



**COLORADO**

Department of  
Transportation

## **Statewide Transportation Advisory Committee (STAC)**

**June 24, 2016**

**9:00 AM – 11:30 PM**

**CDOT HQ Auditorium, 4201 E. Arkansas Ave., Denver, CO**

### **Agenda**

- 9:00-9:05** Welcome and Introductions – Vince Rogalski, STAC Chair
- 9:05-9:10** Approval of May Meeting Minutes – Vince Rogalski
- 9:10-9:20** Transportation Commission Report (Informational Update) – Vince Rogalski
- Summary report of the most recent Transportation Commission meeting.
- 9:20-9:40** TPR Reports (Informational Update) – STAC Representatives
- Brief update from STAC members on activities in their TPRs.
- 9:40-9:50** Chief Engineer Update (Informational Update) – Joshua Laipply, CDOT Chief Engineer
- 9:50-10:10** Federal and State Legislative Report (Informational Update) – Herman Stockinger & Andy Karsian, CDOT Office of Policy and Government Relations (OPGR)
- Update on recent federal and state legislative activity.
- 10:10-10:25** Break
- 10:25-10:35** Freight Advisory Council (FAC) Updates (Informational Update) – STAC Reps
- Report out on most recent FAC meeting and updates on current FAC activities
- 10:35-10:45** Multimodal Freight Plan / State Freight and Passenger Rail Plan (Informational Update and Discussion) – Michelle Scheuerman, Division of Transportation Development (DTD)
- Update and overview of upcoming freight plan development.
- 10:45-11:05** Critical Urban and Rural Freight Corridors (Informational Update and Discussion) – Jeff Sudmeier, DTD
- Discussion of designation of Critical Urban and Rural Freight Corridors.
- 11:05 - 11:25** Bustang and Rural/Regional Bus Network Plan (Informational Update)– Mark Imhoff, Division of Transit & Rail (DTR)
- Update on status of outreach and planning
- 11:25-11:30** Other Business- Vince Rogalski
- 12:00** Adjourn

#### Future Agenda Topics

- **Stakeholder/Public Outreach** – Update/discussion on additional stakeholder and public outreach activities

STAC Conference Call Information: 1-877-820-7831 321805#

STAC Website: <http://www.coloradodot.info/programs/statewide-planning/stac.html>

**Draft STAC Meeting Minutes  
May 20, 2016**

**Location:** CDOT Headquarters Auditorium  
**Date/Time:** May 20<sup>th</sup>, 9:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.  
**Chairman:** Vince Rogalski, STAC Chair  
**Attendance:**

In Person: Vince Rogalski (GVTPR), Kevin Hall (SWTPR), Scott Hobson (PACOG), John Adams (PACOG), Norm Steen (PPACG), Adam Lancaster (CFRTPR), Doug Rex (DRCOG), Elise Jones (DRCOG), George Wilkinson (SLVTPR), Thad Noll (IMTPR), Steve Vanderleest (IMTPR), Becky Karasko (NFRMPO), Mack Loudon (SCTPR), Chuck Grobe (NWTTPR), Jim Baldwin (SETPR), Walt Boulden (SCTPR), Brian McCracken (UFRTPR), Trent Bushner (EATPR), Craig Casper (PPACG), Gary Beedy (EATPR), Pete Baier (GVMPO), Barbara Kirkmeyer (UFRTPR).

On the Phone: Buffie McFayden (PACOG)

<b>Agenda Items/ Presenters/Affiliations</b>	<b>Presentation Highlights</b>	<b>Actions</b>
<p>Introductions &amp; April Minutes / Vince Rogalski (STAC Chair)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of April STAC Minutes.</li> </ul>	<p>Minutes approved.</p>
<p>Federal and State Legislative Report / Herman Stockinger, Andy Karsian, and Ron Papsdorf (CDOT Office of Policy &amp; Government Relations)</p>	<p><b>Presentation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On the federal side the big issue is the THUD appropriation for the next fiscal year, which does include a rescission provision of contract authority for transportation programs, we are concerned about this and working with Congressional delegation to address this issue and determine the potential implications. This is a rescission of contract authority, not obligation authority. Over time there could be a cumulative effect.</li> <li>• Bus-on-Shoulder bill to allow travel on US 36 shoulder but also has possibilities for other, future roadways that are designed for it and approved by CDOT, CSP, and local governments. This could impact projects on I-25 in the future.</li> <li>• Another bill to review the Transportation Commission boundaries and membership; will study and report back to Committee, based on lane miles,</li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>

	<p>population, funding, etc. to see if it makes sense to modify the number and/or location of commissioners.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The I-70 tire tread bill died again this year in the Senate, in part because CDOT is doing too good a job as-is so it didn't seem necessary to create a new law.</li> <li>• All the transportation funding bills failed despite general support voiced among many leaders in the Governor, Senate, and House at the start of the session.</li> <li>• One bill that did pass allocated \$198 million this year and \$158 million next year (for a total of \$358 million) from SB 228 to CDOT.</li> <li>• A FASTER fee bill would have taken away FASTER Transit funding and diverted it to FASTER Safety, but that died in the House.</li> <li>• Another bill sought to allow free access to HOV lanes and to eliminate the requirement for users to purchase a transponder and toll deposit to use the HOV / tolling lanes, we worked with the sponsors and decided that administratively CDOT will "buy" the transponder and if the user only uses HOV then they'll never pay, but if they use toll lanes it will go to the previous fee/deposit structure.</li> </ul> <p><b>STAC Comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Elise Jones</u>: What is CDOT doing to get ready for the switch to HOV 3+? It looks like the conversation around delaying the switch from HOV 2+ to HOV 3+ isn't going away.</li> <li>• <u>Andy Karsian</u>: We are working with local communities, Plenary Roads, and members of the Legislature to spread the word and explain the change to the public. We'll probably see another bill like the one this year, but we hope to have a good conversation in the interim that will help balance the public's understanding before opposition develops. We were caught a bit flat-footed this time around but we won't let that occur again.</li> </ul> <p><b>Presentation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The CDOT Efficiency and Accountability Committee came out of the FASTER bill in 2009 and seeks to maximize the use of CDOT's transportation dollars; the group stopped meeting after a while due to perceived lack of utility but it's a statutory requirement so it's been reinstated and its membership expanded; new members include counties,</li> </ul>	
--	---	--

municipalities, good governance organizations, and other special interests; will have a sunset review after 3 years; let us know if you'd like to serve on that group.

- Bill on off-highway vehicles crossing state highways that pass through municipalities, CDOT worked with CML on that and was successful.
- Finally, TRANS Bond II – CDOT was officially neutral on this; the bill struggled and finally failed in the Legislature.

#### **STAC Comments**

- Elise Jones: What's have you heard about a special session to continue working on some of these bills?
- Andy Karsian: That special session is being called for by individuals who didn't get their agendas passed, but if there wasn't political will to do that during the normal session it seems unlikely that it would occur out of session. Politically it doesn't make sense in an election year.

