

**-Draft STAC Meeting Minutes  
January 29, 2016**

**Location:** CDOT Headquarters Auditorium

**Date/Time:** January 29, 9:00 a.m. - 11:30 a.m.

**Chairman:** Vince Rogalski, STAC Chair (GV)

**Attendance:**

In Person: Adam Lancaster (CFR), Gary Beedy (EA), Todd Hollenbeck (GVMPO), Peter Baier (GVMPO), Elise Jones (DRCOG), Doug Rex (DRCOG), Thad Noll (IM), Becky Karasko (NFRMPO), Chuck Grobe (NW), Norm Steen (PPACG), Andy Pico (PPACG), Scott Hobson (PACOG), Buffie McFadyen (PACOG), George Wilkinson (SLV), Mack Loudon (SC), Jim Baldwin (SE), Edward Box III (SUIT), Kevin Hall (SW).

On the Phone: Stephanie Gonzales (SE TPR).

| <b>Agenda Items/<br/>Presenters/Affiliations</b>                          | <b>Presentation Highlights</b>   | <b>Actions</b>           |
|---|--|--------------------------|
| <p>Introductions &amp; December Minutes / Vince Rogalski (STAC Chair)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review of December STAC Minutes.</li> </ul>   | <p>Minutes approved.</p> |
| <p>Transportation Commission Report / Vince Rogalski (STAC Chair)</p>     | <p><b>Presentation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>House Bill 1018, which would allow STAC to advise the TC directly, was approved by its House Committee and will now move to the Senate.</li> <li>RoadX projects include I-25 smart on-ramps to maintain flow of traffic and I-70 connected vehicle pilot project to gather and share data connecting vehicles and road infrastructure.</li> <li>HPTE (presented by Thad Noll): So far I-70 express lanes have been very successful, even more than anticipated, and HPTE is now experimenting with pricing schemes to better understand public tolerance. It remains to be seen how well it handles crashes in the express lane. There are currently no updates on the US 36 project but it's moving along and successful so far, and the same goes for the I-25 project.</li> </ul> | <p>No action taken.</p>  |

|  |  |                         |
|--|--|-------------------------|
| <p>TPR Reports / TPR Representatives</p> | <p><b>Presentation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Southwest</u>: Region 5 RTD Kerrie Neet is retiring, also losing Public Information Officer; will be meeting next week for the SW TPR meeting; the Governor’s list of “16 for 2016” trails was announced last week and SW TPR has two, but it’s not clear yet what the implications are; Durango’s transit agency is looking for ways to fund transit but it’s getting harder each year; La Plata County, the City of Durango, and CDOT are working together on a transportation model update with Fehr &amp; Peers, which should take about 6 months in preparation for a new county transportation plan.</li> <li>• <u>Pueblo Area COG</u>: SH 47 repaving project underway; bridge project just to the north of downtown Pueblo is underway and ahead of schedule; I-25 ILEX is underway and on schedule; MPO has extended comment period for the long range transportation plan in order to get more public feedback, now scheduled for Board approval on 2/25; looking at a potential restructuring study for PACOG to start in March; “16 for 2016” has one trail in Pueblo West.</li> <li>• <u>Pikes Peak Area COG</u>: Andy Pico was elected chair of PPACG but Norm will continue as STAC representative; some discussion of the 10 Year Development Program and how it will be prioritized, hope is that work on this list will be ongoing at the staff level rather than just a few STAC check-ins; PPACG takes positions on state legislation and is opposing SB 11, which would move \$15 M in FASTER funds allocated to DTR into road maintenance.</li> <li>• <u>Central Front Range</u>: Working on the reorganization of the TPR; working with Region 2 to develop access control plan; reconstruction of trail head project; pavement repairs on CO-115.</li> <li>• <u>Grand Valley MPO</u>: Had a good meeting with CDOT, City of Grand Junction, and other stakeholders about the road around the Grand Mesa to make it more suitable for road bikers; GVMPO has 2 trails in the “16 for 2016” list; GVMPO would like an update on potential new FASTER policies being developed by CDOT.</li> <li>• <u>San Luis Valley</u>: TPR meeting is scheduled for next week, missed the last one due to weather.</li> <li>• <u>Southern Ute Indian Tribe</u>: The Tribe has completed final drafts for its Long-Range Transportation Plan and Tribal Transportation Safety Plan and are getting ready to present them to Tribal Council for approval; there are two</li> </ul> | <p>No action taken.</p> |
|--|--|-------------------------|

