

DRAFT STAC Meeting Minutes
January 10, 2014

Location: CDOT Headquarters Auditorium
Date/Time: January 10, 9:00 a.m.-12:30p.m.
Chairman: Vince Rogalski

Agenda Items/ Presenters/Affiliations	Presentation Highlights	Actions
<p>Introductions/ October Minutes/ Vince Rogalski/ STAC Chair</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes were approved with a single change. Todd Hollenbeck pointed out that under “Formula Programs” there was a typo that showed the previous RPP formula as 45/40/14. This should read 45/40/15. 	<p>Minutes approved.</p>
<p>Transportation Commission Report/ Vince Rogalski/ STAC Chair</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High Performance Transportation Enterprise (HTPE) agenda items included discussion of C-470 and the potential for tolling along I-25 North. • The Transportation Commission discussed possible funding for I-70 from I-25 to Tower Road, including the Viaduct. One funding possibility is the use of SB-228 funds. • A presentation was given on the Interregional Express Bus Plan. Questions about weekend service and advertising were asked, similar to those asked at STAC. • There was a workshop on Asset Management and the Statewide Plan. The focus of the workshop was refinement of PD-14. • The Safety Committee discussed risk-management and excellence in safety with the focus of improving safety. • Program Reconciliation was discussed with the focus of making those programs with a budget shortfall in FY 13 whole again. The TC agreed to use \$6 million from the TC Contingency Fund for this purpose. The TC also made it clear that this is for FY 13 only. The TC also discussed a change in the budget process which would be accomplished by the replacement of PD 703. • Tim Harris provided an update on RAMP and flood recovery efforts. 	<p>No action taken.</p>

<p>Federal and State Legislative Update/ Kurt Morrison/ CDOT Office of Policy & Government Relations (OPGR)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The State legislative session began January 8 and CDOT has two bills on the legislative agenda. The first is an outdoor advertising bill that will make some changes to the outdoor advertising program. The second is a flagger training bill that seeks to create a uniform flagger training certification. • There has been mention of a \$100 million transfer to the Highway Users Tax Fund (HUTF), but the details are unknown at this point. CDOT wants to ensure that this transfer wouldn't constitute a trade-off for future SB 228 funds. • There are expected to be between 7-8 flood related bills introduced during this legislative session. • There are a couple of "reduction of funding" bills that relate directly to CDOT. The first bill would waive vehicle registration fees for military members who are serving overseas. The second bill would provide an exemption on personal property for seniors. • It is also anticipated that a bill addressing the HPTE will be introduced, although details are not known at this time. • Amtrak is asking for money from states to help fund the struggling Southwest Chief rail line. There are two bills that would allow the state to supply them with the requested funding amount. The first simply allows for a General Fund transfer of \$4 million and the second introduces a new financing mechanism that would raise the desired amount. • Vince Rogalski inquired about Congress and the re-authorization of MAP-21. MAP-21 is set to expire September 31. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Kurt Morrison indicated that AASHTO developed recommendations for a draft bill. Key provisions include: a proposed gas tax increase of 15.4 cents, allowances for state DOTs to increase the study of VMT user fees, and a continuation of funding with a solution to the solvency problem. ○ John Cater said that FHWA is optimistic that an extension will be approved this fiscal year. 	<p>No action taken.</p>
---	--	--------------------------------

