDOT. This is an informative exercise with utility. The plan is to ask TC for feedback next month, confirm our approach, and to adopt for a July 1 deadline.
- Attachment A is proposed timeline for FY 2021 budget that is in your packet. We hope to bring budget scenarios to the TC in June. Also a draft FY 2021 budget is being drafted a bit earlier than usual, with September discussion item, and an October approval by the TC. Also will bring the FY 2020 budget to be effective in July 2019.
- Commissioner Hofmeister asked about the concept presented previously to eliminate the term budget and start using the term allocation.
- Jeff explained that via statute, CDOT is required to develop a budget. So term budget is still needed. However, staff is moving towards providing the TC with a more complete picture of finances that includes allocations.
- Core objectives in mind for new format were described.
- Proposed format explained today was for the purpose of gathering for TC input on core functions and support functions.
- A new one-page budget format is provided that simplifies items by consolidating some smaller programs to reduce complexity and breaking out others where it seems appropriate. Gray highlighted categories are Core and Support functions and blue categories are sub-allocations. For example, Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Maintenance and Traffic Signals were combined and CDOT local programs and transit & multimodal under sub-allocated programs are now distinct.
- Commissioner Zink asked about if the RTDs are considered under administration.
- Jeff Sudmeier explained that administration is defined by statute. Most Executive Management Team (EMT) members including RTDs are identified as administrative costs.
- Columns on the one-page budget have also changed– some were removed, and are reported in sub-allocation reports.

- Roll-forward reporting between fiscal years was described and were noted as estimates. More regular amendments to the budget may occur.
- Commissioner Zink asked if the monthly budget supplements are reported in this new format.
- Jeff responded that generally any item that changes the budget is reported to the TC as the TC approves all budget changes.
- FY 2021 initially was considered the first year for developing into this new format, but we may also do for FY 2020.
- Commissioner Gilliland asked if the TC would see this format monthly, or only for big amendments.
- Jeff Sudmeier noted that an updated look of quarterly budget report will also reflect this change in format. We will probably bring to TC monthly a report that highlights project level expenditures and other changes
- In terms of project level status reporting, Josh Laipply will oversee those reports.
- From the budget perspective that is the CFO's domain, and this will be reported monthly; it will be up to the TC to decide how often to check-in to project status compared to budget expenditure expectations.
- Jeff Sudmeier explained that he plans on doing some threshold reporting to highlight deviation from anticipated expenditures.
- Commissioner Scott asked if it would be possible to add links to line items to go deeper into details.
- Jeff Sudmeier noted that the budget allocation reports will be revamped and will be very detailed. Jeff also mentioned that if we phase in providing links for each line item, start at a higher level, this could eventually be accomplished.
- Commissioners Scott and Stuart both agreed that seeing the report monthly would be good to get familiar with it.
- Commissioner Gifford commented that she thinks quarterly reports to TC would be preferable.
- Jeff Sudmeier anticipates activity changes every month so he will bring reports to TC every month – but the level of TC action requested may vary. Staff can post the report too for TC members to access.
- Commission Hall asked about what is an amendment vs. a supplement.
- Jeff Sudmeier explained that supplements don't change the budget amount – project level changes to add budget is a supplement, and amendments are bigger changes that impact the budget.
- Commissioner Gilliland wants to see what changes look like next month before the TC comments on the new format.
- Jeff welcomes TC feedback on the new format any time and to discuss this more next month.
- Commissioner Scott expressed that he believes we are going in the right direction.

Small Business and Diversity Update Workshop (Josh Laipply, Greg Diehl)

Purpose: This workshop intends to discuss the preliminary financial estimates and operational benefits of creating a campus that can accommodate, CDOT's Maintenance Training Academy (MTA), ITS Maintenance Work Unit and CDOT's Workforce Development Program, RISE.

Action: CDOT is requesting guidance from the Commission regarding construction of this joint use campus before seeking funding approval for the project in June, 2019.

Details: CDOT owns a 28-acre property in Adams County near 1-76 & Pecos that could house a permanent workforce training facility that would support the long-term needs of CDOT's internal and external workforce development programs as well as the needs of the ITS Maintenance Unit. This joint campus would allow CDOT to leverage classroom and training space for multiple purposes and add to the value of CDOT's internal training curriculum by allowing trainees to learn at an operational maintenance site which supports the CDOT Whole System Whole Safety initiative. The property is in an industrial area and is easily accessible via transit to residents of Denver's most historically underserved communities.

Additionally, this campus would allow for CDOT to complete activities like guardrail installation training that cannot be conducted using CDOT's existing facilities. Proper guardrail training is imperative to ensuring public

safety and has been the subject of past litigation against CDOT. Conducting this sort of training limits CDOT's financial exposure and adds to the safety of the traveling public.