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <p>road projects on the agenda (one with La Plata County); also looking into new tribal housing development that has sparked another project on SH 172 at an intersection identified by the IACAP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <u>Denver Regional Council of Governments</u>: Recent opening of the Flatiron Flyer BRT on US 36 signifies the completion of Phases 1 and 2 of that corridor, a multi-year project that's been very successful so far, now working out the kinks related to tolls and other minor issues, HOV 2+ will become HOV 3+ starting in 2017, the 18-mile bike trail will open in a few more weeks, overall this has been a great collaboration between RTD, CDOT, and many other partners; DRCOG region has 3-5 trails on the "16 for 2016" list; continuing to work on the MetroVision 2040 plan, making progress and Board has adopted 14 outcomes and we expect to have a new regional vision adopted by summer.</li><li>• <u>North Front Range MPO</u>: NFRMPO has a new chair, vice chair, and STAC representatives; Council has approved the North I-25 legislative agenda and now member counties and municipalities are in discussion about funding contributions; recent staff turnover at the MPO spurs a need for re-staffing; bus service extension to Boulder started last week and is very exciting.</li><li>• <u>Eastern</u>: Held a TPR meeting on Monday and one point of discussion was funding scenarios (including a sales tax), and the TPR voted to support that as a means of increasing funding, not favorable of bonding without a new revenue source; projects are mostly shut down for the winter; attended Ports-to-Plains meeting in Texas, they are looking to add shoulders to all rural corridors and finding ways to move freight off of the interstates (and onto water, rail, etc.), looking to expand I-27 across the state but won't likely happen too quickly, current Colorado situation is no planned improvements on US 287 and concern is that without these more and more traffic will congregate on I-25, worsening safety and congestion.</li><li>• <u>Intermountain</u>: Regional Transportation Forum to discuss mobility will be held on 2/5/16, Grand Ave Bridge will be a big topic of discussion, a 3-year project that will be very painful to undertake but has a lot of support; SH 9 Breckenridge - Frisco bids will open on 2/18/16; Simba Run in Vail will take local traffic off of interstates and provide bike/ped/transit options under interstate; "16 for 2016" list includes a grant partnership between the Climax Mine, Lake County, and Summit County that has been in the works for a long time.</li></ul> |  |
|--|--|--|

|   |   |                         |
|---|---|-------------------------|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>South Central</u>: TPR meeting was held yesterday, got a lot of info about projects on I-25; in the process of negotiating with CDOT, Amtrak, counties, and other stakeholders about potential multimodal improvements, which has been a long process.</li> <li>• <u>Northwest</u>: TPR meeting was held yesterday, a number of projects coming up this summer on SH 131, SH 9, SH 13, and US 40.</li> <li>• <u>Southeast</u>: TPR meeting was held yesterday, included a lot of discussion of the regional “wish list”; had a good conversation about funding transportation in the region via a sales tax; new signage going up south of Lamar to help with weather issues that have happened in the past.</li> <li>• <u>Gunnison Valley</u>: It’s been very cold (-17 to -37), lots of avalanche control going on along US 550 and US 50; Three Rivers Regional Transit Coordinating Council (TRRTCC) working on a local transit implementation plan; San Miguel County (including Telluride and other municipalities) is working on putting together an RTA that may go to the ballot in November.</li> </ul> |                         |
| <p>Freight Advisory Council (FAC) Update / Norm Steen &amp; Gary Beedy</p>                                    | <p><b>Presentation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The group is continuing to have good meetings, the last one had between 60-70 attendees.</li> <li>• The group is industry-led, but also has academics and government participants.</li> <li>• The main focus right now is on quick wins and we appreciate the participation of Debra Perkins-Smith and Mike Lewis.</li> <li>• Next meeting will be at University of Denver on February 11<sup>th</sup>.</li> </ul>  | <p>No action taken.</p> |
| <p>Federal and State Legislative Report / Andy Karsian (CDOT Office of Policy &amp; Government Relations)</p> | <p><b>Presentation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>HB 1008</u>: Would allow CDOT buses to use shoulders along US 36 – needed clarification in statute, moving forward in a bi-partisan way, and has a quick timeframe, opportunities to use this on other corridors in the future, provided that they are designed with that in mind and have local buy-in.</li> <li>• <u>HB 1018</u>: Would allow STAC to advise the TC directly, Vince testified well on behalf of the STAC.</li> <li>• <u>HB 1031</u>: Would have legislative services do a study of whether to modify TC regions to align with STAC, bill would not change them, only study the potential for change.</li> </ul>  | <p>No action taken.</p> |

