

**DRAFT STAC Meeting Minutes**  
**March 15, 2013**

**Location:** CDOT Headquarters Auditorium

**Date/Time:** March 15, 2013 9:00 a.m. – 12:00

**Chairman:** Vince Rogalski

**Attendance:** Sign-in sheets were distributed to note attendance at the meeting.

<b>Agenda Items/Presenters/ Affiliations</b>	<b>Presentation Highlights</b>	<b>Actions</b>
Introductions/February Minutes/Vince Rogalski/STAC Chair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minutes were approved without changes.</li> </ul>	<b>Minutes approved.</b>
Transportation Commission (TC) Report/Vince Rogalski/STAC Chair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Transportation Commission reviewed a draft MOU between the High Performance Transportation Enterprise (HPTE) and CDOT, creating an Office of Major Project Development, and approved the list of Transit awards for FY '14 and FY '15. It held a public hearing about Apportionment Rules governing the administration of tolls. Starting in 2017, Tolled Express Lanes will require 3 people, instead of 2 to travel without toll.</li> <li>The Commission also discussed what dollars might be available to move forward under the RAMP program, and chose to place higher emphasis on maintenance and lesser emphasis on partnerships, so, of the \$ 300 M available, \$ 175 M will be allocated to Maintenance, while the remaining \$ 125 will be available for the Partnership Program, both Public-Public, and Public-Private. RAMP Pre-Applications are available now, and are due by May 1st. Based on the Pre-Application, projects deemed eligible will require completion of detailed applications, due July 1<sup>st</sup>.</li> <li>The Commission's Subcommittee for the Statewide Plan is looking at safety goals and objectives for all modes, emphasizing Education, Engineering, Emergency Response, and Enforcement. The fatality rate is calculated per hundred million vehicle miles traveled (VMT), but the question was raised as to whether this is best, since, as VMT grows, the rate can decrease, although more fatalities may actually be occurring. MAP-21 requires measurement of not only the fatality rate, but also serious injuries, so the Committee will determine how this will fit into its Policy Directive (PD) 14, which sets direction for the Plan.</li> <li>The Asset Management Program is also moving toward the performance</li> </ul>	No action taken.

	<p>measures required in MAP-21, which also requires a “Risk-Based” Asset Management Plan, which will direct us toward fixing what needs to be fixed first, in order to deal with scarce resources. To do this, the Commission is looking at “High Maintenance Areas” vs. “Low Maintenance Areas”.</p>	
<p>Federal and State Legislative Update/ Kurt Morrison/CDOT Office of Policy &amp; Government Relations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is day 66 of the legislative session and 520 bills have been introduced to date. CDOT is tracking 70-80 bills including two bills introduced by CDOT. SB 203 bars CDOT’s ability to put any commercial establishments in the ROW. HB 1252 increases settlement funds coming from current lawsuits. AFLCIO is seeking an overhaul of CDOT’s contracting processes, changing the current bidding process to best value. CDOT is evaluating to determine whether this will result in an increase or decrease in costs.</li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>
<p>Federal Lands Access Program/Scott McDaniel/CDOT Staff Branches/Allen Grasmick/Central Federal Lands</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MAP-21 created this new program, intended for roads that are owned or maintained by state or local county governments but access federal property. A 17.21% local match is required. The application is available on CDOT’s website, along with schedules, a project proposal form and project evaluation criteria, a completed sample application, and contacts.</li> <li>The Programming Decision Committee (PDC) – of which STAC’s Thad Noll is a member – is refining selection criteria. CDOT can be an applicant. The deadline for applications is May 15<sup>th</sup>. The hope is that when that application is put in, it is already cleared with the applicants’ committees. As the program is so new, the committee would like to see the type of applications it receives prior to determining the best application cycle. The PDC will put together a short list of projects based on applications.</li> <li>We’re really looking for a coalition...you can also reach out to others to bring in additional funding. For example, you can take funding from a business for a section of road that provides access to that business. Military facilities are eligible and the best approach would be to partner with Defense Access Roads for a really good project. In the past, we’ve seen that the most successful applications have been jointly prepared by partnering applicants.</li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>
<p>MAP-21 Funding Programs/Sandi Kohrs/CDOT Division of Transportation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MAP-21 is a two year bill. There will be time for additional conversations for FY ’15. The STAC approved a motion recommending the following to the Transportation Commission: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP)- Recognizing that the</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>Motion Approved.</b></p>