The approximate cost of development for a suitable structure is \$9.5 million, based on initial estimates. We anticipate that this project would breakeven in year ten and would represent over \$4 million in savings over a 20-year period. If CDOT does not build this campus, it will need to lease space for a Workforce Development Center and operate out of multiple sites with limited MTA training capacity. Additionally, CDOT will need to invest in a standalone ITS or Engineering facility to resolve the Colorado State Patrol (CSP) co-location issue in Golden.

Discussion:

- Build new facility for Workforce Development Training.
- Erica Downey with RISE program gave a presentation on the new joint facility proposed.
 - Erica went over the need for a joint facility to serve multiple needs – Workforce Development, Maintenance Training Academy, and ITS Maintenance Work Unit. Several locations were considered and the site with the least cost that met the criteria was at I-76 and Pecos.
 - Commissioner Thiebaut asked about a similar facility for Pueblo.
 - Erica responded that lessons learned for this model could be replicated in other areas of the state to address similar needs elsewhere.
 - Commissioner Hofmeister expressed major concerns with such an investment in the metro area, when rural needs are not addressed. Thought the workforce development facility was temporary.
 - Johnny Olson, CDOT Deputy Executive Director, noted \$9.5 million to save lives with this important training facility is a small amount to pay. This training is important and needed. The loss of the CDOT employee in Gypsum is to be avoided.
 - Josh Laipply noted that he agreed with the concept the project would need to benefit CDOT beyond the workforce development program for 70 Central.
 - Commissioner Hofmeister, commented that land value is the issue, and strongly recommended placing this facility in a rural area of the state.
 - Josh Laipply commented that this is the first project of its type, with future opportunities for smaller rural facilities. In addition, CDOT does not want to take dollars away from maintenance, but use TC contingency funds instead.
 - Commissioner Connell noted that the TC needs to understand in more detail where money comes from and how it is spent. We still see pavement condition issues in rural areas.
 - Josh Laipply explained that CDOT did a cost benefit analysis on this project and looked at different options for funding, including financing and paying interest.
 - Per Commissioner Connell, we need better communication prior to making decisions regarding what programs are preserved for expenditures.
 - Johnny Olson commented that - I don't want to take money from rural roads, we want to add.
 - Locations of projects also take hotel costs into consideration, with less funding being made available for CDOT staff for in-state travel.
 - Commissioner Gilliland would like to get this model in Denver established, then we have a model to consider for the future. In terms of workforce development, we didn't have skilled labor that is needed to construct projects. Lots of dangers and risks, and need heavy equipment and CDL drivers. This is an opportunity to do something about the skilled labor shortage. Having fields and tracks to practice on is important, vs classroom work. There are real and valid reasons for this.
 - Josh Laipply explained that the hope is to have TC approval in June, but we may need further discussion.
 - More discussion occurred regarding the site selection process and the benefits associated with the proposed site.
 - Josh Laipply mentioned that a funding partnership with Adams County is necessary to move forward with the proposed location.
 - Commissioner Hofmeister asked about the distinction between the Traffic Incident Management facility in Douglas County and this proposed facility.

- Josh Laipply and Kyle Lester, Division of Maintenance and Operations Director, jointly explained that the distinction is that the Douglas County facility is primarily a track with limited out buildings to provide space for vehicles during emergency responder training, to enhance response times and coordination between CDOT, and local emergency responders and towing companies; whereas, the training proposed in Adams County would be employee training to operate CDOT maintenance vehicles/trucks.

Statewide Planning Committee (Rebecca White)

- **Attendees** Introductions: Committee Members – Commissioners: Karen Stuart, Ed Peterson, Sidny Zink, Rocky Scott, Steven Hofmeister, and STAC Chair, Vince Rogalski
- A Planning Process Status Update was provided by Rebecca White

County Meetings

Staff has begun the process of meeting with the counties as part of the Project Priority Programming Process (4P), and has met with seven counties to date. These counties are: Crowley, Gunnison, Kiowa, Mesa, Montrose, Otero, and Prowers. The reaction to the new planning approach at the county meetings has been positive and productive.

Launch Event

CDOT is planning a launch event to kick-off the Statewide Transportation Plan. The main objectives of the launch event are to:

- Hold a press conference to generate broadcast, online and print media coverage around the state.
- Premiere a Statewide Plan video that highlights CDOT’s accomplishments over the last few years, the transportation challenges still facing Colorado and introduces the new public engagement tool on CDOT’s website. The video will follow the theme of “walk in my shoes.” In addition to being hosted on CDOT’s website, the video will also be included with the media kit that will be provided to the media immediately following the event.
- Demonstrate the new public engagement survey tool and encourage the public to take the survey.