|   |  |                         |
|---|--|-------------------------|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>HB 1039</u>: Traction bill would require vehicles to have adequate tires or traction devices on I-70 between October and May – passed out of committee and now on to the Senate.</li> <li>• A bill was presented last year with idea of continuing SB 228 until the full amount is transferred, ensuring that it's eventually transferred (rather than expiring after a set time). This bill died last year but has been reintroduced this session, though it still doesn't look like it will pass. The Joint Budget Committee is having a general conversation about some options: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Change nothing and let SB 228 play out as originally designed.</li> <li>○ Use one forecast to determine transfer amounts rather than multiple economic forecasts throughout the year (as is currently done) – not clear how this would work if the chosen forecast proved to be way off.</li> <li>○ Get rid of forecasting and just commit to transfer a set amount each year – likely would be less than the original \$1 billion cap, but would be consistent and more than what CDOT might get under the current scheme. This funding would come out of the general fund.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <u>SB 11</u>: Would terminate transit fees from FASTER and dedicate to FASTER Safety; passed out of Senate but expected to die in the house; would be a \$15 M hit to CDOT and would harm DTR, Bustang, etc. CDOT opposes this.</li> <li>• There are some other bills in development related to transponders, lane splitting, red light cameras, considering military installations in planning, increasing voting membership of STAC to include the state's two tribes, and motorcycle operator training requirements. There are still a lot of other bills that may come through before the deadlines next week.</li> </ul> |                         |
| <p>Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act / Ron Papsdorf (CDOT Office of Policy &amp; Government Relations)</p> | <p><b>Presentation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At the last meeting, CDOT gave a high-level overview of the FAST Act and now we have put together a 10-page memo with more detailed information. This is still just a first step and we are soliciting your input via a survey in the packet to get an idea of where we should focus our ongoing efforts in delving into this more deeply.</li> <li>• We have a group working on picking the bill apart but some of this may change given FHWA guidance or other new information that comes to light.</li> <li>• 5-year, \$300 B highway, transit, safety, and rail bill.</li> </ul>   | <p>No action taken.</p> |

- Normally rail is separate – a first to include in the surface transportation bill.
- The FAST Act continues to distribute 93% of funding based on formula.
- Funding levels are increased but mostly on pace with inflation.
- Changes Surface Transportation Program (STP), the second largest program, into a block grant program.
  - A few minor changes go along with this: moves TAP into STP as a set-aside, adds new project eligibilities, retains off-system bridge set-aside, and increases local area sub-allocation from 50% to 55% over the life of the bill.
- Safety
  - Requires biennial survey of automatic traffic enforcement systems (safety, accountability, transparency, etc.).
  - USDOT study on marijuana-impaired driving within 1-year.
- Freight
  - Overall additional emphasis on freight planning and movement.
  - Establishes National Highway Freight Network.
  - Requires states to create a State Freight Plan (CDOT has already completed).
  - Encourages states to form FAC (already have one).
  - New formula freight program created - \$85 M to Colorado.
  - New competitive Nationally Significant Freight and Highway Projects Program (only projects above \$100 M, grants of at least \$25 M).
- Transit
  - Bicycle storage and parking are eligible.
  - Plans must identify intercity bus facilities.
  - Redefines BRT to include non-exclusive right-of-way systems to be eligible for Small Starts funding.
  - Recreates competitive bus and bus facilities grant program.
  - Creates innovative coordinated access and mobility pilot program.
- Rail
  - Amtrak funding separated into Northeast Corridor (\$2.6 B) and National Network (\$5.5 B).