Development (DTD)	<p>dollar amount for the program is less than what was previously allocated to any of the individual programs now encompassed in TAP, STAC's recommendation was to accept an offer from DRCOG to take less TAP funds (in exchange for additional CMAQ funds) and to keep all other areas whole to the level of FY 14 Transportation Enhancements (TE) in Resource Allocation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o CMAQ- Under MAP-21, a new provision allows funding CNG or electric vehicle recharging stations. STAC recommended that funds above FY 14 Resource Allocation be held back pending further discussions with the Colorado Energy Office on a statewide CNG program. Funds up to the level in the FY 14 Resource Allocation will be allocated among recipients as indicated in Resource Allocation. This approach was agreed to by the Front Range CMAQ recipients in previous discussions.</li> <li>o Surface Transportation - STP-Metro - sub allocations are based on the population in urbanized areas over 200,000. The allocations are barely over Resource Allocation figures. STAC recommended distributing STP-Metro in FY 14 pursuant to past practice on the basis of the population of urbanized areas over 200,000.</li> </ul>	
RAMP Update/Debra Perkins-Smith/CDOT DTD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RAMP information, including a schedule, criteria, and FAQs is now available on the CDOT website.</li> <li>• Debra stated that RAMP is not new money - this is not an infusion of cash, or a new revenue source – it's a different management method for the funds we have. MAP-21 requires allocating funds according to performance. The idea under the RAMP Program is to do a statewide evaluation of needs. Vince added that "critical need" is determined by the actual condition of the asset. If the road is drivable, a project may not happen for a while. If design is not ready, a project cannot be advanced – it's not being pushed back, but it's not being pushed forward. Within the Partnership Program there are public-public partnerships and public-private partnerships. For partnerships, selection will depend on an evaluation of applications. The Partnership Program requires a target 20% match.</li> <li>• There is about \$ 10 M for operational improvements which you can apply for as well. Operations does not require a match. We have not looked at advancing funds to local agency projects. Special considerations, such as whether a proposal receives credit for money already spent in design, will</li> </ul>	No action taken.

	<p>be considered in the Pre-Application process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Debra explained that CDOT wanted to do a 2-step process, starting with a Pre-Application and, if the proposal is deemed appropriate, a Detailed Application. Pre-Applications will give us information on the projects that you're considering. Pre-Applications will be submitted to the regions unless you're working directly with HPTE or the Operations Division. On May 1st, the Regions will review the Pre-Applications to see if proposed projects are eligible. If Pre-Application is successful, detailed applications are due July 1st.</li><li>• We will want to know whether the proposed project may be completed by 2017. The intent of the program is not to fund a project already slated for funding. We plan to have a list of STIP projects that can be accelerated for you in April. We're also working on a list of projects for surface treatment.</li><li>• STAC members expressed concerns about regional needs being neglected, and asked that regional needs and priorities be considered.</li><li>• There was concern that rural Colorado will be at a disadvantage for the funding match - ability to pay may not align with the criticality of a project - but that's one of the reasons matching with federal funds is not allowed, as the TPRs do not have access to these funds. Communities wishing to propose a project need not have their required funds "in hand" by May 1st, but must be able to demonstrate where it would come from.</li><li>• Barbara Kirkmeyer stated she'd hate to see emphasis on projects that are over-matched, because there are critical needs in areas that can't afford a match. Deb responded that the Commission has recognized this. The use of federal funds for match is excluded, as these are not available to the TPRs. However, other "in-kind" items may be used as match, such as right-of-way, materials, etc. These would need to be approved by the Commission.</li><li>• Members asked for clarification on "projects integrated with the system", and Debra said that the idea is to have discussion on that. Definitions/examples for "legitimate" and "critical" can be found in the application.</li><li>• Steve Rudy cautioned the Commission against making five years of</li></ul>	
--	---	--