Public Engagement

One key aspect of effectively engaging the public in the Statewide Plan is having a strong, recognizable brand. The brand for this plan is: “Your Transportation Plan” with the tagline “Connections. Choice. Colorado for All.” CDOT is designing a new webpage hosted on the CDOT website with the web address YourTransportationPlan.com. This dedicated webpage will be the central platform for all public engagement and serve as the launching point for interactive surveys. CDOT will be utilizing an interactive survey tool will allow the public to:

- Identify their top transportation trends and issues
- Map their transportation concerns
- Rate goals and strategies for improving our transportation system
- Link them with other areas of interest on the CDOT website for more information and updates

Discussion:

- Commissioners Hall commented that for one of the first county meetings in her area, Gunnison, that the County Commissioners were surprised on the county focus when county transportation is intertwined. The County started with identifying projects outside of their county.
- Vince Rogalski, STAC Chair, noted that the right questions were asked by the County Commissioners in Gunnison Valley. TPR meetings are happening also that will start the broader conversation.
- Commissioner Thiebaut noted that the Southeast TPR Commissioners wonder how different the planning process is, they state their priorities for several years, and then none of them are funded. The feeling is data is shared, shelved and regurgitated.
- Commissioner Gilliland suggested that for the new planning piece with County Commissioners, that a description of the broader focus and the expectation to include more stakeholders to county meetings (not just county commissioners) needs to be communicated.

- Rebecca White explained that she is developing a letter to address Commissioner Gilliland comments.
- A Web Survey tool is getting ready for Friday also. CDOT Staff is getting excited to roll this out. This tool will help CDOT identify stakeholder sense of priorities and top strategies.
- Commissioner Scott stressed the importance to get cities involved too.
- Rebecca explained that public works and city managers are getting invited too. The biggest change is transit being included.
- Rebecca is going to the Colorado Municipal League (CML) Conference this year in an effort to target city officials, and will send a letter describing the planning process and how to engage via the CML email distribution list.
- Mike McVaugh, Region 5 Transportation Director explained that they have long list of cities and other stakeholders – each agency in each county are invited. Mike re-emphasized the TPR meetings planned as part of the process. The Statewide Travel Model data will help discussions tremendously.
- Commissioner Hofmeister reiterated his concerns with focusing on planning instead of funding projects to improve rural transportation systems, and the need to follow through with rural priorities. The vote on the \$250 million going to the I-25 North project was cited as a key example of major money flowing to the urban areas.
- Commissioner Connell noted that in Northwest Colorado stakeholders thought making a list of priorities was enough to make things happen. Planning to attend a four hour meeting next Thursday, where our TPR will work on getting projects shovel ready. Rural areas need to get folks involved more to accomplish projects. The RAMP program was audited, but RAMP was the biggest of unique ideas to handle cash to get projects completed. We need to do more of shovel readying, and I-25 and I-70 are important too. However, rural roads are a safety concern with condition. We can't forgot the rural areas, and thank you to CDOT STAC and staff for their hard work and support.

Statewide Travel Model – Erik Sabina

Details

CDOT's statewide travel model is now operational, and tested against real world data to ensure accuracy (for example, comparing its estimates of roadway volume against CDOT traffic counts.) We have simulated a number of scenarios depicting the years 2010, 2015, 2030 and 2045. We are preparing the model for use on several key projects, including the Statewide Transportation Plan and the Front Range Rail corridor study. A few highlights of its results:

- Total vehicle miles (cars/trucks) driven in the state was 131 million in 2015, and is projected to be 178 million in 2030 and 211 million in 2045 (this growth driven heavily by growth of population and jobs in the state.)
- The 2030 and 2045 scenarios are no-build. Build scenarios could show somewhat higher VMT.
- North I-25 travel time highlights:
 - An I-25 travel time analysis was done for the 2011 North I-25 EIS that showed AM peak hour travel time from
 - Wellington (north of Fort Collins) to 20th Street @ I-25 in downtown Denver **for the year 2004 at 66 minutes;**
 - The travel model estimates that in **2015** (prior to any managed lane development) **that the same trip took 86 minutes;**
 - Our model estimates that in **2030**, with no improvements beyond the 2015 network (a "no build" analysis), **the same trip would take 141 minutes;**
 - In **2045**, a "no build" analysis estimates **this trip would take 196 minutes.**
- Note that CDOT has already built more than what is included in this no-build analysis, particularly the managed lane between US-36 and 120th Avenue, and has more highway improvements programmed. We are creating a 2030 "Build" scenario, which will show these effects.

Discussion:

- Erik Sabina, CDOT Information Management Branch Manager noted that this new statewide travel model at CDOT is one of the most detailed state travel models.

- Households and jobs are depicted and mapped at individual addresses, mechanics of system, revenue on transit and managed lanes, travel times. Try to determine how people make transportation trip/tour decisions.
- Information came from survey in 2010 for Front Range Area. A 2020 Survey for the whole state is planned.
- The travel model computes a travel diary for each person.
- Many planning scenarios have been run within the model.
- Will continue to improve and enhance this model as it is new. Can do Transit demand, toll effects, non-motorized demand (bike and pedestrians).
- Working with MPOs on their models too, and CDOT is assuming their model information for their MPO areas.
- Commissioner Gilliland asked if the model could estimate the amount of truck traffic off of I-25 to SH 71 if SH 71 had improvements to accommodate trucks.
- Erik answered yes. Commissioner Gilliland can tell team to check-in with Erik.
- Erik noted that all requests for model runs can go to him.
- Commissioner Stuart noted the issue for local governments is what actually happens vs. what is projected to happen. The model is only as good as data that is installed. Eventually the desire would be to get models to do runs in real time.
- Erik Sabina commented that it is a continuous process to play catch-up, e.g., including electric scooters into the mode types.