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Creates State Supported Route Committee to promote cooperation and planning.</li><li>● <u>Grants</u><ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Consolidated Rail Infrastructure and Safety Improvements.</li><li>○ Federal State Partnership for State of Good Repair.</li><li>○ Restoration and Enhancement (only \$20 M per year nationally).</li><li>○ Amtrak now required to obtain independent recommendations for methods to determine intercity routes and service level decisions.</li></ul></li><li>● <u>Planning &amp; Performance Management</u><ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ No new national performance measures beyond MAP-21.</li><li>○ System resiliency and tourism must now be considered in metro area and statewide planning efforts.</li><li>○ “Private Transportation” should include consideration of intercity bus operators.</li></ul></li><li>● <u>Environmental Review</u><ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Includes new streamlining measures.</li><li>○ Allow states to assume responsibility for project design, plans, specs, estimates, etc. (within reasonable bounds).<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Await FHWA guidance on what that means.</li></ul></li><li>○ Thresholds for categorical exclusions are indexed to inflation.</li><li>○ Improves process for carrying forward planning level decisions into NEPA process.</li></ul></li><li>● <u>Design &amp; Project Delivery</u><ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Can now bundle two or more similar bridge projects into one, within certain criteria.</li><li>○ States may allow the use of alternative roadway design publication for local jurisdiction projects.</li></ul></li><li>● <u>Innovation</u><ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Establishes advanced transportation and congestion management technologies deployment initiative – competitive grants of \$60 M per year.</li><li>○ Grants to demonstrate user-based alternative revenue mechanisms between \$15 M - \$20 M per year.</li></ul></li></ul> |  |
|--|---|--|

- TRB to conduct study of Future Interstates to consider NHS routes that should be added to interstate system.
- FHWA to develop new datasets and tools to assist MPOs and DOTs in performance management.
- Financing
  - TIFIA rising to \$300 M by 2020, and no more redistribution of unused funds.
    - Credit assistance, not new grant money.
  - Eliminates limitations on conversion of interstate HOV lanes to HOT lanes.
  - Over the road buses must have access to toll facilities under same conditions as public transportation.
  - Must consult with MPOs on the placement and amount of tolls on interstate HOV facilities within their boundaries.
- Miscellaneous
  - HSIP funds can't be used for automated traffic enforcement (except in school zones).
  - USDOT to designate national electric vehicle charging and hydrogen, propane, and natural gas fueling corridors within one year.
  - A state may relinquish park-and-ride facilities to local government agencies for highway purposes.
  - I-70 from Denver to Salt Lake City is now a "Corridor of High Priority".
    - The meaning of this is still unclear, but could present an advantage in competition with other states.

**STAC Comments**

- Elise Jones: Is there a minimum amount of designated right-of-way for the BRT policy?
- Ron Papsdorf: The language isn't that specific.
- Elise Jones: Is the Recreational Trails program still included? If so, is the flex opportunity retained?
- Ron Papsdorf: Recreational Trails is still there.

- Debra Perkins-Smith: If you don't want to use the money for Recreational Trails then you have to have the Governor opt out. The same rules as before apply, the funds are just in a different place.
- Elise Jones: Is there an assumption that the EV, propane, CNG corridors will be one and the same?
- Ron Papsdorf: The language isn't that specific.
- Adam Lancaster: Is there an additional funding opportunity related to the marijuana impaired study?
- Ron Papsdorf: That item relates to USDOT doing a study, it doesn't include any grant funding for states. But given that we are within a handful of states facing this issue, we as a state may help inform those efforts.
- Adam Lancaster: Isn't Colorado already doing this? We might be able to accomplish this same goal through our own efforts.
- Mike Lewis: I think it's a good idea, we should offer our support.
- Jon Cater: USDOT is making a real effort to have a consistent roll-out of the interpretation for this bill to ensure that there's no confusion. That might mean that it takes a little longer for us to release that interpretation, but hopefully once it's out everything will be very clear.
- Gary Beedy: On the freight corridor issue, are we going to keep working on designating those rather than waiting for the FHWA guidance?
- Debra Perkins-Smith: Yes, we will continue working on that with the FAC and CDOT staff. It might be a challenge if we are limited to 75 or 150 miles, but we have to wait and see. We're not going to leave any money on the table.
- Gary Beedy: When can we see the map of the primary freight network?
- Debra Perkins-Smith: We can send that out to the group.
- Becky Karasko: We would like to bring your FAST Act Summary to our MPO board and get their input on the most important elements.
- Ron Papsdorf: As long as we get the STAC input within 2 weeks that will be useful to us.
- Jon Cater: FHWA is hosting a series of Freight Roundtables around the country and will have one in Denver on April 4, 2016. I'd like to ask the

