

DRAFT STAC Meeting Minutes
March 14, 2014

Location: CDOT Headquarters Auditorium
Date/Time: February 14, 9:30 a.m.-12:30p.m.
Chairman: Vince Rogalski
Attendance:

Agenda Items/ Presenters/Affiliations	Presentation Highlights	Actions
<p>Introductions/ October Minutes/ Vince Rogalski</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes were approved without changes 	<p>Minutes approved.</p>
<p>Transportation Commission Report/ Vince Rogalski</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was a great deal of public controversy surrounding the HPTE discussion on the public private partnership (P3) for US 36. However, the US 36 proposal was widely supported by the business community and municipal/county leaders. HPTE and TC approved the project and contracts. • The Transportation Commission (TC) discussed four funding scenarios for the I-70 Viaduct. This discussion also included various parts of the project and what funding is available achieve it. • During the Asset Management workshop TC members went through all the projects and listened to the various implementation strategies. • During the Program Distribution workshop TC members were presented with the STAC recommendation of allocating Transbond retirement savings to RPP. They did not adopt STAC's recommendation. • During the RAMP workshop projects were divided into categories and placed into one of three groups. • During the Flood workshop TC members discussed potential impacts of the spring run-off along US 36, US 34, Big Thompson Canyon. • During the Program Management workshop TC members discussed how they will balance all of the existing CDOT initiatives. • The TC approved FASTER Transit, Program Distribution, and RAMP projects. 	<p>No action taken.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The TC discussed and passed the US 36 compliance agreement. The TC acknowledged that if public wants capacity improvement projects completed, they must be open to the use of P3s because the HUTF cannot provide for these. • The TC was given a presentation on the US 550 rock fall, just south of Ouray, which recently took place. CDOT crews have been able to clear the roadway, but rock falls still persist. 	
<p>TIGER VI Grant Program/ Herman Stockinger</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Herman Stockinger came before STAC to give an update on TIGER VI grants. Herman informed STAC that one of the principal differences this year is the inclusion of planning grants. This means that CDOT will have the ability to recommend three planning grants and three capital grants. • CDOT came to STAC with a list of staff recommended projects, which include: 1) SH 160: Mesa Verde Multi-Use Path (Planning), 2) U.S. Bike Routes Plan for Colorado (Planning), 3) Interregional Connectivity Study-Phase II Interoperability Assessment with RTD (Planning), 4) C-470 Managed Lanes (Capital), 5) I-70 Peak Shoulder Lanes (Capital) and 6) US 40 Berthoud Pass Automated Avalanche Pilot Project (Capital). • TC needs to approve recommended projects on March 20th, 2014. Applications for TIGER VI are due late April 28th. <p>STAC COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vince Rogalski commented that the U.S. Bike Routes Plan for Colorado fits with Governor Hickenlooper’s goal of being the number one bike friendly state. • Thad Noll commented that the U.S. Bike Routes Plan for Colorado is a big ticket item that has the ability to positively affect many communities in Colorado. He also commented that US 40 Berthoud Pass Automated Avalanche Pilot Project has the potential to make a positive impact on many of the communities within the I-70 mountain corridor. • Pete Fraser inquired about the Interregional Connectivity Study- Phase II Interoperability Assessment with RTD and if it would be the most likely to come off the list. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>ACTION ITEM:</i> <i>Wayne Williams made a motion that the STAC recommend to the Transportation Commission the approval of the CDOT staff recommended list of TIGER VI grants. Contingent upon the status of the Interregional Connectivity Study- Phase II Interoperability Assessment with RTD and CDOT’s willingness to co-sponsor and offer letters of support. The motion</i>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mark Imoff explained that there were savings from the IGS study that could be used to fund, or partially fund, this project. The Division of Transit and Rail is considering moving forward with this project regardless of the outcome of the TIGER VI application ● Greg Severance inquired into the significance of CDOT sponsoring a TIGER Grant application and success rates associated with such an endorsement. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Herman explained that, according to his research, state DOT endorsement does not guarantee success. In fact, when looking back to prior TIGER applications, there are a greater number of applications that were accepted from cities, counties and MPOs than State DOTs. ● John Cater explained that if a local government is submitting an application for a project on the state highway system and that project is not on the State DOT's list then the application will probably fail. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Greg Severance commented that due to the uncertainty associated with co-sponsorship, he would not be voting for the motion. <p><i>ACTION ITEM: Wayne Williams made a motion that the STAC recommend to the Transportation Commission the approval of the CDOT staff recommended list of TIGER VI grants. Contingent upon the status of the Interregional Connectivity Study- Phase II Interoperability Assessment with RTD and CDOT's willingness to co-sponsor and offer letters of support.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Terri Blackmore asked what commitments CDOT will make to work with North I-25? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Herman explained it would require a coalition of local governments to come forward and identify a specific project that they would like to make a priority. That being said, the technical requirements come from the region. So if an MPO knows of a local government that has a grant application, then they should work with the Regional Transportation Director. Also, CDOT has the ability to co-sponsor projects and not have it count against allotted number of application. 	<p><i>passed with Greg Severance as the lone dissenting vote.</i></p>
--	--	--

