

**DRAFT STAC Meeting Minutes**  
**April 11, 2014**

**Location:** CDOT Headquarters Auditorium  
**Date/Time:** February 14, 9:00 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"> <li>• Minutes were approved with one change. Commissioner Bobby Lieb Jr. pointed out that Wayne William's motion to not support the FY 15 budget did not pass unanimously. Commissioner Lieb was the lone dissenting vote.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Minutes approved.</b></p>
<p>Transportation Commission Report/ Vince Rogalski</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At the High Performance Transportation Enterprise (HPTE) meeting, opponents of the US 36 proposal were allowed to convey their reservations about the project. Afterwards, there was a closing of all the documents needed to move the project forward.</li> <li>• CDOT's Office of Major Projects is now operational and some of the projects being considered are C-470 and the I-70 mountain corridor.</li> <li>• There was a discussion about the RAMP partnership and operations projects. These projects have organized into four, color coded, categories:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Group One (Green): These are projects that don't have any substantial changes and are moving forward.</li> <li>○ Group Two (Yellow): These are projects that have some changes that the Transportation Commissioner needs be aware of.</li> <li>○ Group Three (Red): These are projects that still need some work.</li> <li>○ Group Four (Black): These are projects that have either been withdrawn or eliminated.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• During the Program Management workshop there were a number of different topics addressed. Specifically, TC members discussed what projects are ready to go advertisement and which ones are scheduled to go</li> </ul>	<p><b>No action taken.</b></p>

	<p>to advertisement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The FY 15 Budget was approved by the Transportation Commission and sent to the Governor's Office, as required by law, despite the lack of endorsement from STAC.</li><li>• During the Transit and Intermodal Committee meeting, the AGS and ICS studies were discussed. It was confirmed high speed transit is technically feasible in both corridors, but not financially feasible in either corridor at this time.</li><li>• During the I-70 Right of Way acquisition workshop, TC members discussed how under the recommended Preferred Alternative approximately 57 homes will be acquired. Of those, approximately 21 are owner-occupied and 26 are renter occupied. A special concern is many of the occupants in the residential properties are minority (90 percent) and low-income (32 percent) households. Displaced homeowners may not qualify for the financing of their new home due to more stringent lending. Therefore, the proposal is to set aside funds to assist in the financing for these residents.</li><li>• The Transportation Commission approved a resolution authorizing the Department to submit three capital grant applications and up to three planning grant applications for TIGER VI discretionary grant program.</li><li>• The Intermodal Committee met to discuss CDOT's strategies for becoming the #1 bicycle friendly state. A recommendation was made to establish a Governor's statewide bicycle advisory committee. Also, there is a TIGER VI grant proposal that would create a US Bike Routes Plan.</li><li>• TC members discussed RPP and Program Distribution, but there was no discussion about the RPP formula. However, TC members plan to discuss the RPP formula during their May meeting.</li></ul> <p>STAC COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Thad Noll inquired about the I-70 Viaduct and relocation of those residents who will be impacted by the project. Vince informed Thad that the question is more about the amount of funding and how it will be used to assist residents.</li></ul>	
--	---	--

<p>Cash Management/ Maria Sobota &amp; Scott Richrath</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Debra Perkins-Smith introduced the topic by saying she couldn't attend the STAC in March, but that her review of the record indicates four messages from the STAC: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ More money should be assigned to the Regional Priority Program, with the money controlled through the Regions</li> <li>○ More information is needed on the 7<sup>th</sup> Pot program (This has been set for next month.)</li> <li>○ More specific information on the budget, not just an account of how much revenue is expected in a year and how only that money will be spent</li> <li>○ Better understanding of the cash management program and how it affects the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Maria began by outlining her primary goals of reviewing the changes to the TIP/STIP and giving an overview of Cash management. Maria then introduced Scott Richrath who spoke to STAC members about Cash Management, Program Management, the importance of communication, the FY15 budget and CDOT's existing cash balance.</li> <li>• Maria then gave STAC a presentation on Cash Management. This presentation included: Program Management, Projects and Portfolio Management, fiscal constraint, RAMP, history of the CDOT's cash balance, an overview of CDOT's cash balance, a historical perspective on programming vs. expenditure performance, a historical perspective on Cash Management, current and future Cash Management, and old/new STIP multiple projects w RAMP.</li> </ul> <p>STAC COMMENTS ON DEB'S REMARKS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Beth Humenik thanked Deb for addressing STAC concerns.</li> <li>• Bobby Lieb Jr. said that another STAC concern that Deb didn't mention is the centralization of power within the Transportation Commission and CDOT Headquarters, with resulting diminishment of the role of the TPRs and the STAC.</li> <li>• Thad Noll commented that in the last year CDOT has been through RAMP,</li> </ul>	<p><b><i>ACTION ITEM: Jack Hilbert made a motion to approve the FY 2015 budget. It passed unanimously.</i></b></p>
---	--	--