|  |  |                         |
|--|--|-------------------------|
|  | <p>STAC to designate a representative for that because it would be good to have your input.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Mike Lewis</u>: Any idea of the invitee list?</li> <li>• <u>Jon Cater</u>: Planning for about 30-50 people, including higher-level officials from government, shippers, private companies, academia, etc.</li> <li>• <u>Mike Lewis</u>: The FAC would definitely like to participate so we should put that on the agenda for the next FAC meeting.</li> <li>• <u>Jon Cater</u>: The issue of the freight corridor mileage limit is a good one to raise – it may work in smaller states but doesn't make any sense here.</li> </ul>   |                         |
| <p>Development Program / Jeff Sudmeier (CDOT Division of Transportation Development)</p> | <p><b>Presentation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We provided an update on the Development Program in October and November. We've been working with the regions to identify major investments based on priorities identified through the planning process and in RTPs. The inventory in your packet includes nearly 100 projects totaling roughly \$8 billion. Focusing on bigger projects, what we're calling "major investments", projects that typically can't be funded through a single existing revenue source, or that we really can't do more than chip away at without new revenue sources.</li> <li>• A draft version was sent out in early December and was cross-checked with all the RTPs to make sure we didn't miss anything. Highlighted items are all those that have been added since the last version. This is more complete but it still might not be 100%.</li> <li>• We're not losing sight of the smaller projects, just tracking them at a lower level of detail given the emphasis here on major investments.</li> <li>• We wanted to share this new version with you and get any feedback, either here or after you've had time to review and discuss with your local groups.</li> <li>• There is now a website set up for the Development Program which we will be keeping current moving forward:</li> </ul> <p><a href="https://codot.gov/programs/planning/projects/development-program">https://codot.gov/programs/planning/projects/development-program</a>.</p> <p><b>STAC Comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Elise Jones</u>: How does bike/pedestrian roll into this? While those projects aren't large, they do create a more complete picture of the whole system.</li> </ul> | <p>No action taken.</p> |

- Jeff Sudmeier: We've been working with DTR on identifying the transit needs component. We have a line in there for bike/pedestrian needs and the methodology there is still being determined. So we do intend to identify bike/ped needs but haven't gotten there yet.

**Presentation**

- The spreadsheet included in your packet shows some of the types of data that we're collecting in order to understand and filter these projects in the future.
- As I mentioned, these currently total over \$8 billion, which is beyond what we could reasonably expect in the next 10 years even were new funding made available. We'd like to get to a narrower subset of projects in the vicinity of \$2.5 billion. We'd like to get your input on some potential criteria that we could use to get to that smaller list. These may include:
  - Mobility
  - Economic Vitality
  - Safety
  - Asset Life
  - Regional Priority
  - Strategic Nature

**STAC Comments:**

- Craig Casper: I think that the six criteria you mention are all solid – would these be qualitative or quantitative measures?
- Jeff Sudmeier: It would be a mix of qualitative and quantitative given the great variety in projects and what data is available.
- Elise Jones: When we're measuring mobility, I want to double check that we're talking about moving people/freight rather than just moving vehicles. In terms of the regional priority factor, I imagine that there are some priorities and projects that are cross-regional and I'd like us to capture that.
- Jeff Sudmeier: That's a good point, and I want to also clarify that we're not necessarily talking about ranking a list or giving individual project scores, this is more of a sub-set or tiering of projects.

