

DRAFT STAC Meeting Minutes
January 11, 2013

Location: CDOT Headquarters Auditorium

Date/Time: January 11, 2013 9:00 a.m. – 11:30

Chairman: Vince Rogalski

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

| Agenda Items/Presenters/Affiliations | Presentation Highlights | Actions |
|--|--|------------------------------------|
| Introductions/December Minutes/Vince Rogalski/STAC Chair | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minutes were approved without changes. | Action- Approve minutes. |
| Transportation Commission (TC) Report/Vince Rogalski/STAC Chair | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The High Performance Transportation Enterprise (HPTE) formulated rules governing the administration of tolls. A public hearing will be held on February 20th. The draft rules will then be taken to the Commission for anticipated adoption on March 30th; The Commission's Statewide Plan Development committee is looking at the current Policy Directive (PD) 14's 60 % Good/Fair rating for surface condition, along with the goals for Maintenance and ITS, considering how the new requirements of MAP-21 will affect them. Goals must be specific, measurable, and achievable, and support program delivery and "risk-based" asset management. "Risk-based" means, "What happens to the system if this particular asset malfunctions?" The Commission discussed the Regional Commuter Bus concept, an update on a program to reduce rockfall, and the AGS Technology Forum. They viewed presentations on the RAMP program, and the Aeronautics Division. One item of note- Aeronautics receives its funding from a tax on aviation fuel, and that tax is indexed, which appears to be a really good system. | No action taken. |
| Federal and State Legislative Update/ Kurt Morrison/CDOT Office of Policy & Government Relations | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The state legislature is back in session. There are 22-25 bills that could impact CDOT. One proposes to increase the number of Commission members from 11 to 13. The additional members would have statewide jurisdiction- the idea being that this would provide greater statewide perspective. House Bill 1057, seeks to retain the Colorado Avalanche Center in the Department of Natural Resources. CDOT expressed concerns over the Center moving to the Colorado School of Mines. | No action taken. |

| | | |
|---|---|-------------------------|
| <p>Transportation Alternatives Program/Debra Perkins-Smith/Division of Transportation Development (DTD)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MAP-21 combines Transportation Enhancements (TE), Safe Routes to School, and Rec Trails into one new grant program called Transportation Alternatives, which requires a competitive process. Funding is less than we had in the past for all of these programs, even less than we had for Enhancements. The new program requires that 50% of the funding be distributed based on population, and 50% be distributed to the rest of the state. Over 200,000 area funds are directly allocated to the TMAs. CDOT has been looking into how this could work for Colorado, asking what should be the focus of this program and how should it be managed, along with numerous other questions, such as how to deal with projects that have already been selected. One proposal is that the program focus on Bike/Pedestrian ne Over 200,000 area funds are directly allocated to the TMAs eds. Another is that separate criteria should be created for urban and rural areas. Another suggests no specific set-aside for traditional Safe Routes projects. Should this be administered from a statewide pool or should the funds be allocated to the Regions, and, if so, would that be based on a formula or some other method? A statewide pool would allow consistency in evaluation – projects could be reviewed and compared together. If we go with allocations to each Region, then we need to determine a formula. We don't have the ability to compare all projects against each other. And it would be hard to fund a larger project (there is only \$ 9.4 million for this entire program). Looking ahead at FY 14, the regions would have to work with the MPOs because the sub allocations would be less than in the past. • Wayne Williams put forward that, if we already know we have to obligate to population areas, why aren't we starting with that? Why create an additional process when there is already a process in place? Why does the rest of the state need to be involved in DRCOG's decision? Debra responded that the 50% distribution, based on population, includes funds for the Urbanized Areas over 200,000, which are suballocated to the TMAs. Wayne suggested that, rather than set up two competing processes, simply use the existing process for the other 50%. • Steve Rudy added that Commission has always said that the TMAs have a legitimate process, so why not let them continue - it's about the same amount of money that they had before. What's the problem that the state is trying to solve? Projects in DRCOG are well over-matched, so it could be tough to compete with them. DRCOG's project selection system stresses transportation's function and benefits, including air quality benefits, and | <p>No action taken.</p> |
|---|---|-------------------------|