Risk and Planning Process— Rebecca White and William Johnson

Under direction of Director Lew, staff have brought a number of risk and resiliency efforts together into one illustrative process that will be integrated in the Transportation Asset Management (TAM) program and asset management plan. The process includes:

1. Criticality analysis

- Adopted from the I-70 Corridor Risk & Resilience Pilot, the criticality score reflects Average Annual Daily Traffic, roadway classification, freight, tourism, a Social Vulnerability Index, and system redundancy.
- Used as an input within CDOT's asset model—the Asset Investment Management System—to provide information used in project selection and prioritization.

2. Database of damaged assets

- Extend the analysis of damaged assets to all CDOT TAM asset classes for all mainline highways.
- Staff performed a historical analysis of damaged assets that included Emergency Response events and other, more frequent, risk events.

3. Risk Register

- Developed to be scalable from the agency level to the project or asset level. The register included in the asset management plan will include enterprise and programmatic risks that affect all asset classes.
- Provides a tool to document and store information on risk events, risk likelihood, direct consequences, and vulnerability.
- Supports the vulnerability assessment calculation developed from the I-70 Corridor Risk & Resilience Pilot, where Risk (score) = Consequences X Vulnerability X Threat.

4. Framework for analyzing reasonable alternative strategies to address specific risks

- The process supports the development of reasonable alternative strategies to manage risks and provides information that can be used to invest in lowering CDOT risks.
- The risk register is used to analyze the change in vulnerability from different approaches to replacing damaged assets, and provides a framework for staff to compare benefit/cost of those strategies.

The TAMP will also include information to achieve minimum FHWA requirements besides risk and resilience, which include:

1. Summary listing of NHS pavement and bridge assets, including a description of asset condition

2. Asset management measures and state DOT targets for asset condition—as adopted by the TC in April 2018
3. Performance gap analysis
4. Life-cycle planning
5. Risk analysis, including summaries of evaluations of assets damaged more than once in emergency events
6. Financial plan
7. Investment strategies

Discussion:

- Commissioner Connell noted that we need this damage data for assets in rural areas.
- William Johnson responded that we do infrastructure condition assessment every year continuously.
- The TAMP requires us to do a Risk Register for each asset.
- Concept is to develop reasonable alternative strategies to harden facilities. TAMP plan is due in June to submit to FHWA.

Formula Programs and Program Distribution– Rebecca White and Tim Kirby

Staff proposes that the Commission move forward with recommendations for Metro Planning Program (Metro-PL), Surface Transportation – Metro (STP-Metro), and Transportation Alternative Program (TAP) as agreed to by the Statewide Plan

Committee at its February 2019 meeting:

- Metro Planning (Metro–PL):
 - Statewide Plan Committee Recommendation: Use current formula and apply growth rate to minimum floor Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) of 3% and hold constant; Revisit during the next round of Program Distribution.
 - Proposed Formula: Distribution based on population of MPO with a minimum dollar base of \$340K to Grand Valley MPO and \$360K to PACOG.
- Surface Transportation Metro (STP-Metro):
 - Statewide Plan Committee Recommendation: Maintain current STP Metro formula.
 - Proposed Formula: Funds to be sub-allocated to MPOs that are Transportation Management Areas (TMAs) on the basis of population of the TMA Urbanized Areas (UZAs).
- Transportation Alternative Program (TAP):
 - Statewide Plan Committee Recommendation: Maintain current TAP formula.
 - Proposed Formula:
 - For the 50% of funding can be spent anywhere in state us a distribution formula of 45% vehicle miles traveled (congestion), 40% lane miles (extent of the system), and 15% truck vehicle miles traveled (economic vitality).
 - For the 50% of funding allocated based on population, 50% of funding allocated based on population to be spent in TMAs based on UZA population and 50% of funding allocated to non-TMA areas of CDOT regions based on population.

Next Steps

- Adoption of the remaining Statewide Plan Formula Programs at the conclusion of the planning process.

Discussion:

- Commissioner Connell commented that in many instances larger communities get too much money and we should revisit historic calculations. Just give this some thought.
- Commissioner Stuart explained that the distribution based on population is federally mandated for programs and CDOT does not decide.
- For the Transportation Alternative Program the discretionary 50% of funds used a historic Regional Priority Program (RPP) formula.