|  |  |                         |
|--|--|-------------------------|
| <p>SB 228 Update / Maria Sobota (CDOT Chief Financial Officer) &amp; Debra Perkins-Smith (CDOT Division of Transportation Development)</p> | <p><b>Presentation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Andy provided updates as part of his legislative update. The most recent forecasts for SB 228 are calling for transfers of about \$106 million in FY 17. We originally forecasted \$0 in FY 17.</li> <li>• We will receive FY 16 transfers in two parts- in April of this year, and in January of 2017.</li> <li>• The FY 16 SB 228 funds were committed to the I-70 Viaduct project. We now have to think about what we'll do with funds for FY 17 and any possible transfers beyond FY 17.</li> <li>• For the original SB 228 list, projects were selected based on mobility and potential economic vitality impact. At the last TC meeting, the group reaffirmed those criteria as their chosen approach.</li> <li>• The original list totaled \$2 billion. Today I'd like to ask the STAC if those are still the right criteria that we should be starting from in narrowing down the list.</li> </ul> <p><b>STAC Comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Thad Noll</u>: If those criteria are in the SB 228 legislation, then we should probably use them. Are those the same as the transit criteria?</li> <li>• <u>Mark Imhoff</u>: They are the same criteria for transit.</li> <li>• <u>Debra Perkins-Smith</u>: One item that we brought up with TC was the idea of geographic equity. One commissioner suggested putting the funds towards asset management. Others said that they didn't want to rank the projects so much as have tiered groupings.</li> <li>• <u>Vince Rogalski</u>: So we're not developing a new list?</li> <li>• <u>Debra Perkins-Smith</u>: Well that's up to you, if you tell us that we need to emphasize safety then that might be a new list. If you like the original criteria then it's more of an update.</li> <li>• <u>Vince Rogalski</u>: I think it makes sense to use the original list totaling \$2 billion and narrow it down from there rather than starting from scratch.</li> <li>• <u>Jeff Sudmeier</u>: Just to clarify, all the items on the original SB 228 list are included in the Development Program. The SB 228 list is focused on mobility and economic vitality. What we discussed in terms of \$2.5 billion for a subset of the Development Program is more "general purpose" and could include mobility, safety, major reconstruction, etc.</li> </ul> | <p>No action taken.</p> |
|--|--|-------------------------|

|   |  |                         |
|---|--|-------------------------|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Debra Perkins-Smith</u>: We will return with more information and discussion next month.</li> </ul>  |                         |
| <p>SWP Lessons Learned and Ongoing Planning Discussions / Michelle Scheuerman (CDOT Division of Transportation Development)</p> | <p><b>Presentation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We are planning to return for a workshop at a future STAC meeting to seek your input on the most recent Statewide Transportation Plan (SWP) development process.</li> <li>• Want to know what went well, what could be improved, and the lessons learned for the next time around.</li> <li>• Question topics will include the parts of the SWP/RTP reviewed by the interviewee, thoughts on the types of media used, plan areas of too much / too little detail, data used and analyzed, overall usefulness, preferred communications, meeting organization and facilitation, outreach methods, etc.</li> <li>• Key participants will include CDOT Executive Management, CDOT Regions, DTD and other CDOT plan owners, FHWA, SWP Committee Chairs, STAC, TPR Chairs, MPO Reps, consultants, etc.</li> </ul> <p><b>STAC Comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Norm Steen</u>: I'm glad that you're doing this, it improves the process.</li> <li>• <u>Thad Noll</u>: I would include TPR members as well as TPR chairs.</li> <li>• <u>Michelle Scheuerman</u>: That's a good point – we are hoping to send the liaisons to the TPR meetings to get that input.</li> <li>• <u>Todd Hollenbeck</u>: Are you going to follow up with participants who are no longer in their roles, like our ex-TC commissioner?</li> <li>• <u>Michelle Scheuerman</u>: Yes, definitely.</li> <li>• <u>Norm Steen</u>: You will get better results if you provide us with the questions to share and discuss with our organizations and then bring that feedback to you.</li> <li>• <u>Michelle Scheuerman</u>: We were planning to dedicate 90 minutes to this at the next STAC in a workshop format, maybe with breakout sessions. We can do that in March rather than February if it works better for you.</li> <li>• <u>Norm Steen</u>: I think that would be a good approach.</li> <li>• <u>Michelle Scheuerman</u>: Okay, that's what we'll do.</li> </ul> | <p>No action taken.</p> |