#### **Presentation**

- The Colorado Contractors Association will not be putting a sales tax increase on the ballot in November 2016, so the only option left for increased transportation funding is via the TABOR reform effort.
- The proposal would allow the state to retain excess revenue above TABOR limit for specific purposes:
  - 35% to transportation
  - 35% to education
  - 30% to healthcare, mental services, etc.
- Estimated retained revenue:
  - \$122 million for transportation in 2017, with about \$78 million of that to CDOT under the HUTF formula.
  - Without a TABOR refund, SB 228 would flow unimpeded, accounting for another \$200 million.
- It's hard to say how this would affect the Legislature's willingness to let CDOT receive excess and SB 228 funds, which creates a large range of funds that would be possible under this scenario.
- These revenue estimates are rather optimistic, with no downturn in next 10 years, which is by no means guaranteed.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is the only thing out there right now; the sponsors received permission to start collecting signatures on May 5th and they have until August 8<sup>th</sup> to collect enough to get on the ballot.</li> </ul> <p><b>STAC Comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Elise Jones</u>: Is CDOT supporting this?</li> <li>• <u>Herman Stockinger</u>: We have no formal position at this time but I think that we would do so if asked.</li> <li>• <u>Elise Jones</u>: How would CDOT spend those extra funds if received?</li> <li>• <u>Herman Stockinger</u>: We don't have a plan for that just yet but should within 30 to 60 days.</li> <li>• <u>Norm Steen</u>: There was an effort to extend SB 228 in a way to guarantee that the full amount is eventually paid out to CDOT, but it failed. Do you think we'll see something like that again in the future?</li> <li>• <u>Herman Stockinger</u>: I think it's possible that something like that will occur again in the future.</li> </ul> <p><b>Presentation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thanks to all the Commissioners who came down the Legislature to testify for or against various bills during the session, we certainly appreciate that. Commissioner Steen in particular spoke against the bill requiring 15 outreach meetings across the state, which would have constituted a significant burden for CDOT.</li> </ul>	
<p>Transportation Commission Report / Vince Rogalski (STAC Chair)</p>	<p><b>Presentation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Held the TC meeting this month in Steamboat Springs.</li> <li>• One topic of note was the concern around narrow highways without shoulders, the type you see on the way driving to Steamboat. These have implications for safety and resiliency, particularly along SH 13, SH 141, and US 40.</li> <li>• Another point was that the STIP was approved for FY2017 – FY2020 and some questions around how cash balance and cash management and how those work, i.e. how can we be spending FY 2019 money today when we haven't spent FY 2013 funds yet. So we're working on how to better define and explain that and will be getting more info on that in the future.</li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>

	<p><i>High Performance Transportation Enterprise</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The US 36 project wrap-up will occur on June 13<sup>th</sup> at 10:00 AM to celebrate the state's first big P3 project – a great success that is very popular with the public now. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Also a big bike ride on June 18<sup>th</sup> to celebrate the completion of the parallel US 36 bike trail, a fantastic project that the state should be proud of.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Discussion with FHWA about the potential for extending the number of operating days that we may use the I-70 mountain express lanes; currently this is limited to 73 days per year but at the current rate we expect to run out of those by September; they've been very successful so we'd like to get the limit bumped up to 100 days of operation per year.</li> </ul>	
<p>TPR Reports / TPR Representatives</p>	<p><b>Presentation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>GVMPO</u>: The Governor came out and looked at some trail projects in Grand Junction, particularly the 2 among the 16 for 2016 list; met with the 6 eastern Utah Counties and learned that their Legislature gives them funding for a full-time consultant to continually plan and keep projects shelf-ready for TIGER and other grants as they come along, which gives us a look at who we're competing against for those types of grants.</li> <li>• <u>SWTPR</u>: No meeting since last time so not much to report there; Durango-La Plata airport has been planning for expansion a long time, some possibilities to fund include a property or sales tax increase, or whether it should become an Airport Authority, The Governor recently signed bill in Durango that would allow Airport Authorities to cross over state lines, which is interesting based on the heavy traffic from Farmington, NM;, since going to county voters for a tax increase is probably a long-shot this could be very complicated solution but might make more sense than the current arrangement.</li> <li>• <u>PACOG</u>: LRTP to be adopted on Thursday, May 26<sup>th</sup>, the 3 big projects in the region are currently on schedule; a question to include in TTH would be: "If you had a choice of expanding or extending the highway system, which would it be?"; working with FHWA and CDOT to put together a peer exchange with non-TMA MPOs in the next 2-3 months; also want to introduce John Adams, the new PACOG transportation program manager.</li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>

- PPACG: Last meeting on May 11<sup>th</sup> and discussed TIP public comments, will vote on June 15<sup>th</sup> whether to adopt; LRTP amendment also being discussed; Governor is at PPACG today and will be signing a veterans bill there.
- CFRTPR: PEL Study on US 24 project has started and staff is working to keep everyone involved; met with CDOT R2 staff on local agency process issues; bids on the Canon City RAMP project came in over the design estimate, so we're asking TC for permission on extra funds but haven't heard back yet, hoping we can get that done quickly; for a TTH question "Where does transportation fit in among your priorities for all the things that the state funds?".
- DRCOG: Denver is one of 7 finalists among 78 applicants for USDOT's Smart City Initiative, Secretary Foxx visited earlier this week to see the final presentation, Denver's application focused on electrification of vehicles and preparation for C/AV adoption, if Denver wins they'll receive \$50 million; this is a big year for RTD including US 36 (45% increase in BRT ridership since opening, speeds increased in all traffic lanes by 30%), the University of Colorado A Line to the airport, the first portion of the Northwest Line to Westminster in the summer, the Gold Line in the fall, and the Aurora light rail line in the winter; working with the RAQC on submitting a new SIP to meet 2008 ozone standard compliance for last EPA standard and will next begin work with them compliance with the new EPA standard, which will be a greater challenge.

**STAC Comments**

- Thad Noll: Would TPR letters of support help in the Smart Cities application?
- Elise Jones: The final application is due next week so for anyone that is able to take quick action it would certainly be welcome as a sign of solidarity and support, given that the project will benefit everyone.

**Presentation**

- SLVTPR: Started up projects in downtown Buena Vista, also widening of SH 17 to have 3 foot shoulders; TPR meeting on the May 5<sup>th</sup> saw good turnout, and the new RTD Mike McVaugh was present and well-received by the group.

- IMTPR: The TC did a tour through the Vail RAMP project on I-70, which is moving along with some traffic impacts; the Grand Ave Bridge in Glenwood Springs is a complex but necessary project that incorporates a lot of community input for true context-sensitive design, thrilled that CDOT and Bridge Enterprise are helping to fund that along with Garfield Co, Pitkin Co, and others; TC also saw new wildlife crossing projects on the way to Steamboat Springs; Iron Springs project will start on Monday and the contractor is confident that they may be able to have it open to traffic this winter, the old highway will become a part of the local bikeway system, thanks to CDOT for their great support on this.
- UFRTPR: Next meeting will be on June 2<sup>nd</sup>, so not a lot to report; CDOT applied for a FASTLANE grant for US 85 totaling \$156 million, which includes several railroad improvements so they partnered with Union Pacific, Weld Co, and CDOT for the grant, 40 miles of US 85 are in the Union Pacific ROW and the lease expired 7 years ago so we're working to get that under our control; a TTH question would be "Should the Governor and General Assembly dedicated 5% of sales tax revenues to transportation construction projects?"

**STAC Comments**

- Buffie MacFayden: Do you mean new projects only or maintenance as well?
- Barbara Kirkmeyer: New ones – maintenance is covered by other sources.