	<p>If strong applications arise, CDOT would be willing to co-sponsor.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jane Dowker expressed at the last North Front Range MPO meeting, some of the members had asked about the future of the TIGER grants. She also asked what can be done to prepare TIGER Grants next year. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Herman said that he was willing to work with groups to make those projects ready to go. • Greg asked if having CDOT as a co-sponsor enhances an applications credibility and has any influence in the decision making process. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ John Cater explained that if it is a project is on a state highway and not on that corresponding state DOT's top three list, it signals that the project most likely is not a top priority. 	
<p>Federal and State Legislative Update/ Kurt Morrison/CDOT Office of Policy & Government Relations (OPGR)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kurt Morrison gave a federal legislative update to STAC members. Recently the Obama Administration expressed its transportation priorities to Congress through the FY 14 budget proposal. The proposal includes significant funding increases, but does not account for how to pay for them. • Kurt Morrison also gave a state legislative update to STAC members. Within a few weeks the General Assembly is expected to introduce the Long Bill, which will consume legislative activity. Office of Policy & Government Relations will be monitoring the budget to track any changes that may negatively affect CDOT. • There were two bills on the legislative agenda for CDOT this session. Each of these bills, flagger training and outdoor advertising, have been sent to the governor for his signature. CDOT's legislative agenda is now completed and the Office of Policy & Government Relations will now monitor legislation that could affect CDOT. • Other bills CDOT will be monitoring are HB1301 which allows for the transfer of \$3 M from the general fund to CDOT for the Safe Routes to School program. The first hearing for that bill is scheduled for the week of March 17th. While there is general support from the committee, they might sit on the bill until the revenue projections are released. Also, SB 7, which allows for the transfer of general fund dollar transfers to local governments for transportation purposes, was passed and signed by Governor Hickenlooper. 	<p>No action taken.</p>

<p>FY 15 Budget/ Maria Sobota</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maria Sobota, the director of the Office of Financial Management and Budget, came before STAC to ask for a recommendation of approval to the Transportation Commission for the FY 15 budget. • Maria highlighted two key changes to the budget. First, \$40 M was moved from FASTER Safety to RPP. Second, \$100 M was added to the budget for permanent recovery projects. • CDOT staff will be taking the proposed budget to the TC for adoption during the week of March 17th. <p>STAC COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vince Rogalski asked where the \$100 M for permanent recovery come from. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Maria explained that \$100 M represents federal funds for flood recovery. • Terri Blackmore commented that it seemed that RAMP is not accounted for in the budget. She was confused as to how funds can be allocated without ever being part of the budget. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Maria explained that funds for RAMP are not new revenues, and the budget reflects new revenues only. RAMP will be funded with our \$1.5 B cash balance. • Terri commented that CDOT has never shown in the budgets how those funds were built up and it seems like CDOT is never showing us the full revenues that are available and what the carryover is. Barbara Kirkmeyer agreed and asked where the RAMP projects are budgeted? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Maria explained that CDOT did bring STAC the five- in-one budget in November. That is not the official budget that is submitted to the Governor. As mentioned, the RAMP projects will be funded based on our cash balance using Advance Construction. • Barbara asked if CDOT is budgeting the cash fund balance and where that is accounted for? • Vince commented that it would be helpful, since this question keeps coming up, to bring STAC something that shows how much is there and what is 	<p>ACTION ITEM: Wayne Williams made a motion to not support budget. Motion passed unanimously.</p>