| | | |
|---|--|-------------------------|
| | <p>connectivity. Is it really a benefit to the state to have urban compete with non-urban? Wayne added that he is concerned with efficiency: one might need to apply for half the funding through the TMA and the other half through the statewide process. DRCOG's population density allows it to make really good cases, and it becomes harder for the rest of the state to compete. Steve suggested getting rid of the 50/50 split and that the TMAs get at least the same share they were receiving under the TE Program-roughly 57%. Wayne suggested that the statewide portion be divided by CDOT Region.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thad Noll summed up the discussion, saying that 57% goes to the urbanized areas under the old TE formula, and the remaining 43% is divided up among regions by the formula – it's just that the formula hasn't yet been decided. In this way, Platteville and Log Lane Village compete against each other, instead of against Greeley. Idaho Springs is competing against the other rurals, but not against the other DRCOG communities. Barbara added that the question of whether or not there is a suballocation is best answered by whatever works for each Region. • Debra asked STAC members to think about various approaches for the next STAC meeting, and submit any additional comments to CDOT. At the next meeting, we will present all comments received, and have more discussion. After that, we hope to have something to take to the Commission. | |
| <p>Asset Management/Debra Perkins-Smith/DTD</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under MAP 21, there are seven national goals. One of those is infrastructure condition. MAP 21 also requires infrastructure performance measures. We'll need to identify targets for the performance measures identified in MAP21, and provide a reporting structure. • Also MAP 21 specifies that we do a risk based Asset Management Plan. What is Asset Management here at CDOT? We will look at what are reasonable goals, as opposed to what is aspirational. • What is asset management at CDOT? Almost everything we do touches an asset. We have task forces where we need to dig a little deeper. A risk based Asset Management Plan includes an inventory of our assets, and the condition of those assets, and any performance gaps. We need to consider life cycle costs and risk management, a financial plan, and investment strategies. Today, CDOT has five Asset Management categories: Highways, Bridge, Maintenance, ITS, and Fleet. Based on work done to date, we're thinking of two additional categories: tunnels | <p>No action taken.</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|-------------------------|
| | <p>and buildings. What we don't know now is if we put more money into pavement than into bridge how does that affect the system? We're developing a new computer program to help with this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within the Commission, there are two committees: Asset Management and Statewide Plan. This month they're meeting together to talk about Policy Directive 14. PD 14 sets the direction for the statewide plan, and helps determine how we should be optimizing the system. The Commission will set policies and objectives that relate to the assets, including data management and governance. We're discussing whether it's possible to have different goal for on-system NHS vs. off-system NHS. Then how will we allocate funds. Will be joint January SWP/ Asset Management committee meetings. We must have risk based asset management in place by October. We're in pretty good shape to meet that deadline. | |
| <p>Statewide Plan Update/Michelle Scheuerman/DTD</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One of the national goals is around freight and there is a requirement to develop performance measures around freight. • We are thinking about some type of early engagement for public involvement and would like to have our stakeholders ready to have a rich conversation. The consultant is currently putting together a 6-month strategic roadmap outlining the next six months of Plan development. • The Revenue Projections Working Group will be meeting again this month and plans to return to STAC in February to provide STAC with an update on its discussions over the past few months. | <p>No action taken.</p> |
| <p>RAMP Program/Tim Harris/Chief Engineer</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The RAMP program is not about new money – it is about going to an expenditure-based STIP, allowing us to free up \$ 300 M per year over five years, so that other projects already in the STIP can be started. RAMP has two programs, one focused on preservation and operation, and the second on partnerships. For preservation, CDOT will largely use its management systems to indicate which projects are most needed and effective. For the partnership program, we expect much discussion and projects to be nominated. We will still have our normal maintenance program, but are in the process of improving our surface treatment program to result in the best investments. In February, CDOT will start discussions on what projects meet the criteria. • Peter Runyon said he'd heard about "pushing up projects by priority", but the TPRs have already set priorities, and, therefore, he believes the STAC should have a chance to weigh in on these decisions. Tim said it certainly | <p>No action taken.</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|-------------------------|