**Presentation**

- EATPR: About to start our RAMP project, which will include an overlay that increases the cost by \$80 million, with the TC hoping to fill that gap with savings from other RAMP projects; SH 23 is going well from Holyoke to Nebraska state line, excited to have that done this summer; TPR meeting last week and got a presentation on the rest area study that's underway, some concern that there wasn't more coordination between rest area study and the truck parking study, which doesn't really look at the whole traveling public, also discouraged that they only looked at interstate routes rather than the entire state system, the estimated costs of sewage treatment for some rest areas seem quite high; a related TTH question would be "What is the public's perception of wanting to keep rest areas on a statewide basis



	<p>versus only keeping them near the borders?”, this seems like more of an issue in rural areas than urban ones.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>SCTPR</u>: Overlay project on I-25 progressing; TPR meeting next Thursday so I’ll ask that group about potential TTH questions they’d like.</li> <li>• <u>NWTPR</u>: Repairs to SH 13 came off very well, very pleased to see how those were done; construction on SH 9 is a 20-30 minute delay but the progress is coming along very well, it’s going to be exciting when that’s complete; SH 131 state bridge is being resurfaced; overlay on SH 13 north of Craig; lots of good progress going on.</li> <li>• <u>SETPR</u>: Already enough moisture to grow weeds on US 50 and they’re mowing now.</li> <li>• <u>NFRMPO</u>: Construction of the new 2.1 mile truck climbing lane on N I-25 near Berthoud began on Monday and the ground breaking next week, MPO committed \$3 million in funding to the project; adopted an updated Title VI plan and continuing to coordinate with local communities on that.</li> <li>• <u>Deputy Director Mike Lewis</u>: Great to get up to the Northwest and see some of the project impacts and effects of the Glenwood Canyon I-70 closure; happy to take any questions from the group.</li> <li>• <u>GVTPR</u>: San Miguel Co still working on possibility of getting an RTA on the ballot this year; RAMP project through Ridgway is underway after years of planning, so that’s great; US 50 getting an overlay west of Gunnison and the completed portion is nice so far; TTH question: “What is the public willing to do to fund transit in a significant way?”.</li> </ul>	
<p>Discretionary Grants Updates / Debra Perkins-Smith (CDOT Division of Transportation Development Director)</p>	<p><b>Presentation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CDOT submitted a TIGER VIII application for north I-25 north and also approved up to \$1 million towards the Southwest Chief Commission’s application.</li> <li>• 4 FASTLANE grants submitted by CDOT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ US 85 North</li> <li>▪ Lamar US 287 Reliever Route</li> <li>▪ US 550 / US 160 Connection</li> <li>▪ Statewide Truck Parking Information and Management System</li> </ul> </li> <li>• FLAP grants applications are due tomorrow and CDOT is submitting 4: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ US 160 Passing Lanes north of Towaoc</li> <li>▪ US 50 Blue Creek Canyon</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ US 550 from CR 218 to CR 302</li> <li>▪ SH 139 Little Horse South</li> <li>• Applications for STSFA (Surface Transportation System Funding Alternatives) grants are also due today: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 11 western states are doing joint research on a Road Usage Charge system (i.e. charging by mile).</li> <li>▪ WA, OR, CA, NV, MT, AZ, HI, ID, UT, OK, and CO</li> <li>▪ CDOT will have its own pilot with 100 vehicles starting soon</li> <li>▪ Focus of this grant is how this type of system would operate cross-state.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• ATCMTD (Advanced Transportation and Congestion Management Technologies Deployment) grant applications due in June: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Linkage with RoadX Managed Motorways Project (I-25 from University Blvd. to Ridgeway Parkway).</li> <li>▪ Would add arterial management and transit park-and-ride information to the existing project.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• FTA Section 5339 – a competitive capital grant: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ DTR has refined unfunded projects from last go-around of the CCCP and will submit together as a bus replacement project.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>STAC Comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Mack Loudon</u>: The RUC concept could be a big problem for rural Colorado, where you have to drive 100 miles round trip for everything.</li> <li>• <u>Debra Perkins-Smith</u>: We would like to get some rural drivers to participate in the pilot to see how this would affect their overall bill. Currently those same folks pay a lot in gas tax whereas drivers with EVs and those making shorter urban trips are paying a lower percentage. This system might benefit rural drivers compared to what we have now.</li> </ul>	
<p>CMAQ Alt Fuels Colorado Program Update / Steve McCannon (Regional Air Quality Council) and Wes Maurer (Colorado Energy Office)</p>	<p><b>Presentation</b> <i>Vehicles</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 6 funding rounds have been completed so far: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 521 vehicles</li> <li>▪ 30 unique fleets</li> <li>▪ 47 separate projects</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ \$7 million expended</li> <li>• Adams Co. has the most vehicles based in it (as a transport hub), followed by Denver Co. and Weld Co.</li> <li>• Transit vehicles are now eligible and the RAQC is working with CDOT's Division of Transit &amp; Rail to coordinate the process and requirements.</li> <li>• Next round opens June 6<sup>th</sup> and applications will be due by July 8<sup>th</sup>.</li> </ul> <p><i>Fueling Stations</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thanks to those STAC members participating in the AFC Advisory Council: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Barbara Kirkmeyer, Norm Steen, Terri Blackmore, Thad Noll, and Pete Fraser (former).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The goal is to establish a sustainable statewide alternative fuels market in Colorado.</li> <li>• The AFC program has awarded 14 CNG stations so far, 5 of which are currently operational. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The remainder will be within the year.</li> <li>▪ Among awarded stations, 3 included co-located EV and propane fueling.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The top funding priorities are along interstates and major transportation corridors, defined as those with &gt;1,000 mid- and heavy-duty trucks per day. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Tier 1 Corridors: I-25, I-70, I-76, and US 287.</li> <li>▪ Lamar is in a gap area of focus.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Secondary funding priorities are along corridors with &gt;250 mid- and heavy-duty trucks per day. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Tier 2 Corridors: US 160, US 550, and US 285</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Within the year you will be able to travel the entire length of I-25, I-70 E, and I-76 in Colorado using CNG without any issue.</li> <li>• Key target areas are gaps on I-70 between Denver and Glenwood Springs.</li> <li>• Planned community engagement activities focused on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Silverthorne-Dillon-Frisco-Eagle</li> <li>▪ Grand Junction</li> <li>▪ Central, South, and West Denver Metro</li> <li>▪ Lamar</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
--	---	--

- The 5<sup>th</sup> round of funding starts in June 2016 and future rounds will follow roughly every 6 months.

**STAC Comments**

- Trent Bushner: I see the Limon to Lamar area highlighted, which is great. Where is the Nebraska station that you would be connecting to on the other side of the border?
- Wes Maurer: We're working with the companies that operate in Neb to find locations for those but I don't know specific locations. It should only take 3 or 4 to bridge the gap to KC.
- Elise Jones: When we started this project, the common wisdom was that co-location of CNG, electric, and propane fueling made sense, but it seems like that hasn't been borne out by the applications. Should that co-location requirement for EV chargers be dropped at this point?
- Wes Maurer: We would certainly be open to that if the STAC would like us to investigate the possibility.
- Elise Jones: It wouldn't affect the funding picture very much either given the relatively minor costs of EV stations as compared to CNG infrastructure.
- Thad Noll: We in the Intermountain TPR would like some CNG infrastructure but have barriers such as a lack of high capacity gas lines and difficult geography. If we could see some more emphasis on electric charging that would be helpful because it's more feasible to accomplish.
- Wes Maurer: Thanks for that input, it sounds like there's interest here and we just need to find out what makes sense. I'd be happy to come out to talk with your local stakeholders about this in more detail.
- Norm Steen: This conversation shows another reason that the gas tax is a dying funding source. My question is how the public will know about these new infrastructure locations.
- Wes Maurer: We are working with CDOT on adding prominent signage to indicate the station locations. The US Department of Energy also has an Alternative Fuels Data Center website (<http://www.afdc.energy.gov/locator/stations/>) that shows all locations nationwide and we also promote on our CEO website.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Norm Steen</u>: These corridors align very closely with the Bustang routes – is there any thought of CDOT converting its Bustang fleet or other state vehicles to CNG fuel?</li> <li>• <u>Mark Imhoff</u>: We looked at that originally, but our vendor didn't consider it feasible and cost effective at the time. We are continuing to look at that for future expansion and replacement of the Bustang fleet.</li> <li>• <u>Debra Perkins-Smith</u>: We are required by the Greening Government Executive Order to consider the conversion of state vehicles to CNG where possible and we have begun to do so, starting mostly with light-duty trucks. But we're always looking for good opportunities to expand that effort.</li> <li>• <u>Peter Baier</u>: What sort of outreach are we doing to larger companies, such as Walmart, to make them aware of the benefits and maybe get that big buy-in that incentivizes station development?</li> <li>• <u>Steve McCannon</u>: We work closely with Colorado Motor Carriers (CMC) and are always working with them to spread the message. Walmart and other larger fleets haven't taken us up on it quite yet due to their preference for other fuels and desire for consistent equipment or fuels across multiple states.</li> </ul>	
<p>STAC Retreat and the Role of STAC / Vince Rogalski (STAC Chair)</p>	<p><b>Presentation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We've discussed the importance of working with TC on the new STAC role, i.e. how do we relate to them, how do they relate to us, etc. via a STAC retreat. What would the group like to see in terms of dates, times, and topics to cover at the event?</li> </ul> <p><b>STAC Comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Kevin Hall</u>: It would be helpful for those of us who travel to be able to do this all in one day, rather than separate trips for STAC and the retreat.</li> <li>• <u>Norm Steen</u>: I would be interested to hear what the TC wants to know from us – what are their blank spots in terms of making decisions that serve the public? How can we help fill those gaps?</li> </ul>	<p>Tentative date set for September 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2016.</p>