- Commissioner Scott asked if the formulas reflect CDOT's Investment strategy.
- Program Distribution is calculated for all CDOT Programs.
- TC has discretion for a few of the programs.
- Commissioner Stuart reminded Committee members and Commission members that the TC already agreed to these.
- Rebecca White explained we are asking for an approval of these three programs only, and that were these three were already approved by TC at previous workshop.
- Use input from the current planning process occurring this summer for the remaining, RPP, CMAQ, and FASTER Safety program in developing proposed distribution formulas.
- The three program formulas approved now, will be effective July 1, 2019.

CDOT Contingency Liability Associated with the Enterprises (Jeff Sudmeier and Nick Farber)

Purpose: The purpose of this workshop is to respond to a TC request for a contingent liability analysis as it relates to the High Performance Transportation Enterprise (HPTE) and Bridge Enterprise (BE), jointly referred to as the Enterprises.

Action: No TC action is being requested and the purpose of this item is informational only.

Discussion:

- This workshop is in response to a TC request to more fully understand liability for CDOT backstop to Enterprise debt.
- A presentation highlighting CDOT, HPTE and BE debt service was discussed.
- The key question to understand is what makes a CDOT backstop contingent liability for HPTE a true liability for CDOT.
 - BE gets its money from vehicle registration. If vehicle registrations were to decrease significantly, they potentially could cause CDOT liability
 - Overall, HPTE possesses more risk for a CDOT liability than the BE revenues do
 - If an economic decline occurs where less revenue goes to HPTE than CDOT would have a true liability.
 - HPTE has benefited from CDOT signing for lower interest loans.
 - HPTE has evaluated their debt services and trends with revenues and believes it can withstand a 10% decline in revenue can still cover itself out to 2026, without needing a backstop loan from CDOT.
- Kathy Young explained that a loan from CDOT to HPTE is not a TABOR violation. Same is true for BE. Nick Farber, Interim HPTE Director, noted that a backstop for US 36, HPTE needed CDOT backstop and other deals started, to obtain better loan interest rates.
- As the toll express network grows, under HPTE in state statute, HPTE is allowed to expend surface transportation integrated with project. It is anticipated no further backstop requirements are needed. HPTE will get network credits, and eventually all financing will be under HPTE alone by 2026.

Transit and Intermodal (T&I) Committee (David Krutsinger)

Committee Attendees: All were present.

- Introductions / Overview / T & I Minutes approval (March 2019) – Minutes were approved.
- SB 267 / Overview of Two Proposed Projects - Sharon Terranova, Division of Transit and Rail (DTR) Planning Manager described the components of these two projects
 - **Troy Hill Bus Storage Facility** that will have 10 (7 for existing buses and 3 for the future) bus bays, be climate controlled, and be a facility for Bustang buses joined with the CDOT Region 2 vehicle storage facility. The design for this project has been funded, DTR is looking for construction funding working with Region 2. This project will also include providing a light maintenance facility

- where buses can be washed in their bays. Hail damage from being left out in the element and security issues, e.g. a battery theft, will no longer be concerns with this indoor facility having protection from the weather and being secured. Other benefits include the capability to service toilets on site (reducing service costs) and a decrease in non-revenue service, with buses being closer into their service area routes. Funding request for this project is \$3 million.
- **I-25/SH 56 Berthoud Transit Station** – This project replaces the existing carpool lot, as was recommended by The North I-25 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), would increase mobility throughout the Front Range Corridor, would allow I-25 North segment 6 to begin construction in spring 2020. Funding request for this project is \$0.7 million.
 - Commissioner Hall asked if there would be an underground tunnel for this project.
 - The design that is anticipated plans to use SH 56, and will not need a tunnel or elevator.
 - Commissioner Peterson supported this effort and noted it is important to piggy-back and leverage funds as these projects do.
 - Commissioner Stuart likes this idea a lot with the stop located in the center of the roadway, as along– I-25 between 84th and 88th – currently buses must cross over multiple lanes to get from left HOV lane to Park-n-rides on the right side of the roadway.
 - Commissioner Thiebaut motioned to approve these two proposals go to TC for approval tomorrow. The Committee passed this motion to move forward.
- **SB 228 Transfer of \$2.5 million for Bus Replacement Fund**
 - DTR staff is requesting a delay for proposed fare increase, and include fare increases later in the Bustang expansion program instead.
 - Requesting \$2.5 million for fleet replacement costs for two years.
 - Commissioner Thiebaut asked about projects identified for year two SB 267 projects – Pueblo Park-n-Ride. What other projects?
 - David Krutsinger, DTR Director, will bring a project list by end of this year after planning process is complete and input from stakeholders is considered.
 - Commissioner Gilliland supports this funding.
 - The T&I Committee agreed to move the request to the full TC to approve a \$2.5 million fleet preservation fund for Bustang.
 - **T&I Informational Items were presented by David Krutsinger**
 - **SB 18-001 Multi Modal Options Fund (MMOF)**
 - Ann Rajewski of CASTA is here to answer questions of MMOF Committee recommendations, as she is a committee member. The Committee convened three times.
 - MMOF Committee recommendations included:
 - 5% off the top (or \$4 Million of \$80.12) for administration, reporting, environmental/design reviews. To be adjusted later based on actual project selection.
 - 81% of remaining \$76.12 to the five urban areas (MPOs), 19% to the ten rural planning regions (TPRs)
 - Two sub-allocation formulas, one urban, and the other rural, to each of the fifteen areas of the state, with particular population and employment factors relevant to urban and rural areas.
 - Match “relief” or reduction to be decided at the fifteen regions (TPRs) of the state. CDOT provided data to support that decision-making.
 - General expectation that minimum transit project size of \$25,000, and minimum capital project size of \$150,000 would be observed for project selections, with reasonable bundling of smaller projects encouraged to reach these minimums
 - Commissioner Hall noted that transit is important in rural areas; people are aging and getting folks to medical services is important; Bustang service- people are using this.