projected to be spent on RAMP.

- Maria replied that Sandi has asked her to come back to STAC in April to give presentation specifically about RAMP.
- Barbara said that would be great and if we could also see the impacts to the projects that are supposed to be funded and the impacts to the regions now that they don't have any discretionary funds. She mentioned a specific project in Hudson, CO.
- Maria explained that funding has been moved into RPP that will be flexible within the Regions, but in situations like this we will be working with the Regions to make sure that projects that come up work into our analysis. Just this month we have met with the RTDs, Statewide Plan Team, and Business Managers to review an analysis of the FASTER Safety projects in the STIP and begin to demonstrate how we will keep the STIP whole. We will bring a more condensed version of that, along with RPP and Surface Treatment, to the STAC next month as part of my presentation to hopefully provide a level of comfort that we will keep the STIP whole through FY 15.
- Beth Humenik expressed concern over asking STAC to recommend approval of this budget before providing STAC with additional information.
 - Sandi Kohrs explained that CDOT wants engage STAC in a more detailed discussion in April. The budget reflects incoming new revenue and the places where it is being programmed so it doesn't show old money. That is the way that CDOT is required to submit the budget.
- Rob MacDonald explained that for the MPOs, certainly Pikes Peak, there is a large disconnect. The TIP and STIP are supposed to be identical. Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments (PPACG) has asked for months for CDOT HQ through the regions to give PPACG a TIP amendment for two things: 1) where are the RAMP dollars going to and 2) where are they coming from out of pools. How can PPACG explain to thier local governments that the TIP is a nice document, but it doesn't mean anything when we can't budget projects because it's not even tied to the CDOT

budget. PPACG has a huge project and when we looked at the TIP our Board said PPACG has plenty of money, when PPACG went to OFMB they said you don't have any money. PPACG would like a TIP amendment to forward to the PPACG Board that shows money has been swept to Denver and it is up to CDOT HQ to allocate the money out. That's what our Transportation Commissioner reported to PPACG Board on Wednesday. Our CDOT RTD also reported that the funding decisions will be made at CDOT HQ and all the TIP categories that don't exist anymore. We have a concern about that.

- Sandi replied that CDOT and PPACG should meet to discuss that matter. CDOT needs to understand this better. We usually build the TIP and STIP off of Resource Allocation and we know those numbers have changed.
- Pete Fraser commented that a few months ago when Scott Richrath presented that the very same kind of question came up. Because the RAMP projects are using the cash balance one would think those funds need to be in the budget in the current year as expenditures. STAC asked to see that sort of reconciliation. The TPRs would like to see, with regard to RAMP projects, here's the money and here's where it came from.
- Vince told STAC that he has been hearing concern from Regions, who in the past, set aside money from the existing budget for a project they were going to do in three years. Now, the concern is that the money set aside in the STIP isn't there anymore.
 - Sandi explained that we need to set aside time on the agenda to go through this and Maria will go over these issues in April.
 - Maria explained that the five- in-one Budget was provided to STAC in November, and was sent out again last week. What you have today is the legislatively approved Long-Bill budget. A great number of projects are under budget, and those funds will be used for RAMP. We have inactive projects that haven't used funds for years. Those funds will also be used. So it is separate from the budget that

goes to the legislature.