- Thad Noll: I thought that the last retreat went very well, I'm not sure how much we can realistically get through in the same day as the STAC meeting. Maybe we should host it on the day before in order to limit the travel burden.
- Pete Baier: The two topics that we often talk about are budget and legislative issues, so I think we need a good way to provide that input to the TC members.
- George Wilkinson: I don't have a problem with dedicating two days rather than trying to do it all in one.
- Chuck Grobe: I also think that the two day approach makes sense so we don't feel limited in the conversation by having to get back on the road home.
- Barbara Kirkmeyer: We need to talk about the implementation of this bill and how it will work.
- Craig Casper: Also PD 14 performance measures.
- Scott Hobson: We have lots of lists of projects, so how do we develop a strategy to identify the key projects that we want to put forward?
- Norm Steen: I'd like to see a road map of what this looks like down the line in a year. What is the engagement cycle? How do we propose ideas or discussions to one another? This needs to be a process, not a single event.
- Vince Rogalski: What do people think about doing this in September?
- Barbara Kirkmeyer: How would that align with the budget cycle?
- Debra Perkins-Smith: Normally the draft budget is adopted in November and staff begins working on it in August, so this timeline might work well. Also, the chairmanship of the TC changes on July 1<sup>st</sup> so it makes sense to hold the event after that date.
- Vince Rogalski: I've already spoken with the new TC Chair and he is interested in working with us on this. Let's set the tentative date for September 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2016 and confirm when we get closer to that.
- Kevin Hall: I'm not opposed to having this over the course for two days, provided that it's a good use of time. I'd like to see the more specific agenda before we confirm that we need the 22<sup>nd</sup> as well as the regular STAC day.

<p>Safe Routes to School Update / Leslie Feurborn (Safe Routes to School Coordinator)</p>	<p><b>Presentation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Packets include the list of projects submitted and chosen in this round of SRTS.</li> <li>• SRTS was originally a part of SAFETE-LU but lost its federal funding under MAP-21 and CDOT has had to identify specific funding sources for it each subsequent year.</li> <li>• Last fall, the TC resolved to fund SRTS on an annual basis for \$2.5 million, which provides some consistency to both staff and applicants.</li> <li>• CDOT received 38 applications from all parts of the state, 2 of which were disqualified due to procedural violations.</li> <li>• A total of 21 projects were funded – 7 infrastructure and 14 non-infrastructure projects.</li> <li>• All 5 regions are represented and a wide variety of projects are included.</li> <li>• Next round of applications will open in August and be due in November.</li> </ul> <p><b>STAC Comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Norm Steen</u>: Is this all FY16 - FY17 money?</li> <li>• <u>Leslie Feurborn</u>: It's all FY16 but it carries over given the multi-year nature of the projects, especially the non-infrastructure ones.</li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>
<p>Development Program / Jeff Sudmeier (Multimodal Planning Branch Manager)</p>	<p><b>Presentation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scott's comments are timely, as the Development Program is intended to bring some clarity to the various lists that we have and how they relate to one another.</li> <li>• We are now entering the second phase of this project.</li> <li>• The web address at the bottom of the slides is where we keep on ongoing update of the work that we're doing here – it's a good resource if you want to track the progress.</li> <li>• The Development Program is an inventory of major investment needs based on MPO, TPR, and other plans. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Not a new list, but a compilation of all the existing ones.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• It contains approximately 100 major highway projects totaling \$8.5 billion. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Transit, bicycle/pedestrian, and operational projects are included.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Not intended to include every project, only the major ones as defined by each region.</li> <li>▪ May include smaller projects on a programmatic basis (i.e. regional intersection priorities).</li> <li>• The 10-Year Development Program is a subset of the \$8.5 billion that are the highest priority over the next 10 years.</li> <li>• It will provide a planning tool that can serve as the foundation of other project selection and development efforts, such as SB228, discretionary grants, etc. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Aiming for roughly \$2.5 billion total.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The big reasons for this effort are to consolidate our lists, think about funding priorities outside of specific silos, and get ahead of the curve on new funding opportunities.</li> <li>• Staff will continue to work with STAC to verify the projects that are included and develop how this list will be used moving forward – including the project selection process for specific funding types.</li> <li>• The Development Program will be a living document to be updated as needed by the CDOT Regions.</li> <li>• The 10-year Development Program will have more process established around updates, for instance alignment with the yearly STIP update.</li> <li>• We want to avoid having this information become stale over time.</li> <li>• In the future we want to integrate this more closely into the development of the SWP, RTPs, and STIP for the next cycle rather than as a separate stand-alone.</li> <li>• One question is whether a project needs to be in the Development Program to be included in the STIP? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The answer is no – most STIP projects are smaller than what the DP would capture, and those that are large enough to be in the DP would definitely be captured in the STIP.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Development Program Next Steps: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Regions coordinate with TPRs/MPOs over the summer.</li> <li>▪ Final draft of 10 Year Development Program in the fall.</li> <li>▪ Ongoing discussions with STAC and other stakeholders.</li> <li>▪ The FAQ document on the website will be continually developed alongside the broad \$8.5 billion inventory, so you can find updated information there.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
--	--	--