<p>Program Distribution/ Debra Perkins-Smith/ Division of Transportation Development (DTD)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Debra Perkins-Smith provided an update on Program Distribution. She explained the scenarios that are being presented to the TC at their January meeting. The baseline scenario is based on FY 15 budget levels with TransBond funds assigned to Asset Management, and other variance left unassigned. Scenario #1 allocates the TransBond funds in Asset Management and additional variance needed to reach PD 14 goals for Surface Treatment, Maintenance, and Structures, with the remaining variance left unassigned. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Wayne Williams asked why funds “freed up” through the retirement of TransBond debt service are being placed in Asset Management when its original intent was for capacity improvements. Debra informed him that the decision came at the direction of the TC. The TC said that TransBond funds should go to Asset Management, specifically maintenance, surface treatment and structures to meet PD-14 goals. ○ Vince Rogalski asked if there was any discussion about putting the funds into transit. Debra said there had been no discussion around the use of these funds for transit. ○ Vince also asked if there was any discussion about using TransBond funds for the I-70 Viaduct. Debra said that it could fit into Asset Management, but there has been no mention of specific projects at this time. ○ Gary Beedy commented that scenario #1 makes sense and allows for flexibility. He went on to say that the remaining variance should go to the TC Contingency Fund. ○ Wayne Williams commented that the problem with scenario #1 is that there are varying needs across the state and putting all the revenue into three categories doesn’t recognize this. Communities with a low number of roads get left out under this scenario. If one were to put all the money into RPP then the regions could express their priorities. Also, the approach in scenario #1 represents the continued centralization of decision making at CDOT. 	<p>ACTION ITEM: STAC unanimously passed a motion recommending that the TC allocate funds “freed up” by the retirement of TransBond to RPP.</p>
--	---	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Barbara Kirkmeyer suggested that the TransBond funds be placed in RPP because the bonds were originally intended for strategic projects. She went on to say that \$50 million for RPP is not enough and all TransBond funds should go to RPP with some exception for maintenance.○ Thad Noll said that the TC is unlikely to put all \$167 million into RPP and suggested putting the remaining variance into RPP.○ Vince Rogalski reminded the group that RPP was once at \$167 million.○ Barbara Kirkmeyer reminded the group that under ISTEA, an emphasis was placed on development of priorities and decision making at the local level. She also noted that 25-30% of funding allocated by CDOT goes to overhead type costs to get projects ready. Barbara also mentioned that at the CTI winter conference Gov. Hickenlooper was asked about RPP and said that he was in support of a regional process.○ Pete Frasier expressed concern about reduced input from the Regions and the role of the STAC in advising the TC.○ Steve Ivancie said that the conversation gets to the credibility of the process and CDOT. He also mentioned that there are a variety of needs across the state.○ Greg Severance noted that he noticed the shift towards centralized decision making and said it was frightening. He further asked what was wrong with the way things used to be done.○ Trent Bushner commented how some rural TPRs couldn't afford the matching funds required for RAMP.○ Debra Perkins-Smith reminded the group that CDOT's funding levels are 30% below what they were when RPP was at \$160 million. She also spoke to how the Regions express priorities, encouraging all STAC members to take part in the Statewide Planning process through their RTP development.○ Barbara Kirkmeyer commented that STAC has been supportive of	
--	---	--

	<p>surface treatment and maintenance, now it is time to honor the RPP process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Doug Rex commented that DRCOG would like to see the RPP formula revisited if RPP is funded at more than the \$10 million level of recent years. ○ ACTION ITEM: Wayne proposed a motion: Recommend to the TC the allocation of fund “freed up” by the retirement of TransBond to RPP, which will restore RPP to historic levels. The motion passed unanimously. 	
<p>RPP and FASTER Safety/ Debra Perkins-Smith/ DTD</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Debra informed the group that the RPP formula (45/40/15) has been approved for FY 15 only. The TC has said that they would like to revisit the formula now that RPP funding has been increased to \$50 million. ● Vince Rogalski commented that the TC said that STAC was pushing the formula on them and he had to remind them that the formula was originally developed by the TC. ● Debra told STAC members that staff will be going back to the TC with new RPP formulas developed by a working group of Senior Management Team (SMT) members. The formula must align with the goal or a purpose of the program. ● Barbara Kirkmeyer said STAC needs to be involved in the creation of the new RPP formula. ● Debra referenced the internal CDOT audit on FASTER Safety, one of the findings of which was a need for better measurement and reporting. ● William Johnson, CDOT’s Transportation Performance Branch Manager, provided a presentation on FASTER Safety, which included a snapshot of CDOT’s safety program, historic FASTER safety projects, new program goals and objectives, a look at the proposed FASTER FY 15 program, and the proposed project selection criteria. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Barbara Kirkmeyer asked why, if CDOT is in compliance, is there a need to change the process. She also commented that she liked 	<p>No action taken.</p>

	<p>the way it has worked in the past.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Debra replied that the internal audit found that CDOT is being consistent with the legislation, but project selection in the region is not consistent. CDOT would like the program to continue and if the legislature asks CDOT what value have you gotten from the program then there would be a measurement of that value. ○ Steve Ivancie asked if the new approach will be driven by accident reporting. William responded that would not be the case. Steve then asked how CDOT receives accident data. William responded that CDOT has a crash database from which it receives raw data. That data is then cleansed and sorted in a variety of ways. 	
<p>I-70 West/ Tony DeVito/ Region 1 RTD</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Tony DeVito, RTD for Region 1, provided a presentation on widening the westbound Twin Tunnel. His presentation included the reasoning behind why now, cost savings, tunnel rebar gantries and tunnel lining forms, efficiencies, EB Twin Tunnel detour route and portal to portal road, utilization of existing detour, construction phasing comparison, impacts to the traveling public future vs. now, and estimated cost and project schedule. ● Bobby Lieb Jr. clarified that the \$48 million available for the project was a returned loan from the HTPE portion of RAMP. He then asked what the original funding scheme was. Tony informed him that there wasn't one, but as outlined in the presentation there will be real problems in attempting to complete this work in the future (e.g. current detour no longer available, loss of gantries, etc.). Tony also clarified that this project was not submitted as a RAMP application, but it would come out of the HTPE piece of RAMP. ● Wayne Williams commented that this is an uncompleted corridor that was promised to voters. He also added that this is a known priority and has been for some time. Tony added that the original cost estimate on the project was \$100 million, but now that estimate is down to \$55 million. ● Trent Bushner commented that if the RAMP money had not been returned 	<p><i>ACTION ITEM: STAC unanimously passed a motion recommending the TC approve \$48 million in RAMP funding be allocated the I-70 West WB Tunnel project.</i></p>