|   |   |                         |
|---|---|-------------------------|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Doug Rex</u>: And you'll be following up with individual organizations separately, right? Should DRCOG anticipate having our own discussion with you?</li> <li>• <u>Michelle Scheuerman</u>: Yes</li> <li>• <u>Gary Beedy</u>: I sometimes hear from legislators that CDOT has no plan, when of course we do. I think in the future we need to make an effort to get those directly into the hands of the legislators so that they're completely aware of all the work we're doing.</li> </ul>  |                         |
| <p>Approval of Non-Metro and Public Involvement Plan Guidance Documents / Michelle Scheuerman (CDOT Division of Transportation Development)</p> | <p><b>Presentation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The public review period for these two documents is complete and we want to give you a chance to approve them.</li> <li>• Motion, second, no discussion, passes unanimously.</li> </ul>   | <p>Plans approved.</p>  |
| <p>Federal Lands Access Program (FLAP) / Scott McDaniel (CDOT Division of Project Support)</p>  | <p><b>Presentation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scott McDaniel is one of three Colorado representatives on the Colorado FLAP Program Decision Committee.</li> <li>• Used to be the Forest Land Highway Program, changed to FLAP in MAP-21, and saw only minor modifications in the FAST Act.</li> <li>• FLAP's second call for projects is coming up.</li> <li>• Not a grant program or reimbursement program</li> <li>• New considerations for this second round – more strategic look at project locations and consideration of NEPA status for potential projects (not a requirement but a consideration).</li> <li>• The FLAP webpage is a great resource for applicants:<br/><a href="http://flh.fhwa.dot.gov/programs/flap/">http://flh.fhwa.dot.gov/programs/flap/</a></li> <li>• Schedule: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Call for Projects: 2/15/16</li> <li>○ Deadline: 5/21/16</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Colorado specific page has more details on past project, application link, and more.</li> <li>• Committee members are Scott McDaniel, Ryan Tyler, and Thad Noll. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Morgan Malley is the application contact and a good resource.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <p>No action taken.</p> |

|  |  |                         |
|--|--|-------------------------|
|  | <p><b>STAC Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Norm Steen</u>: Can you give us a general idea of what a good project would look like – some general parameters?</li> <li>• <u>Scott McDaniel</u>: In the past we've found that upgrading an existing roadway is a good approach, for example from gravel to pavement. These connect communities and have other benefits.</li> <li>• <u>Thad Noll</u>: The emphasis is on high-use recreation areas with economic benefit, roadway or otherwise. One successful project in the past was adding bike lanes leading up to a national park.</li> <li>• <u>Jon Cater</u>: This program has roughly \$60 M to work with over the course of three years, so there's a lot to work with. Focus on products that when you've finished you have more access than before, rather than a small part of something bigger.</li> <li>• <u>Thad Noll</u>: While working on your application, talk with your local federal lands contacts to ensure that you are aligned with their needs – you'll have a strong application.</li> <li>• <u>Scott McDaniel</u>: There is a map on the website showing all the federal lands in the state so that you can connect the dots and coordinate with the right people to have the greatest success.</li> <li>• <u>Jim Baldwin</u>: Keep in mind that in the case of any upgraded facilities, the ongoing maintenance will still be the responsibility of the owner.</li> <li>• <u>Scott McDaniel</u>: The last time around we had 43 projects apply and only approved 7 of them. Those projects that missed the cut last time around can be resubmitted again this year, and maybe they'll be funded now.</li> </ul> |                         |
| <p>Rural Regional Bus Network Plan / Mike Timlin (CDOT Division of Transit and Rail)</p> | <p><b>Presentation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Rural Regional Bus Network is a not a new project – it comes out of the Statewide Transit Plan that was adopted in May 2015. Nor is it meant to replace the 5311f program, but to improve the system to be more passenger- and economy-friendly.</li> <li>• 5311f is currently about 15% of FTA funding to CDOT. It's a valuable program for planning and marketing assistance as well as infrastructure support.</li> <li>• Requirements include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 7-day-a-week service</li> <li>○ Meaningful connection with national intercity system</li> </ul> </li> </ul>  | <p>No action taken.</p> |

|   |  |                                     |
|---|--|-------------------------------------|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The plan is to utilize unused 5311f and FASTER Transit funds to add new routes to the intercity bus network</li> <li>• Next Steps: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Meet with regional bus operators.</li> <li>○ Coordinate with SWP team and other stakeholders.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>STAC Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Gary Beedy</u>: Are any federal funds being used to operate Bustang?</li> <li>• <u>Mike Timlin</u>: No, they are all FASTER funds.</li> <li>• <u>Buffie McFadyen</u>: Having been one of the legislators who voted for FASTER, I'm pleased to see how popular Bustang is in El Paso County. Maybe we should remind the current legislators of how successful it's been and how FASTER is benefitting them.</li> </ul> |                                     |
| Other Business / Vince Rogalski (STAC Chairman) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Vince Rogalski</u>: The March STAC meeting falls on Good Friday, and I'd like to change that to the week before – from 3/25/16 to 3/18/16.</li> <li>• The STAC members agree to this change.</li> </ul>  | March STAC date changed to 3/18/16. |

**STAC ADJOURNS**