	<p><b>STAC Comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Mack Loudon</u>: Is this something that could help fund projects that come up unexpectedly?</li> <li>• <u>Jeff Sudmeier</u>: There is no specific funding attached to this, so not in that sense. But I would say that any significant project should be included here because it puts it on the table as something that's prioritized.</li> <li>• <u>Thad Noll</u>: Do you have a threshold amount for the size of these projects? If we don't set that I think the list will continue to grow.</li> <li>• <u>Jeff Sudmeier</u>: We intentionally didn't do that because the "major" nature of a project varies greatly between regions. We will rely on the folks in each region to tell us what is major to them. Those smaller projects we can include at a programmatic level rather than specific small projects.</li> <li>• <u>Norm Steen</u>: Is the cost included here just meant to capture construction, or all the things that lead up to it like the EIS, ROW purchase, etc.?</li> <li>• <u>Jeff Sudmeier</u>: It's meant to capture need, so if a project is in the pre-environmental phase then it should include those costs, perhaps as a line item.</li> <li>• <u>Craig Casper</u>: Will this be rolling like the STIP?</li> <li>• <u>Jeff Sudmeier</u>: I think that makes sense for us to align it with the STIP update process. Again, there's no funding on this but I think it would be good in terms of keeping it as current as possible.</li> <li>• <u>Craig Casper</u>: I think that when the Statewide Travel Model comes online it will be helpful in supporting some of the decision-making on this.</li> <li>• <u>Steve Cook</u>: Is this 10 years including the STIP? Or 10 years beyond it?</li> <li>• <u>Jeff Sudmeier</u>: It's meant to be 10 years from today, but anything that's in the STIP by definition has funding so we wouldn't need to include it here as well, unless it's an additional, unfunded phase to an existing STIP projects.</li> </ul>	
<p>SWP Lessons Learned / Michelle Scheuerman (Statewide Planning Manager)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We're in the midst of final steps and will provide a report to the STAC next month.</li> <li>• Outreach was conducted via interviews, surveys, STAC workshop, and TPR meetings, with over 100 total participants.</li> <li>• Synthesized results are included in the STAC packet, with more detail coming in the report next month.</li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Organized by items to keep, items to improve, and new items to add.</li> <li>• We want to use a more proactive approach to this in the future – ongoing planning and laying the foundational work now rather than waiting for SWP kick-off in a few years' time.</li> <li>• STAC Workshop Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Brainstormed on lessons learned.</li> <li>▪ Identified and prioritized future informational topics.</li> <li>▪ Started discussions on improving plan integration.</li> <li>▪ First in the series of workshops that we will hold.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Next Steps: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Starting mid-fall, rolling out informational sessions based on STAC Workshop and TPR feedback on Lessons Learned. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Could be at STAC or with individual TPRs.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Topics included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Better data coordination, role of emerging technologies, safety data and planning, better connection between planning and program distribution.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Will develop a framework for next plan development cycle and solicit your feedback on it.</li> <li>▪ May consider the concept of STAC sub-committees on specific topics.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<p>Statewide Travel Model Overview &amp; Coordination / Erik Sabina (Information Management Branch Manager)</p>	<p><b>Presentation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of the statewide travel model will be a great benefit for future planning activities. We want to share this with you so you can provide input on what the model can and should do for you.</li> <li>• Currently we're in the early stages of model development – assembling a lot of data and will begin model construction soon.</li> <li>• Essentially, CDOT is borrowing the DRCOG model and adapting it for statewide purposes.</li> <li>• There are a number of reasons to build a model: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Reduce project time and expenses for projects that used to build project-specific models.</li> <li>▪ Improve consistency in traffic analysis between projects.</li> <li>▪ Allow for better “what if” analysis that is consistent between projects – construction, land use, modes, etc.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>

**STAC Comments**

- Norm Steen: Can the model show what would happen if you close a road?
- Erik Sabina: Yes, it depicts the behavior of the system, and you can change the system however you like to see how it behaves under new conditions, such as a closure.

**Presentation**

- Will be an Activity Based Model (ABM), which is more fleshed-out, detailed, and specific than older trip-based models, and can give you modal, demographic, economic, and regional comparisons with better insights.
  - Overall it provides a more realistic representation of the state and its transportation network.

**STAC Comments**

- Becky Karasko: What is the detail level for the road network?
- Erik Sabina: We use collectors and above.

**Presentation**

- Basic model outputs include:
  - VMT
  - Travel speeds by time of day (probably 7 time periods)
  - Travel delay by time of day (probably 7 time periods)
  - Traffic volumes by time of day (probably 7 time periods)
  - Mode choice
  - Truck volumes
  - Number of trips and miles driven by demographic group
  - Trips by any mode origination from or destined to any location
  - Elements for school buses, trucks, etc.
- Data is structured in a way that ties trips to specific types of people, i.e. retirees, students, etc.
- A typical model run is anticipated to take 24 hours.
- Can be used by different types of audiences: senior management, planners, project engineers, planning partners, and the public.
- Use in SWP/RTP development could include:

- Needs
  - High priority corridors
  - Project outcomes
  - CDOT staff will work with all planning partners to make sure that we are able to address their needs moving forward.
  - Future scenario planning via the model will help us think about potential impacts of emerging technologies, pricing changes, tolling, mode choices, and changes to the economy.
  - Aiming to have the model operational in 2017 and will be seeking input from stakeholders on an ongoing basis.
- STAC Comments**
- Norm Steen: One of the non-transportation priorities in the state is broadband internet, which could drastically impact travel patterns in rural Colorado. Where would something like that fit into this model?
  - Erik Sabina: We could run that as a scenario by eliminating different types of trips based on the potential impacts and seeing what that does to the system.
  - Debra Perkins-Smith: We could do some research on that and see what potential impacts might be.
  - Gary Beedy: How will you model all of the out-of-state traffic from tourism, freight, etc.? How can you capture the interconnection between Colorado and other states?
  - Erik Sabina: The model includes internal-external travel showing trips that pass the borders and where they go within the state, separated by truck and passenger. This is not a commodity model, but a vehicle model, so it won't show what freight is going to each place, only the vehicle.
  - Gary Beedy: Will there be a possibility to look at other routes from surrounding states that impact travel within the state, such as 4-laning of US 287?
  - Erik Sabina: In this model we don't include other states' networks, but we can look at their results and enter those on the border areas.
  - Kevin Hall: How does this model differ from a regional model like that of La Plata Co. and are you collaborating with them on scrubbing data to make sure it's representative of reality?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Erik Sabina</u>: We are supporting that effort and collaborating to make sure that we both get the best data possible. It makes sense for specific areas to have individual models both in terms of the size of the data, speed of running it, etc. We are working closely with the MPOs and other regional model owners to make them as consistent as possible and keep learning from each other.</li> <li>• <u>Thad Noll</u>: Will the model have the type of granularity to answer questions such as the RUC issue of payment based on gas tax versus miles traveled?</li> <li>• <u>Erik Sabina</u>: Part of the reason that we have so much detail on individual travelers in this model is to give us the ability to answer those types of questions in the future.</li> <li>• <u>Pete Baier</u>: We seem to be at the infancy of this type of activity based model and I think in the longer term it would be useful to develop some unified standards for everyone rather than each MPO or jurisdiction going its own way.</li> <li>• <u>Erik Sabina</u>: Yes, we are certainly open to that but also mindful of not stepping on other groups' planning processes.</li> <li>• <u>Gary Beedy</u>: Are you using ports of entry truck data to track truck movement within the state?</li> <li>• <u>Erik Sabina</u>: Yes, we use every piece of real-world data that we can get our hands on to verify what the model is showing us. DRCOG is leading a large survey of commercial vehicles across the Front Range that will also be helpful in that regard. We are also anticipating another statewide travel survey to occur in 2020 that would include commercial vehicles.</li> <li>• <u>Jeff Sudmeier</u>: Just a reminder that the packet contains FAQs on the Statewide Travel Model if you'd like more information, and we will also continue this discussion at future STAC meetings to get your input on how this new tool can and should be used by STAC and other planning groups.</li> </ul>	
Other Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The next STAC meeting will be held on June 24<sup>th</sup>, 2016.</li> </ul>	No action taken.

**STAC ADJOURNS**

Transportation Commission June 16, 2016, CDOT Headquarters Auditorium, 4201 E. Arkansas Ave, Denver, CO 80222

---

## Transportation Commission (TC) Workshops

### Thursday, June 16, 2016

**Note:** Materials for specific agenda items are available at <https://www.codot.gov/about/transportation-commission/meeting-agenda.html> by clicking on the agenda item on the schedule provided at this site.

#### **Project Management Office (PMO)/Cash Management Workshop (Josh Laipply, Maria Sobota, Jane Fisher)**

##### **Purpose**

- The Program Management Workshop provides the TC with an update on the integration of Cash Management and Program Management, Asset Management, and the Responsible Acceleration of Maintenance and Partnerships (RAMP) program. The Asset Management program is the largest part of the program that CDOT actively manages. Last month's TC presentation identified that additional asset management information is desired to help the TC make informed policy decisions.
- Provide an overview of the Cash Balance program related to cash flow and its monthly balance targets. The US 385 Intersection at Yuma CR 33.6 RAMP Partnership (RAMP #4-51) project is requesting an additional \$125,000 in RAMP Contingency funding for a total estimated project cost of \$ 739,000. The shortfall is due to overall construction price increases and an additional 2 inch overlay component for the project.