- Need transit resources in outlying areas. Urban areas think rural areas don't need transit, but we do.
 - Access for veterans to health care, such as Veteran Administration (VA) facilities and other resources in context of transit is an important consideration.
 - Commissioner Thiebaut requested more information on match relief recommendations. Asked to explain it a bit more. David explained data was given to TPRs to determine match relief based on population and economic risk factors. TPRs then decide match relief for a project.
 - Commissioner Peterson noted that this puts the onus on locals submitting projects. He supports this concept.
 - Commissioner Thiebaut wanted to know if a community has recourse if they are denied funding, or if they have an appeal process.
 - David Krutsinger noted that CDOT has an existing appeal process that TPRs could use.
 - Rebecca White explained that the next steps are a staff recommendation going to the TC next month, and will ask the TC to move forward from there.
- Bustang Expansion Concept
 - DTR is starting to explore options, and developed a rough preliminary list of potential projects and "back of the envelope" project cost estimates
 - These projects still need funding sources identified for them
 - Commissioner Hall asked about the need for a Cheyenne to Fort Collins service. Johnny Olson explained that many veterans go to the VA facilities in Cheyenne.
 - Commissioner Scott asked about establishing criteria for these projects and when will DTR come back to TC with more details.
 - David Krutsinger commented that DTR will come back over the summer and is doing a similar exercise for Outrider service too.
 - Commissioner Peterson feels that this list is almost too premature to present
 - Commissioner Gilliland – partnerships with ski areas – for Snow Bus – need to define partnerships as benefactors – see if they can contribute funds to implement these.
 - Bustang and its success makes this more attractive to potential partners.
 - Commissioner Connell mentioned that communities like Steamboat Springs usually raise taxes to get funding for community transit projects.
- Bustang Quarterly Report – overall, Bustang is doing very well
 - Fare box recovery is very high at 64%
 - Ridership is up over 30%
- Outrider Quarterly report indicated that all is holding steady. We tripled ridership with Colorado Springs connection established to Lamar.
- Commissioner Peterson noted that the workforce development program is linked to this with need for skilled drivers.
- Transit Grants Quarterly Report & RFP Update – remains strong – program doing well
- Rail Commission updated reported that the Request for Proposal (RFP) with a blended team approach to retain a consultant to develop a rail service plan and a NEPA document will be released soon with a Notice to Proceed expected in August 2019.

Transportation Commission Regular Meeting

Thursday, May 16, 2019, 9:30 am – 11:30 am

Audience Participation

- Harry Camp, representing property owners along SH 149 south of Lake City, asked the TC to delay action on a pilot project on off-highway vehicle use of a state highway until after a municipal election in July that will have a ballot issue on the issue. (See the notes near the bottom of this document.)

Call to Order, Roll Call:

All were present.