- Doug Rex- The main concern of the MPOs is the financial constraint component. I would like to ask John Cater the position of FHWA?
 - John Cater expressed that FHWA is comfortable with the process. CDOT does have a large cash balance and this is a way of spending down that cash balance. From the FHWA perspective, there is no reason to think RAMP isn't going to work. John also said that he has not heard any issues about TIPS not being fiscally constrained, but if that's the case FHWA will investigate that.
- Terri Blackmore expressed concern that the TIP and STIP process is not being followed. John Cater said that FHWA will pursue the matter.
- Gary Beedy commented that there is no funding for those STIP projects going forward with this new allocation of funding. It's all going into Asset Management and other programs that are totally controlled by CDOT HQ.
- Terri Blackmore asked how CDOT can have more than one budget. CDOT has multiple budgets and STAC has no idea where the money is going or coming from.
 - Sandi commented that this budget is prepared the way CDOT is required to by the State law.
- Wayne Williams expressed concern over the process and suggested that further discussion was warranted. In April, it is important to make sure that STAC has a significant time allocation to go through the budget. I'd like to point out that 90,000 people joined the state of Colorado this year. If you look at what this budget does- if you look under expand you will see a \$0. If you look at Congestion Relief you see \$4 M. This is not a Transportation Commission complaint, this is an executive and legislative complaint- the budget that is being allocated to CDOT is not sufficient to cover the needs of the State. I think we need to raise this issue- the legislature is not doing their job. The legislature needs to keep its commitment on SB 228 and do more.
- Vince Rogalski asked STAC what recommendation they would like to make.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Barbara suggested that STAC make a recommendation to not accept this budget for the reasons Wayne articulated and the other things that have been said. The message needs to be sent that local governments and the people of Colorado are paying attention to transportation and we are not going to accept a budget that doesn't give us the full detail and basically appears to all of us that you are sweeping funds out, are centralizing everything here at CDOT, and that to local governments and people out in our areas it doesn't matter what they say or what they want with transportation. Transportation is for everybody it should be coming from a grassroots bottoms up approach.○ Beth Humenik stated that based on principle, DRCOG will not be supporting the budget.○ Jan Dowker commented that it goes back to the question of not financing our TIPs. STAC has questions about local control. The fact that we are asked to make decisions on something that isn't really complete.● Greg Severance suggested that a more appropriate motion would be to say the STAC is not comfortable with the level of detail, and that we would consider a budget with more information.● Thad Noll stated that capacity projects that are going to happen, they are just not shown in this budget. Also, it is unclear how the money is being spent and what kinds of dollars are going to the overall transportation system in the State.● Bobby Lieb Jr.- The format for the budget sounds largely prescribed. Questions and concerns I am hearing seem to be separate from adopting this budget as we are required to develop it. Maybe STAC needs to be a little more constructive about how it passes forward our concerns to the Transportation Commission.● Barbara Kirkmeyer- You are right. STAC was set up by the legislature in statute to be an advisory committee. We not only give advice to the	
--	---	--

	<p>Commission, we also have the opportunity to advise the legislature and I think we should do that. Over the last couple of years I honestly feel that we've been lied to. When going from six to five Regions we were told don't worry about it we'll get to Resource Allocation and that will answer all of your questions. Well guess what we got to Resource Allocation and now we don't have Resource Allocation we have Program Distribution and in the meantime we were also told about RAMP projects, which totally bypassed our regional planning process. Those projects weren't selected through the Regions, the TPRs, the MPOs, they were selected right here at HQ. Now because those projects have been obligated and they do cash advance with our cash fund balance that were obligated to other projects in the STIP the reality is there are going to be TIP and STIP projects that will not be able to be funded. So basically over the last year the philosophy of the Governor and the Transportation Commission has been to centralize the prioritization of projects and how funds are spent on the transportation system. They have been not only dismissive of the STAC, but of the TPRs, the MPOs, County Commissioners and City Council members. While I agree they will probably just dismiss this, I think we need to start giving that advice.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beth Humenik said that STAC has been asking for all this information for months now and if STAC had gotten it we wouldn't be in this position today. Everything that's been said here has been very valid. • Pete Fraser said she believes that staff could say we recommend this, but with strong reservations for the following reasons: the transparency issue, the RAMP issue and the incompleteness of the budget. <p><i>ACTION ITEM: Wayne Williams made a motion to not support budget. Motion passed unanimously.</i></p>	
<p>CEO Advisory Committee/ Sandi Kohrs/ Tom Hunt</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sandi Kohrs prefaced the discussion with an overview of the Statewide CNG program. • Tom Hunt from the Colorado Energy Office (CEO) came before STAC to solicit members of the CEO advisory Committee. This advisory committee 	<p>No action taken.</p>