##### **Requested Action**

- 1) Review updated asset management information to confirm it meets the TC's needs.
- 2) Per Policy Directive (PD) 703, staff is requesting TC approval to budget an additional \$125,000 in RAMP Contingency funding via the June TC budget supplement to advertise the project.

##### **Discussion and Comments**

- The Chief Engineer explained that the information provided was in response to what was discussed at the May 2016 meeting to make reporting of information more clear. It was mentioned that June is a big month for expenditures. CDOT hit 12.8% mark target of all annual expenditures based on expenditures for June in previous years.
- TC requested a comparison of expenditures from last year in June. This year, more expenditures were made for June than last year.
- TC raised no questions regarding the cash balance.

#### **Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Workshop (Joshua Laipply, Maria Sobota, Greg Diehl)**

##### **Purpose**

Members of CDOT's Executive Management Team (EMT) have expressed a strong desire to move forward with a strategic and programmatic approach that addresses non-compliant curb ramps that are not scheduled to be addressed through regular project delivery. The primary purpose of the requested funds, anticipated to be \$55 million for FY 2016-17 through 2020-2021, is to attain full compliance with the ADA Title II federal laws over the next five years.

##### **Action**

Information Only. TC will requested to approve this funding next month.

**Discussion and Comments**

- The Chief Engineer went over history of ADA compliance. FHWA is making a transition plan to be compliant with ADA for curb ramps over 5 years. Region 1 is reviewing all their facilities to determine where they are compliant.
- How incorporate ADA compliance into the regular program was evaluated. CDOT needs additional funding to become compliant – most ramps are in the Denver area.
- Any time CDOT repairs roadway that includes curb ramps, CDOT is required to bring the facility into compliance. The contingency request asks for the transition program to bring all ramps up to code in 5 years.
- TC will not vote on this this month –agenda item for July 2016.
- Clarified that \$55 million programming funds to comply with ADA curb ramp standards would be new funding.

**Transportation Commission Regular Meeting  
Thursday, June 16 2016**

**Roll Call**

- Commissioners Thiebaut and Schriener were excused. All other nine Commissioners were in attendance.

**Audience Participation: Subject Limit: 10 minutes; Time Limit: 3 minutes**

- No audience participation

**Comments of Individual Commissioners**

- Rebecca White was thanked for her work on the application that won the FHWA On-the-Job Training (OJT) grant of \$400,000 that includes training of potential CDOT contractors.
- Last month’s trip to Steamboat Springs was widely appreciated, giving the TC a chance to see work done on wildlife corridors and the beautiful countryside.
- A presentation to a Rotary Club on the CDOT budget and financing was well-received and informative to meeting attendees.
- A TC member attended a conference which 10 of the 13 Denver City Council members also attended; the TC member took the opportunity to discuss the Central 70 project with Denver City Council members.
- Replacement of five bridges on 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue is continuing; the project delivery method, design, and execution have been impressive.
- The Marine Corps Memorial near the intersection of 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Colfax Avenue in Lakewood is getting some much-needed improvements after right of way issues were resolved.
- A CDOT-Ute Mountain Ute Maintenance Agreement was signed during a recent Bear Dance ceremony.
- Commissioner Connell received many thanks for her leadership of the TC over the past year.
- Zach Alexander received thanks for his work as the TC liaison, and Herman Stockinger was recognized for his work as TC secretary.
- A TC member heard many compliments from transit representatives attending the Colorado Association of State Transit Officials (CASTA) conference in Durango regarding their appreciation to CDOT for CDOT’s collaborative communications.

**Executive Director’s Report (Shailen Bhatt)**

- Welcomed Commissioner Reiff as the new TC Chair and expressed appreciation for the fact that Commissioner Connell will still serve on the TC.

- Described attendance at the Ute Mountain Ute Bear Dance. Expressed appreciation to Karrie Neet and Mike McVaugh who oversaw execution of the Maintenance Agreement with the Tribe. The Bear Dance was an amazing event.
- Visited Washington DC for Smart Cities Challenge final presentation. Denver has a good chance, as Denver was selected as one of eight. Also met with USDOT to discuss the Central 70 project and its 15 year methodical public engagement program. CDOT received recognition for this project and its public involvement effort was held up as a potential standard for other states to adopt.
- OJT – Recognized Rebecca White and Tony DeVito for being awarded for a pilot project conducting local workforce hiring and provided CDOT with a grant for \$400,000.
- Attended an Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) America meeting. All the technological solutions being developed to address congestion are impressive. Also spoke with a trauma surgeon regarding the importance of seat belts and their potential to save lives, which could be used to support enacting a primary seat belt law. Additional work with the Colorado legislation regarding a primary seat belt law will occur next year.

**Chief Engineer’s Report (Joshua Laipply)**

- Reflecting back on the PMO Workshop, the TC made a policy decision to go cash based with expenditures. To provide perspective, a total of \$445 million will be expended next year, and we are scheduled to expend \$223 million in FY2017-18 and another \$83 million for FY2018-19, for a total of \$306 million, which are dollars CDOT would not have expended under previous practices. In addition, CDOT is now avoiding costs associated with inflation on these expended dollars.
- Resiliency is a key issue for CDOT and the TC was requested to think about a policy to support resiliency-related activities. Resiliency is critical to the state’s economy and to mobility.
- The award to CDOT of the OJT grant for \$400,000 shows local hiring coming together with this and workforce development. This is an approach to get divided communities (along I-70) engaged.
- Greg Diehl, who leads Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) and Emerging Small Businesses, won an AASHTO award from the civil rights committee, and was recognized for this award.
- TC desires staff to form a TC sub-committee to focus on resiliency.

**High Performance Transportation Enterprise (HPTE) (Nick Farber)**

A high level overview of what HPTE accomplished in May 2016 included:

- The US 36 celebration occurred on Monday morning – TC members attended the Plenary Roads celebration that same day.
- On Saturday there will be a bike ride at Avista Hospital to celebrate US 36 bike lane.
- The third draft of RFP for the Central 70 project was submitted.
- Reopened I-70 Mountain Express Lane.
- TC member impressed with Mountain Express Lane that kept eastbound I-70 traffic moving over the weekend. TC member would like numbers on results of the express lane. July 4<sup>th</sup> is the biggest traffic weekend on I-70 and HPTE will share results from that weekend with the TC.

**Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Division Report (John Cater)**

- The Central 70 project is receiving a lot recognition and has received many compliments considering this project as “top notch”.
- OJT Grant for \$400,000 recognizes innovative national, regional and local workforce development. This grant program supports programs that: help raise standards of living, provide training for better job opportunities, and improve the transportation system.



- US 160 Wolf Creek Pass is a safety concern for trucks. A Road Safety Audit is occurring today (June 16, 2016) with a multi-disciplined team including representation from Colorado State Patrol (CSP), Colorado Motor Carriers Association (CMCA), and engineers from FHWA. This team is gathered to identify why crashes are happening. FHWA is looking forward to reviewing the results of their audit.
- FHWA met with the U.S. Forest Service regarding wildlife as emphasis is building on this issue. Wildlife crossing improvements along SH 9 are potential considerations for other places around the state.
- Executive Director expressed his appreciation to FHWA recognizing John Cater and FHWA staff for their high level of involvement with CDOT, and help with defending projects.