Comments of Individual Commissioners

- Commissioner Kathy Hall – Thanked CDOT workers for their work on avalanches over the winter, and Regional Transportation Director Mike Goolsby of Region 5 and his staff for their cooperation with locals. She attended the ribbon-cutting at the Visitor Center in Fruita for installation of a Welcome to Colorado sign. The event was a cooperative effort of CDOT, CDOT’s Scenic Byways program, and the Office of Tourism, part of the Office of Economic Development and International Trade. Dinosaur Diamond, a 512-mile byway route in Colorado and Utah, will be mentioned in a CBS Sunday Morning program this coming Sunday.
- Commissioner Sydney Zink – She attended a ground-breaking for construction of passing lanes between Cortez and Towaoc on US 160 that is a cooperative effort with the Ute Mountain Ute tribal government and CDOT. During the groundbreaking, a number of freight trucks drove by, perfectly illustrating the need for passing lanes. She also attended a San Luis Valley Transportation Planning Region (TPR) meeting, and said those TPR meetings are drawing more attendance.
- Commissioner Kathy Gilliland - She visited I-70 Central for the first time since the official kick-off, and said people would be amazed at what’s happening there. Much of the work is behind the scenes, such as working with the local community, but you can see some of the work underneath the viaduct and near the Stock Show. She attended a meeting on SH 71, which is being proposed as an alternative route for truckers wishing to avoid I-25 and continue north on the Ports to Plains combination of routes.
- Commissioner Karen Stuart – She’s looking forward to participating in the kick-off of the statewide planning process. DRCOG at its annual awards ceremony recognized Don Hunt and Mike Lewis, the previous CDOT executive directors, for their contributions to transportation in the state. She sat on a panel for the Citizens Planning Academy, which DRCOG, CDOT, and Regional Transportation District have absorbed from another organization. The topic was multimodal transportation. Discussions also have been taking place about legislation that would permit metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) to form regional transportation authorities, as more rural areas of the state can do today. The MPOs could use a sales tax to fund projects. The TC should keep an eye on that proposed legislation. She asked what happens to the rest of the state if Front Range MPOs form their own RTAs.
- Commissioner Kathy Connell – She’s looking forward to the Northwest TPR meeting.
- Commissioner Steven Hofmeister – No comment.
- Commissioner Ed Peterson – CDOT is working with Lakewood on improving an intersection leading to Bear Creek Lake State Park to make the park more accessible. The hard-working CDOT staff, after a hard winter, need a well-deserved breather. Let’s hope Colorado has no serious rock falls and or wildfires this summer.
- Commissioner Rocky Scott – No comment.
- Commissioner Bill Thiebaut – Commented that the homeless man who ran to the aid of those involved in the horrible crash on I-70 near the Denver West exit should be commended. We need to remember how transportation has life or death consequences.
- Commissioner Shannon Gifford – She has been very active with the new planning process, and is looking forward to the official kick-off tomorrow of the new planning process.

Executive Director’s Report (Shoshana Lew)

- Absent – attending a meeting in Washington, D.C.

Chief Engineer’s Report (Josh Laipply)

- On May 7, a national organization recognized quite a few projects as outstanding. Following up on the Public Recognition Week, he said it was amazing how quickly CDOT staff were able to get traffic moving again on I-70 after the horrible accident involving trucks and vehicles. From inspecting the highway and ramps for structural damage, repairing the damage, to opening the interstate to traffic took a mere 6 hours and 15 minutes.

High Performance Transportation Enterprise (HPTE) Director’s Report (Nick Farber)

- HPTC canceled its board meeting because many of the staff members were presenting at a meeting on public-private partnerships (3P) in Denver that the U.S. Department of Commerce organized. The 3P meeting attracted an international audience. In addition, he and staff member Piper Darlington will meet with the Denver Broncos staff about improvements to the Federal-Colfax intersection.
- Much of what is happening with the Central 70 project is not visible. Central 70 has a local hire program, and local workers have already put in 100,000 hours of work. Over 20 percent of the work force for the project is local. On-the-job training also is taking place for 60 approved apprentices; those workers have already put in 13,000 hours.

FHWA Report (John Cater)

- FHWA and CDOT took a hard look at its processes to find ways to be more efficient. The result is that FHWA will defer to CDOT for a majority of oversight for projects, and take a smaller role in the project approval process.

Statewide Transportation Advisory Committee (STAC) Report (STAC Chair, Vince Rogalski)

- The MPOs are concerned that CDOT has not released its formula fund distribution, and recommended that CDOT act on the three formulas prescribed by federal law: Transportation Alternatives, Surface Transportation – Metro, and Metro Planning.
- Legislators have decided to postpone the ballot issue to 2020 rather than this year.
- Some STAC members questioned why CDOT headquarters is directing Central 70 rather than Region 1.
- CDOT is still searching for a new Regional Transportation Director for Region 4.
- The planning reset will focus on transportation needs and priorities rather than funding shortfalls. The STAC discussed the most appropriate data to launch those discussions. Some STAC members sought clarification about how the 5th through the 10th year of the pipeline of projects will be fiscally constrained. The money local governments bring to the table historically changes project prioritization.
- On the Web survey tool, STAC members want CDOT to clarify which issues are state level and which are local level.
- The county meetings have been going very well. In his county, Gunnison, the focus was on safety issues on US 285 outside the county.
- The STAC decided that it did not need to take formal action on accepting recommendations on the Multimodal Options Fund since STAC has three representatives on the committee recommending distribution formulas.

Act on Consent Agenda – Passed on May 16, 2019. Commissioner Thiebaut abstained from voting on four matters that he asked to have separated from the consent agenda because they are in his District 10, and he believes he has a conflict of interest.