	<p>was created at the request of STAC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tom outlined that the CNG advisory committee would meet quarterly and be composed of STAC members, station developers and technical experts. This advisory committee would oversee any changes that need to be made and provide the proper vetting to such changes, as to avoid any unintended consequences. <p>STAC COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thad Noll asked if CEO is looking for a particular distribution of advisory members from around the state. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Tom indicated that CEO would like to see STAC membership that includes those who have experience working with CNG projects, as well as those who are new to the concept and could bring a fresh take and also a geographic distribution of members. • Barbara suggested that it would be valuable to have members from across the state. Also, she informed the group that developing stations and their locations can be a difficult process. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Tom agreed with Barbara and said that in addition to the role of advisor, members would also be emissaries to their local communities and offer how to best make the program function. • After extensive discussion, in conjunction with CEO, it was agreed that any interested STAC members are welcome to attend the meetings. 	
<p>Formula Programs/ Sandi Kohrs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sandi Kohrs came before STAC to review the formula program allocation methodologies and ask for a STAC recommendation on the RPP formula. <p>STAC COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thad Noll commented that the new staff recommendation discounts vehicle traffic in the mountains that has nothing to do with lane miles, truck traffic or population. He thought that population should be in the mix, but the result here has all of the increase going to Region 1 and coming out of Regions 3 and 5. Most comes out of Region 3. • Gary Beedy said his biggest concern is that staff recommended something that is a shift from anything the subcommittee considered, moving funds 	<p>ACTION ITEM: <i>Motion to recommend 25/20/40/15. The motion passed unanimously.</i></p>

from the rural areas to urban areas. He outlined that RPP is the only flexible money for the Regions statewide. VMT is a fairly good surrogate for movement of people and goods, but population shifts funds to the urban areas.

- Doug Rex commented on DRCOG getting more than its fair share; saying that it is anecdotal and unless someone has evidence that shows we get more than our fair share, then it is a moot point. We represent 56% of the population, 50% of the VMT, 53% of gas tax, 2/3 of the state economy, 50% of tourism. To suggest that 35% of funds is adequate to meet the needs of this Region is just unacceptable.
 - Thad Noll replied to Doug that he didn't recall anyone saying that DRCOG is getting an unfair share. The staff recommended formula doesn't take into account traffic volumes in the mountains. Urban areas don't only have RPP dollars to spend- they have other funding pots. We don't get lots of dollars the urban areas get. It's a small pot of money- it's \$50 M statewide. Let's not forget that for the rural areas, we are talking about a million dollars difference- that makes a big difference to a rural area and a small difference to urban areas. As Gary said, we never discussed anything even remotely close to this in the subcommittee.
- Pete Fraser commented that she agreed with Thad and Gary. RPP used to be routinely \$160 M. This flexible money for the TPRs has already been shrinking, you change the formula and it shrinks even more. There were a lot of people that spent a lot of time on the subcommittee to hash out these formulas. All of that work month after month is now being tossed aside. I think it really needs to have some credence. STAC spent a lot of time on those formulas.
- Greg Severance made a motion that the Transportation Commission should consider increasing RPP to \$75 M per year and leaving the formula as recommended by staff.
 - Herman Stockinger recommended that in order to get the best