	commitments this year, as there is still so much to be learned.	
FY 14 Final Budget/Pat Saffo/CDOT Office of Financial Management & Budget (OFMB)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Since last month, an additional \$7.2 M has been moved to Maintenance. The Commission is not anticipated to approve the Budget this month; however, with such minor changes, they might do so. In that case, it would be helpful to have STAC's recommendation. Going forward, both "Indirects" and "Construction Engineering (CE) will be called out separately.</li> <li>• Motion for STAC approval of the FY '14 Final Budget was approved unanimously.</li> </ul>	<b>Motion approved.</b>
Revenue Projections/Pat Saffo/CDOT OFMB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Transportation Commission asked for an additional scenario, to include the Congressional Budget Office projections after 2020, which came with the CAFE standards document, illustrated by the orange line on the handout. Staff recommendation is to use Scenario 4 with SB 228 added, which won't completely make up for the reductions, but it will significantly mitigate them. This projection is still less than 2035 Resource Allocation – these numbers are less than what we had to work with in the last plan.</li> <li>• Steve Rudy recommended STAC concur with the inclusion of SB 228, noting that if it is not shown, CDOT will most certainly not receive it. Vince agreed, noting that, for now, SB 228 is in law, and our policy has always been to do what's in current law. Furthermore, if it is included, and then later taken away, it is easier to illustrate just what is being lost.</li> <li>• The more constrained, the less there is to put into a fiscally constrained plan, making it difficult to show what we'd do if we did have more. The Commission wants this to be realistic, so have above-the-line projects identified. We want to allow for the conversation on what would be priorities if additional funding becomes available. Colorado is predicted to have more HUTF than the national average. Rob Mac Donald added that the Commission is starting to lock itself in in the outer years, and, since STAC will be re-visiting this in a few years, PPACG can support this motion. Motion passes unanimously.</li> </ul>	Motion approved.
Public Participation Guide/Michelle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A 45-day public review and comment period is required by MAP-21. Please provide comments by April 1. After we've incorporated your comments,</li> </ul>	No action taken.

Scheuerman/CDOT DTD	we will forward to FHWA. This does not take the place of public involvement for the statewide plan. This is comment on the public involvement plan itself.	
Statewide Transportation Plan/Michelle Scheuerman/CDOT DTD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A Six-Month Strategic Roadmap has been prepared to guide planning activities for the next six months - including a table indicating Key Elements - and has been sent to STAC members. CDOT would like feedback from STAC. Stakeholder conversations will begin this summer.</li> </ul>	No action taken.
State Freight Plan/Jason Wallis/CDOT DTD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The State Freight Plan is independent from the Statewide Transportation Plan (SWP), but it is being prepared at the same time, and recommendations from the Freight Plan will be rolled into the SWP, as will the other modal plans. The Freight Advisory Committee (FAC) will meet in May, and, in June and July the Freight team will attend the same meetings being held for the SWP, as Freight will be included in the discussions. We'll gather what we learn from the TPRs, and bring it back to the Advisory Committee.</li> <li>The Freight Plan will address the MAP-21 requirements and the National Goals for Freight, freight infrastructure, freight traffic, connectivity, environmental issues, and other safety characteristics related to movement, as well as CDOT policies and strategies. It will take more of an economic approach to this process, looking at freight bottlenecks, and other issues. The FAC will be charged with reviewing our data, and providing additional information that they may have from their industries, and identify ways to keep the industry involved in the planning process.</li> </ul>	No action taken.
Regional Commuter Bus Plan/Mark Imhoff/CDOT Division of Transit& Rail (DTR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CDOT is looking to implement a basic system of express regional commuter bus (RCB) service along the I-25 Front Range and I-70 Mountain corridors, to provide an integrated transportation system, improve mobility, and increase modal choice. RCB plan development began this January, and we hope to take to the Commission this summer for approval. The Commission will serve as the governing body of the RCB system, and, with their approval, we'll begin a series of public meetings and branding efforts. Stakeholder outreach will include STAC briefings.</li> <li>There is a TRAC subcommittee, expanded to include all of the transit</li> </ul>	

	<p>agencies that would be linked throughout the two corridors. They'll help with maintenance and bus specifications. We are recommending diesel over the road coaches. There is a push to use Compressed Natural Gas (CNG), but CNG requires fairly significant maintenance facilities, with costs that may not be feasible for our budget. It appears that a fleet of 14 vehicles is optimal. We're developing draft maintenance strategies, ticketing policy, fare structures, marketing &amp; branding, customer service. We will need Inter-Governmental Agreements (IGAs) with various entities along the routes, and then begin contracting for operation and maintenance of the service. The RCB Plan will utilize a portion of FASTER Transit funding to sustain operations and maintenance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We don't have the demand forecasts yet, but we will have a fixed budget to work with, so it's important we keep to high ridership segments. We're developing draft operating budgets, as well as a finance plan, and an ongoing Intercity and Regional Bus Study is looking hard at startup system and making recommendations on how we would expend in the future if we had additional revenue.</li> </ul>	
Other Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None.</li> </ul>	No action taken.