- a) Resolution to Approve the Regular Meeting Minutes of April 18, 2019 (Herman Stockinger)
- b) Resolution to Approve FY 20 Maintenance Request (Kyle Lester)
- c) Resolution to Approve STIP Policy Amendment (Jeff Sudmeier)
- d) Resolution to Approve 267 Projects (David Krutsinger)
- e) Resolution to Approve 228 Project (David Krutsinger)
- f) Resolution to Approve ROW Acquisition and Settlement Authorization Requests (Josh Laipply)

Discuss and Act on ROW Condemnation Requests (Josh Laipply) – Passed unanimously on May 16, 2019

- Central 70 condemnation, 45th and Steele, ramp on I-70. Steven Mann, brother of the property owner, said his brother wants to work with the state. He said his brother has these concerns about the condemnation: what is meant by 350 square feet “more or less”; why past offers from CDOT were not included in the current offer; and the lack of appraisals to determine the current property values. Property values are higher because they’re along I-70.
- Commissioner Gifford said a vote by the TC to condemn does not mean that CDOT will undertake condemnation.

Discuss and Act on 11th Budget Supplement of FY 2019 (Jeff Sudmeier –Passed on May 16, 2019, with nine yeses and one no

The three budgetary supplement items were:

- Region 1 - \$14.572 million for surface treatment and Regional Priority Program for I-70 Westbound Peak Period to allow Region 1 to award the project to the lowest bidder.
- Region 4 - \$2 million for a transfer from HQ to Region for an Advanced Transportation and Congestion Mitigation Deployment Technologies grant for the Wolf Creek West Fiber project. Region 5 must contribute half in matching funds.
- HPT E - \$5.3 million in Transportation Commission Program Reserve to bring the assets for the US 36 initial work to minimum standard of maintenance per an agreement with Plenary Roads of Denver. CDOT wasn’t able to finish due to budgetary constraints.

Discuss and Act on Program Distribution Allocation Methodologies - materials in SWP –Passed unanimously on May 16, 2019.

Discussion:

- No discussion about the proposal to act on these three formula programs: Metro Planning, Surface Transportation Metro, and Transportation Alternative Program.

Discuss and Act on Resolution to Amend TC RES 08 07 17 – OHV use/pilot Program (Mike Goolsby) – Agreed on May 16, 2019 to defer action until the August Transportation Commission.

- The off-highway vehicle pilot program will be on the ballot in the municipal July election.
- Commissioner Zink said she thought Hinsdale County and Lake City supported the pilot program, but said it would be wise to await the outcome of the ballot issue.
- Commissioner Connell agreed that tabling the issue until August would be the best course.

Discuss and Act on Status of North I-25 \$250 million (Josh Laipply) –Passed resolution on May 16, 2019, with eight yeses and two nos.

Dave Clark of the Loveland City Council and Anne Hutchinson of the Business Alliance both supported the allocation of funds for North I-25.

- Commissioner Thiebaut said he revised the resolution to get things moving, and his suggested changes were reviewed at an open breakfast meeting that morning.
- His changes (not in the TC packet) provides some protection to rural areas if a similar type of project is approved for an urban area in the future. The resolution seeks up to \$250-\$310 million for a permanent alignment for Segments 7 and 8.
- Commissioner Stuart thanked Thiebaut for his mark-up of the resolution, but said she intends to vote against it because the resolution provides for a significant increase. She said the same argument that it’s better to spend money to avoid spending more in the future could be applied to other projects too.
- Commissioner Hofmeister said he would also vote no, and he urged all representatives of rural areas to do the same. He said he doesn’t understand why the rural areas need to take a backseat to urban projects. It’s not fair to rural areas to have rural projects continually pushed back, and cited in particular the reliever route for Lamar.

- Commissioner Gilliland said the North I-25 project arose out of the planning process. It has been under discussion since the late 1990s.
- Commissioner Scott said that when dealing with the scarcity of funds, he looks for projects that have the greatest return on investment. Spending the money now could save \$100 million later.
- Although she represents a rural area, Commissioner Connell said she supported the revised resolution because it provides protections for rural projects in the future. She said she receives about four notifications a day about incidents on I-25, and said the project should make that stretch of highway safer.
- Commissioner Peterson said all parts of Colorado benefit or suffer from TC actions. This is no small investment. He will support it because of its multimodal transportation aspects along Front Range, and finishes a vital project.
- Commissioner Hall said she will support the revised resolution, and recognizes that it's a lot of money going to that part of the state. As a rural commissioner, she said it is hard for her to see money not going to rural areas. She added that she hopes the TC will support work on improving the safety of West I-70.
- Commissioner Thiebaut predicted that requests for more money for I-25 will not stop. More and more money will be needed.

Recognitions:

Public Relations Society of America Colorado Gold Pick Awards • Colorado Contractors Association Awards to follow BE meeting

Other Matters:

Appointment of Nominating Committee for Transportation Commission Chair, Vice-Chair and Secretary for FY '20 (Chairwoman Gifford)

- Commissioner Gifford reported that she has appointed Commissioners Zink, Hofmeister, and Hall to the Nominating Committee to appoint a chair, vice chair, and secretary for FY 2020.