**Statewide Transportation Advisory Committee (STAC) Report (Vince Rogalski)**

Topics covered at the last STAC meeting included:

- Federal and State legislative update – the change of high occupancy vehicle (HOVs) from 2+ to 3+ will occur, and CDOT and planning partners will need to be ready regarding how to respond to questions on this topic.
- Grant updates – CDOT supports the Western Road User Charge (RUC) consortium in conducting a multi-state pilot for RUC. According to research, rural communities are more equitably treated using RUC than the existing method of the gas tax.
- The Colorado Energy Office (CEO) is focused on enhanced use of alternative fuels and the location of electric charging facilities. CEO is also focused on promoting compressed natural gas (CNG) vehicles.
- Development Program is a project list of \$8.5 billion, initially compiled to prepare for changes in legislation that would require quick identification of projects for newly available funding streams. The 10-year Development Program represents \$2.5 billion. STAC recognizes the need to refine the shorter list and identify and define “major projects”, which potential projects to add, and as a result of adding, which projects to remove from the list.
- Statewide Travel Model Overview –Need various entities in discussion and identify distinct issues in local areas. Also, common model parameters need to be established across the state, in order for information and results to be comparable.
- STAC is meeting next week on June 24, 2016.

**Act on Consent Agenda – Approved unanimously on June 16, 2016 with minor revision.**

a) Resolution to Approve the Regular Meeting Minutes of May 19, 2016 (Herman Stockinger) with one minor correction).

**Resolution to Approve HPTE's FY17 Fee for Service Agreement (David Spector) - Approved unanimously on June 16, 2016.**

- CDOT HPTE fee for service through Inter Agency Agreement (IAA). The resolution includes a process for CDOT to pay fair market value FY 2016-17 fees for service to HPTE, a total of \$2.08 million.

**Discuss and Act on the 12th Budget Supplement of FY 2016 (Maria Sobota) - Approved unanimously on June 16, 2016.**

- Includes \$125,000 for RAMP and Road X information.

**Discuss and Act on PD 703.0 Amendment - Cash Balance Policy (Maria Sobota/Josh Laipply) - Approved unanimously on June 16, 2016.**

- Adopt revised 703.0 today and the TC will revisit in fall of 2016.

- Josh and Maria were recognized for their efforts on this reiterative process to amend PD 703. Recognition was given by the TC that it was a fair, balanced, and transparent process.

**FY 2016-17 State Infrastructure Bank (SIB) Interest Rate & Origination Fee Setting (Maria Sobota) – Approved unanimously on June 16, 2016. Rate approved.**

- Summarized to establish rate for next six months and includes the origination fee. The resolution will decrease the interest rate from 2.5% to 2.25%. The TC will revisit then SIB interest rate in six months.

**Report out from the TC Nominating Committee and Election of TC Officers for FY2017**

- The Nominating Committee included Commissioners Gifford, Hall and Hofmeister.
- TC held an election for the nominated candidates for TC Chair, Vice-Chair, and Secretary – and elected the recommended nominees - Gary Reiff as the new TC Chair, Sidney Zink as Vice Chair, and Herman Stockinger as the TC Secretary.
- Support for concept of alternating leadership annually between rural and urban Commissioners was expressed.

**Employee Recognition**

- TC experiences communication and common purpose continues with leadership transition.
- Commissioner Ed Peterson announced that back on November 8, 2014 – Region 1 received a maintenance award. Paul Jesaitis, Regional Transportation Director (RTD) of CDOT Region 1 spoke regarding the Marine Core Memorial at US 40/US 6. The award was for work on the memorial for ceremonies held in 2014. The project involved solving right-of-way issues among CDOT, the City of Golden, and Jefferson County. Commissioner Peterson expressed an apology for late delivery on behalf of the Marine League and Marine Core Memorial Association. Paul Jesaitis recognized CDOT staff: Tony DeVito, Rebecca White, Mike O’Neill, and Steve Harelson, along with Commissioner Ed Peterson, and recognized specifically CDOT’s Kirk Allen, who accepted the award, for his work on this project.

**Transportation Commission May 19, 2016, Steamboat Springs, Colorado****Transportation Commission (TC) Workshops  
Thursday, May 19, 2016**

**Note:** Materials for specific agenda items are available at <https://www.codot.gov/about/transportation-commission/meeting-agenda.html> by clicking on the agenda item on the schedule provided at this site.

**PD 703.0 Amendment - Cash Balance Policy (Maria Sobota, Joshua Laipply)**

**Purpose:** To amend Policy Directive (PD) 703.0 to incorporate the Capital Construction (Fund 400) Cash Balance Policy into the policy directive. The Office of Cash Management, within the Division of Accounting and Finance (DAF), is leading the establishment of a collaborative forecasting model and process management team to ensure effective and proactive management of the CDOT cash balance and spending authority. The anticipated approval in June 2016 of the management process and recommended monthly cash balance by the TC will provide the target values by which CDOT will begin to manage and affect change in the capital construction program up to 36 months into the future.

**Discussion and Comments**

- TC discussed the confidence level recommended by staff working with a consultant.
- An explanation of the Fund 400 Forecast model was given that recommends the monthly cash balance thresholds.
- Biggest expenditures for roadway improvements generally occur during the construction season in spring/summer months; Bridge improvements start in fall/winter when water levels are lower.
- TC supports this approach with semi-annual reporting of the cash balance to the TC.
- The CDOT Chief Financial Officer (CFO) recommended that a financial workshop be arranged to take place in June and December each year to comply with the TC's request for semi-annual cash balance reporting.

**PMO/Cash Management Workshop (Josh Laipply, Maria Sobota, Jane Fisher)**

**Purpose:** The Program Management Office (PMO) continues to evolve. CDOT is progressing toward better metrics and data to help forecast and manage the business. The asset management program is the largest part of the program that CDOT actively manages. Last month's TC presentation identified the need for better and new data/metrics to help the TC make informed policy decisions. The data presented was the PMO's proposal to refresh the monthly PMO workshop materials with better business analytics.

**Requested Action:**

- 1) Review new data and determine if suggested metrics meet the commission's needs.
- 2) Please see Budget Supplement for TC action required related to two Responsible Acceleration of Maintenance and Partnerships (RAMP) projects. Background information on these projects is provided in the PMO Workshop materials.

**Discussion and Comments**

- TC wants more frequent project status reports that are comprehensible.
- Each project wraps up several treatment types.
- The Executive Director sees two items to address:
  - Establish a clear project/program status reporting method.

- A clearer understanding of cash balance management in relation to project/program reporting.
- Statewide project information is important for TC members to have when talking with people throughout Colorado- good for public relations.
- Five hundred and twenty-one (521) projects are being tracked right now – the TC agreed that they do not want that level of detail.
- PD 703.0 (Identify the correct risk profile that is desired).
- Cash Balance – CDOT Regional Transportation Directors (RTDs) can pick projects from rolling list of multi-year projects and treatments – in order to provide the flexibility to bundle improvements effectively and efficiently.
- Not robbing Peter to pay Paul using this approach – need to explain this process more clearly to the TC.
- Staff needs to spend time with the TC to review cash management principles.

## **Transportation Commission Regular Meeting**

### **Thursday May 19, 2016**

#### **Roll Call**

- Commissioners Barry and Schriener were excused. All other Commissioners were in attendance.

#### **Audience Participation: Subject Limit: 10 minutes; Time Limit: 3 minutes**

- The meeting took place in Steamboat Springs, Colorado and several City Council members were in attendance and welcomed the TC and CDOT staff.
- City Council Members Scott Ford, Tony Connell, and Robin Crossan, along with the Public Works Director, Chuck Anderson, all spoke regarding transportation concerns for Steamboat Springs and that area of the state. Key comments included:
  - SH 131 to get improvements to serve as a better alternate route to I-70 when Glenwood Canyon rock falls occur.
  - Heavy trucks using alternate routes in Steamboat Springs and their impact on the roads due to their weight and driver unfamiliarity with the city roads. Please continue to consider Steamboat Springs when considering alternate routes to I-70 and project improvements.
  - Encouraged CDOT to stay focused on investing on resiliency projects - I-70 closure impacts are a major local concern, and also plays a greater role for other areas of the state.
  - Would like to see more public private partnerships (P3) occurring in the area to support transportation projects – encouraged CDOT to continue to look for these types of opportunities.
  - There is a desire to have a Bustang – like program in the area. A local market district tax in Steamboat Springs supports promotion of air travel – city is looking for matching funds to support transit connections to area airports.
- Simba Run Condominiums representative spoke regarding the I-70 Underpass project in Vail that could potentially take land using eminent domain from the condominium association. The representative strongly recommended further discussion between CDOT and Simba Run to occur vs. moving forward with the property taking.