	<p>then this would not be a possibility, but this is a great project and he is in full support.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thad Noll said that the I-70 coalition originally thought that this project was unnecessary, but given the statewide significance and cost saving this project should move forward. He urges the TC to approve the project. • Barbara Kirkmeyer noted that the RAMP application process was one that all local governments worked very hard to go through. She indicated concern that approving this project would be subverting process and setting a precedent for future projects that are using returned RAMP funds. • Wayne Williams shared Barbara's concerns, but added that it was the right thing to do for the state. He also added that other significant corridor should be given the same level of flexibility in the future. • ACTION ITEM: Bobby Lieb Jr. made a motion advising the TC to approve the allocation of \$48 million in RAMP funding to the I-70 West WB Tunnel project. Motion passed unanimously. 	
2015 FASTER Projects/ Mark Imoff/ Division of Transit & Rail (DTR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mark Imoff came before STAC to give a presentation and discuss FASTER FY 15 recommended projects and FASTER redistribution guidelines for FY 16 and beyond. His presentation included FASTER transit redistribution, projects and practice, project award process for FY 15 and guiding principles. • Terri Blackmore asked about how to go about expanding. Mark replied that they would need to go before the subcommittee to approve replace and expansion. He also added that PD-14 guides this to a certain extent. • ACTION ITEM: Wayne Williams made a motion to recommend approval of FY 15 FASTER projects. The motion passed unanimously. 	ACTION ITEM: STAC unanimously passed a motion recommending approval of FY 15 FASTER projects.
AGS/ICS Update/ David Krutsinger/ DTR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • David Krutsinger provided an update on the Interregional Connectivity Study and Advanced Guideway System Feasibility Study. His presentation included an overview of what AGS and ICS are, what high speed transit is, HST study findings, and conclusions about the studies. 	
RAMP/Flood Update/	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scott McDaniel provided an update on RAMP and flood response efforts. 	No action taken.

<p>Scott McDaniel/ Acting Chief Engineer</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flood: all roads are now re-opened and were so ahead of schedule. Now the recovery efforts have moved into permanent repairs. The Incident Command Center (ICC) is developing systems to monitor and track the performance of projects. This will allow CDOT to understand what projects are being completed on schedule and budget and which need more attention. All permanent fixes will go through this process. • RAMP: There was a January 6 deadline for receiving letters of commitment. 35 of 43 letters of commitment have been received with 6 others asking for an extension or guidance from CDOT. CDOT is now in the process of reviewing the scope, schedule, and budget for each application. 	
<p>Statewide Plan/ Michelle Scheuerman/ DTD</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Michelle Scheuerman provided a presentation with the preliminary results from the statewide survey, including an overview of the survey and its purpose, response rate, results, and key takeaways. • Trent Bushner noted that the response rate seemed low. • Pete Frasier asked why CDOT was conducting surveys again. She also commented that in rural Colorado not all homes have computers. Michelle responded that these surveys were intended to get a statewide perspective. • Terri Blackmore commented that the timing of these surveys was not ideal (holiday season). • Scott Hobson added that the Pueblo Area Council of Governments (PACOG) felt that the surveys had a lot of value. • Norm Steen commented that he was surprised that there was a higher response rate in rural areas than in urban areas. 	<p>No action taken.</p>
<p>Colorado Strategic Highway Safety Plan/ Alisa Babler/ Traffic & Safety</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alisa Babler provided STAC with an update on the Colorado Strategic Highway Safety Plan and invited members to attend region meetings being held in January and February. • Trent Bushner commented that he would like to host a meeting in Yuma. • John Cater indicated that FHWA would like to see as many of these meetings take place as possible. 	<p>No action taken.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Gary Beedy asked if these meetings could tie in with regularly scheduled TPR meetings.• Jan Dowker commented the Weld, Greeley, and Fort Collins would like to add the presentation to their February meetings.	
Other Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• None	No action taken.