	<p>transit studies, and reorganization, among many other changes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mark Dowaliby asked if Executive Director Don Hunt is taking the message about the importance of biking to the economic development of the state to the Governor, and suggested CDOT look at the amount of money Washington State (the #1 ranked bicycle state) spends on bike projects compared to Colorado.</li> </ul> <p>STAC COMMENTS ON CASH MANAGEMENT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Craig Casper asked what kinds of risks in the portfolios CDOT is trying to account for. Scott replied that risks can range from extreme weather to contracting issues; basically, anything that could delay project completion.</li> <li>• Greg Severance asked if it is true that the \$1.5 B involved in the RAMP program over five years is the result of the accumulation of project savings and money being saved for particular projects. Scott said the intent of RAMP is to draw down the substantial cash surplus that has built up over the years, but it's not a dollar-for-dollar match.</li> <li>• Scott Hobson asked for an explanation of pooled funds and, in terms of rollover funds, how they relate to STIP'd projects. Scott Richrath said one example of pooled funds would be the Bridge Enterprise funds that are kept in one account until they are moved to a Region account to repair or replace a bridge.</li> <li>• Elizabeth Relford asked if CDOT will give TPR members an update on how it plans to accelerate the internal contracting process to get projects out more quickly. Deb replied that CDOT would provide staff to explain the contract initiative process.</li> <li>• Suzette Mallette asked if the budget that goes to the Legislature equals anticipated revenues in the year. Maria replied that it is that.</li> <li>• Elizabeth Relford said there's a desire for more Regional Priority Program funds in each Region.</li> <li>• Todd Noll suggested that the more complete budget that was handed out show the RAMP projects correlated with their budget categories to give a better picture of how the money is being spent statewide.</li> <li>• Several STAC members thanked Scott and Maria for a good and complete presentation.</li> </ul>	
<p>Formula Programs/ Deb Perkins-Smith</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Debra Perkins-Smith started by giving STAC members a brief presentation on FASTER Safety. This presentation included a timeline for what's been</li> </ul>	<p><b>No action taken.</b></p>

done with FASTER Safety to date, a recap of the FASTER Safety Audit, FASTER Safety Mitigation Program goals, the project selection process, process options, FASTER Safety mitigation selection criteria, and allocation options.

- FASTER Safety Status Update included three possible ways to distribute the \$47M for safety mitigation: a Regional allocation (option one); a statewide pool with CDOT Region planning estimates (option two); and a statewide pool for a statewide program (option three).
- Debra mentioned that the RTD's had a preference for option two because they liked the flexibility that it provided. They also felt that the most critical projects would be identified, as well as those projects that are important to the region.
- Debra solicited STAC members for feedback and discussion surrounding the options for FASTER Safety that were offered.

#### STAC COMMENTS ON FASTER SAFETY

- Karen Rowe asked who does the project selection under option 3. Debra informed her that project selection would be done by staff with a recommendation through STAC to the Transportation Commission.
- Karen Rowe asked when the new program will start. Debra informed Karen that the program will begin in FY 16 and there may be some elements that are implemented sooner.
- Karen Rowe informed Debra that one of Region 2's RAMP projects proposed using FY 16 FASTER Safety funds as half of the project's budget. Although Karen felt that the project would most likely meet the new criteria, she still has some concern. Debra informed her that for a number of the programs discussed, including TAP, CDOT is in a transition. CDOT will work with Region staff to reconcile funds and programmed items.
- Suzette Mallette stated that the options will depend on the formula criteria. For example, using the total number of crashes would heavily favor urban over rural communities.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Craig Casper stated that the use of the word “highways” is a MAP-21 definition, which is the number of collectors and above. He asked if it is the number of state routes or the national highway system. Debra informed him that it is the state highway system. Craig pointed out that in the Pikes Peak area they have 12% of Colorado population and only 1% of the state highway system. Craig went on to request the breakdown of crashes and fatalities on the state system vs. off state system NHS.</li><li>○ Greg Severance asked about the breakdown of \$87 M in total FASTER Safety funds. Debra explained that \$40 M of FASTER Safety goes to FASTER Safety Asset Management and the remaining \$47 M goes to FASTER Safety Mitigation being discussed. Greg stated a preference for option two because it isn’t a dramatic change from what is happening currently. He also commented that he did not prefer option three because it allowed for too much control for CDOT. Greg then turned his attention to the formula criteria associated with FASTER Safety Mitigation and expressed concern over whether the formula will be proactive instead of reactive. Greg also expressed concern that the rural area might not be able to compete with urban areas if the formula isn’t done properly. He commended CDOT on the proactive efforts to work with planning partners to address this.</li><li>○ Thad Noll asked Tony DeVito if he feels comfortable as an RTD under option two that he would have the funding available to proactively prevent accidents from occurring. Tony replied that one of his main focuses is being proactive instead of reactive. One of the things that Tony is excited about with FASTER Safety Mitigation is the ability to be proactive. Tony went on to say that he feels confident with option two.</li><li>○ Karen Rowe said that moving to an expenditure-based STIP will mean the Regions will need a two-year planning window for FASTER Safety funds.</li></ul>	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Bobby Lieb Jr. asked if the information being presented at STAC is different from the State Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) that was conducting regional meetings in prior months. Charles Meyer outlined the differences between FASTER Safety mitigation and SHSP.</li><li>○ Jack Hilbert, speaking to the formula allocation options presented, expressed support for option four because it takes a multitude of factors into consideration and looks at the state system as a whole.</li><li>○ DRCOG supported option 4 and a few others supported option 2, but no consensus was expressed. This will be on the agenda for action in May.</li></ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● After the discussion on FASTER Safety, Debra returned to STAC to discuss the RPP formula. Debra informed the group that the TC will not be making any decisions on the RPP formula at their April meeting. Debra asked STAC for clarification of their comments to ensure that what they have been saying is clearly expressed to the TC.</li><li>● Debra outlined, thematically, what STAC has been expressing about RPP. These comments included: STAC would like to see the overall amount of RPP increased; caution over the TC selecting the appropriate formula because program formulas remain in place for a long time; VMT is a good surrogate for the movement of people, goods, and congestion; population as a formula factor shifts funding to urban areas; the fair share argument; rural areas only have RPP as a flexible funding source, whereas urban areas have multiple funding sources; since the RPP is only \$50 M, a slight change in the formula hurts the rural areas more so than the urban areas.</li></ul> <p>STAC COMMENTS ON RPP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● Craig Casper commented that CDOT has a fiduciary responsibility to the National Highway System and RPP contains federal funds, so combining VMT on the State Highway System and National Highway System would be a much less skewed distribution.</li><li>● Gary Beedy commented that PD 14 has tiers for Asset Management, so</li></ul>	
--	---	--