| | <p>would. Gary Beedy asked whether a new strategic projects list is being created. Tim said that projects may be added to our existing lists, but they must be consistent with the long range plan. Barbara wanted to ensure that the integrity of the planning process, which we all have been working on for so many years, is preserved, and asked how the corridors identified in the criteria memo had been identified. Tim replied that, for the purpose of the memo, staff had simply brainstormed for examples to explain the thinking. Vince pointed out that the new approach, as described, could result in projects not currently in the STIP being added to the program at the expense of projects that are already in the STIP. Wayne did not feel that the elimination of STP-Metro funds as a possible match was necessary, was concerned with the limitation on corridor eligibility, and uncomfortable with the additional eligibility criteria listed under the partnerships program. Ernie Williams put forward that, if any funds can be freed up, they should be put toward getting more of the already-selected projects completed, before looking for new projects. Craig Casper pointed out that, using the draft criteria in the memo, the I-70 projects would have a huge lifecycle benefit. Steve Rudy noted that, some of the projects in the memo were not fiscally constrained; with the result that many plan amendments would need to be brought forward, even though the projects would be only speculative. He also felt a clear definition of "fiscally constrained" is needed. Barbara agreed that population is an important criterion, as well as being consistent with the plan; however, she also pointed out that the oil and gas, agriculture, and tourism industries hold up the state's economy, so we need to get funds to the roadways that serve those industries.</p> | |
| <p>Region Boundaries/Tim Harris/Chief Engineer</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On December 21st, the decision was made to consolidate from 6 to 5 Engineering Regions. The changes will affect every one of the Regions except Region 5. The RTDs will make recommendations on the fine points of this, concerning people, equipment, etc. Don Hunt added this this is a change to CDOT's management structure, not its funding structure. He added that HPTE would like the TPRs and STAC to identify candidate corridors where tolling would be helpful. | <p>No action taken.</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|
| <p>Advanced Guideway System/Interregional Connectivity Study Updates/David Krutsinger/Division of Transit and Rail (DTR)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DTR hosted a Technology Forum, to showcase the various technologies proposed to address the needs of the Advanced Guideway System. 270 people attended, providing a great amount of feedback for the corridor project leadership team. Eighteen companies presented their technologies, including two different types of maglev - American Maglev Technology, and General Atomics. The main question is what kind of alignment can we use in the corridor and can we even handle 300 mph? Three or four personal rapid transit systems were also presented. These would require small stations in many locations, rather than a few large stations. This type of system starts as a collection/distribution system, and can be grown to a corridor system. The next step will be to divide the technologies presented into the three general alignments that they would require, and assess the right-of-way requirements for each. We're also looking at community and environmental issues, and assess cost engineering challenges, and, of course, cost. | <p>No action taken.</p> |
| <p>FASTER Transit Funding/Tom Mauser/DTR</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For FYs '14 and '15, there is \$ 10 M for a statewide pool, and \$ 5 M for a local pool. We've provided a letter to the Commission with a cover memo and list of projects. In the interest of maximum transparency, we've included the reasons why projects were not funded. Money requested for FY '14 was far more than we had available, and the request for FY '15 was less than available. Some of the projects weren't funded because they are eligible for FTA funding. Some of the projects not funded on this list will be funded with \$3.5 M FTA rural funding. Region 2 was not able to use all of the money it was awarded in previous years so DTR had determined to send it to the other Regions. Instead we were able to advance some Region 2 projects in FY 15 and spend all but \$300,000 of the remaining funds in Region 2. We'll be taking new applications for '15 and '16 later on this year. | <p>No action taken.</p> |
| <p>Other Business</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None. | <p>No action taken.</p> |