	<p>possible response from the TC, STAC should probably also say where that money should come from.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Wayne Williams restated the motion, increase RPP to \$75 M per year with the additional funds coming out of the existing cash reserves, and accept the staff recommended formula.• Thad Noll pointed out that formulas stick and the amount of RPP may change. The last formula stuck around a long time.• Todd Hollenbeck pointed out that the formula in the past hasn't just applied to RPP, STAC could be in for the long haul with this formula and it could be used elsewhere.• Gary Beedy asked if the RPP formula is going to be allocated to the MPOs.<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Sandi Kohrs said that it is meant to show how the formula would work at the MPO level, but this is a Regional formula not an MPO formula.• Barbara said that she didn't think it would be fair for us to ask Region 5 to go down to 7.1% because it is too dramatic of a drop. The rural areas don't have other funds that come to them. Rural areas don't use RPP funds on rural roads; it is used on the state highway system. The 50/35/15 just doesn't strike the right balance.• Terri Blackmore suggested splitting the population between population and VMT.• Wayne Williams suggested 30/30/30/10 with population, VMT, lane miles, and truck VMT. He went on to say that population is critical for areas like PPACG that have a more limited state highway system for the size of the area.• Craig Casper suggested that if STAC is going to use VMT, lane miles, and truck VMT, then STAC should be looking at NHS and the state highway system.<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ There was discussion among several different alternatives. Staff calculated different alternatives in response to STAC suggestions.• Steve Ivancie suggested sticking with STAC's original recommendation of	
--	--	--

	<p>45/40/15.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A vote was taken on Greg Severance's earlier motion. Vince indicated that the TC is unlikely to increase RPP to \$75 M. Herman suggested that the additional funds should be specified as coming out of RAMP Partnership, Operations, or Surface Treatment. Motion fails. • Terri Blackmore made a motion for a compromise formula based on the staff recommendation of 25/25/35/15 (Population/VMT/Lane Miles/Truck VMT). • Barbara Kirkmeyer suggested 25/20/40/15 VMT/Population/Lane Miles/Truck VMT. CDOT staff showed results of that proposal for each Region. Thad Noll indicated that Region 3 could support Barb's suggestion. • Motion to amend to 25/20/40/15. Motion passes. New motion made to recommend 25/20/40/15 formula. Wayne Williams requested clarification that the factors were state highway system, not the NHS. Barbara Kirkmeyer and Greg Severance each indicated their support for 25/20/40/15, noting it is a good compromise. <p>ACTION ITEM: Motion to recommend 25/20/40/15. The motion passed unanimously.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thad Noll- I ask that the staff recommendation mirror the STAC recommendation. 	
<p>RAMP Operations Projects/ Ryan Rice</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ryan Rice came before STAC to give an update on the status of RAMP operations projects. As part of the RAMP program, \$75 M over five years were available for operational improvements. After the initial detailed application phase, staff recommended \$65.6 M in operational improvement projects to the Transportation Commission. This left a balance of about \$9.4 M still available for RAMP funding. Ryan walked STAC members through the list of recommended RAMP operational improvement projects. <p>STAC COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wayne Williams inquired to the composition of the CDOT RAMP Governance Committee mentioned in the memo. 	<p>No action taken.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ryan explained that the committee was composed of RTDs and other senior management staff. ● Wayne Williams asked for an update list of operations projects that correct a few errors identified. Ryan confirmed that he would provide that. ● Barbra Krikmeyer offered insight into the communication failures that took place during the historic flooding that took place in Northern Colorado in 2013. She asked Ryan about how these operational improvements address those challenges. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ryan gave several examples of innovative software that CDOT is, or will be, deploying across the state. This is in an effort to avoid the single point of failure that made communication difficult in the past. ○ Barbara offered to work with CDOT to ensure better local connectivity and that the communication failures do not persist in the future. 	
Other Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The next STAC meeting will begin at 9am. ● Wayne Williams asked for an updated list on the status of 7th pot projects and, with inflation adjustments, how much is left to complete these projects. 	No action taken.