	<p>rural areas will receive lighter treatments. There needs to be a way to address those areas that have energy development or sudden, larger volumes of traffic. Gary also expressed concern over the population as a formula factor because it continues to favor the urban areas. Since population is such a large percentage of the formula, areas with smaller populations will find it difficult to manage growing volumes of truck traffic.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Jack Hilbert said that he feels it is imperative to move forward with the staff recommended formula. It will still be possible to change the formula at a later date. Jack continued to say that for a region of the state that has 50% of most major categories, DRCOG is not asking for 50% of the RPP formula. Instead they are compromising and asking for something much lower than that.</li><li>• Mark Dowaliby stated that when considering population as a formula factor it is not just where the population lives, but also where that population travels to around that state. The mountain communities have to accommodate the movements of the Front Range population. Jack responded that the traffic flows in both ways and Denver deals with tourism traffic as well.</li><li>• Ken Simms commented that VMT reflects population and traffic flowing in both ways. From that perspective, why VMT isn't used in place of population? Craig Casper responded that VMT is only on state highways and it would leave out those communities with little or no state highway miles.</li><li>• Bobby Lieb Jr. stated that Southwest TPR sent a letter to the Transportation Commission protesting the staff recommended RPP formula and supported STAC formula. He also asked if the group was revisiting the recommendation put forth in the March STAC meeting or if it was the prerogative of the group to reinforce the STAC recommended RPP formula from March to the Transportation Commission.</li><li>• DRCOG and PPACG supported the Feb staff formula, but several other STAC members expressed support for the March STAC recommendation.</li></ul>	
--	--	--

	This will also be on the agenda for action in May.	
High Speed Transit Vision: Advanced Guideway System/Interconnectivity Study Finalization and State Rail Plan Amendment – David Krutsinger	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• David Krutsinger came before STAC to give a presentation on Advanced Guide way System/Interconnectivity Study Finalization and State Rail Plan Amendment.</li> <li>• The Division of Transit and Rail did two years' worth of high speed rail studies around the state. This maintained CDOT's position to compete for federal funds.</li> <li>• On the Front Range system there were funds reserved for major concerns or controversies that may arise. Since nothing emerged, these funds are being used to fulfill a request that looks at how the system could be moved closer to Union Station. This will come in the form of an interoperability assessment with RTD.</li> <li>• The Federal Railroad Administration identified that they are calling all of their national high speed rail network funds. Funds will become available late summer or early fall that CDOT can compete for. CDOT intends to compete for these funds and will return to STAC to discuss the options.</li> <li>• CDOT has come up with a vision that includes 180 miles, north to south, which runs from Fort Collins to Pueblo. Running east to west, the line would start at DIA and run to Eagle County Airport.</li> </ul> <p>STAC COMMENTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bobby Lieb Jr. commended CDOT for being visionary in their attempt and noted that it is a worthy effort. He asked when the day comes that it does become a reality how will the plan not lose it viability? David responded that the planning funds that CDOT will compete for in the fall will slightly elevate the environmental work and give CDOT a 10-15 year shelf life so CDOT doesn't have to revisit the feasibility studies.</li> </ul>	<b>No action taken.</b>
Other Business	•	<b>No action taken.</b>