#### **Comments of Individual Commissioners**

- TC members thanked the representatives of Steamboat Springs for welcoming them and expressed how beautiful the area is.
- Excitement was expressed about the SH 9 wildlife crossing and the fire suppression system installed at Eisenhower Johnson Memorial Tunnel (EJMT).

- A TC member expressed the importance of bicycle travel and the desire for transit in District 7.
- Several events (meeting and conferences) were attended by TC members – one in Washington D.C with the U.S. DOT Assistant Secretary and another in Colorado where Don Hunt, Steve Parker, and Doug Aden attended.
- Ground breaking for the I-25/Arapahoe Road project took place with Mike Lewis, CDOT Deputy Executive Director.
- Last month Commissioner Peterson was recognized and given an award by the Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG) for his work with them on transportation issues.
- The TC supported and thanked the people that spoke during the audience participation period.

#### **Executive Director's Report (Shailen Bhatt)**

- Transportation is beginning to resonate with the public as being important as it affects our daily lives.
- There is a great vision of what transportation could be, compared to what it is now.
- It is good to get out on the road and visit construction sites.
- Want to be optimistic about the funding of transportation, but legislative session did not provide additional funding.
- Denver is one of seven finalists in the Smart Cities Challenge. Secretary Foxx was in Denver two days ago (May 18<sup>th</sup>) – CDOT will leverage RoadX dollars with the application for this program; it is an exciting time for technology.
- Need to continue to ensure safe travel between Denver and Steamboat Springs, and to keep freight moving.

#### **Chief Engineer's Report (Joshua Laipply)**

- Lots of ground breaking and ribbon cuttings occurring – this is historically CDOT's biggest construction season due to the number of RAMP projects being built.
- Cone Zone program is notifying the public of construction projects in order to avoid construction areas when feasible.
- As of May 2, 2016, a pilot project with Executive Management oversight is the Project First Initiative– the Grand Avenue Bridge was the first of these projects to identify and assess CDOT and Contractor risks in more detail. See: <https://www.codot.gov/business/designsupport/design-docs/partnering-on-construction-projects> for more information.

#### **High Performance Transportation Enterprise (HPTE) (David Spector)**

- Testimony by the Executive Director was successful in stopping SB 123 from passing that would have restricted use of switchable transponders – CDOT will work to meet the goals and intent of the legislators, but will do so administratively. Motorcycles will be able to use toll lanes for free with no need for transponders, and switchable transponders will be provided free for HOV use on CDOT's express toll lanes (ETLs).
- Working on E-470 development framework for a messaging and communications campaign.
- I-70 Central – just conducted the second round of one-on-one meetings with proposers – went well – no unanticipated questions were raised.
- Met with lender/TIFIA in Washington, D.C. – needed to describe all of CDOT's enterprises (Bridge, and HPTE), meeting also went well with no unanticipated questions.
- Conducted first HPTE telephone town hall – provided education on funding issues and toll rates. About 3,000 people participated on the call. It was a successful event, and the first telephone town hall for Mr. Spector.
- HPTE Board meeting:
  - Approved I-25 North toll rates (on today's consent agenda)

- Several Interagency Agreements approved – one for fee for service – to be submitted to TC next month; several more are anticipated for TC approval as they are developed on a project basis.
- Many upcoming celebrations for US 36 – will be sure to send TC invitations to them all.
- I-70 Express Lane appears to support a trend of more travelers leaving the mountains later in the day, due to the more reliable travel times that can be expected.

**Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Division Report (John Cater)**

- Three major ribbon cutting ceremonies – Arapahoe Road, EJMT and US6 & Garrison – all used creative funding strategies to finance these projects. CDOT and FHWA will need to continue pursuing these types of arrangements to keep projects moving.
- Two discretionary FAST Act programs – TIGER and FASTLANE – application periods have closed – FHWA received applications reflecting over fifty times the amount of money available to distribute. The Federal Land Access Program (FLAP) application period is due to close soon. The Colorado projects submitted are believed to be very competitive.
- Working with Director of E-470 on a \$70-80 million project to provide a third lane from Parker Road to about Smoky Hill; will be using CMGC approach/tool for this project. E-470 Director, Tim Stewart, is from Oklahoma and has coordinated closely with DOTs and FHWA in the past on his projects.

**Statewide Transportation Advisory Committee (STAC) Report (Vince Rogalski)**

- Statewide Transportation Plan (SWP) Lessons Learned STAC workshop occurred at the last meeting in April; 2040 SWP was the best plan so far and work is being done to ensure a continuing process and discussion will occur to improve the planning process further.
- A Freight Advisory Council (FAC) update was provided to the STAC – a focus of the FAC will be identifying the rural and urban critical freight corridors.
- Next STAC meeting is May 20<sup>th</sup> – tomorrow.

**Act on Consent Agenda – Approved unanimously on May 19, 2016.**

- a) Resolution to Approve the Regular Meeting Minutes of April 21, 2016 (Herman Stockinger)
- b) Legislative Memorial Designations (Andy Karsian)
- c) Repeal of Policy Directive 390.0 (Josh Laippy, Scott McDaniel, Herman Stockinger)
- d) Approve Updated Policy Directive 80.0 (Darrell Lingk, Herman Stockinger)
- e) FY 16 Maintenance \$50,000 to \$150,000 (Kyle Lester)
- f) Policy Directive 1602: Bicycle/Pedestrian Policy (Debra Perkins Smith)
- g) I-25 North Segment 2 Intra-Agency Agreement (David Spector)

**Discuss and Act on the 11th Budget Supplement of FY 2016 (Maria Sobota) - Approved unanimously on May 19, 2016.**

- \$1,306,375 – *Greeley Evans Transit Hub* – **FASTER Transit** – Bid adjustment for project award.
- \$1,794,963 – Transfer from the *Transportation Commission Contingency for Snow and Ice* to the Grand Junction, Eisenhower Tunnel and Durango Maintenance Sections. This request will fund 60% of the projected shortfall.
- \$465,100 – *Durango Property Emergency* – **TC Contingency Reserve Fund (CRF)** – Emergency building repairs to West US160 Maintenance location as discussed by Region 5 RTD in March 2016.
- Region 2:

- \$1,200,000–*US 50 - Purcell to Wills*– **FASTER Safety**-Due to underestimating the asphalt quantities for the project, additional funds are being requested and will be executed through Change Modification Order.
- \$560,000–*US50A AND DOZIER INTER. IMPROVEMENTS*– **RAMP Partnership Contingency**- Additional funds are needed to award project to provide intersection improvements in Canon City.

**Adoption of the FY2017-FY2020 STIP (Jamie Collins, Maria Sobota) - Approved unanimously on May 19, 2016.**

Received many comments regarding the I-70 Central project. The final STIP submitted for TC approval was revised to address typos, etc.

**Vail Underpass Property Acquisition (Kathy Young) – Approved with an added whereas to the resolution - unanimously on May 19, 2016.**

Approval was based on a revision to add a Whereas to page 2 of the resolution after the 3<sup>rd</sup> Whereas (being the fourth Whereas) – “the TC wishes to approve this resolution on condition that the petition of condemnation by Eagle County District Court will be dismissed by the Attorney General’s Office with legal counsel on record for CDOT.” The TC declared, via this resolution, that the public interest and convenience will be served by the proposed changes to I-70 by virtue of the Vail Underpass Project, and authorized the Chief Engineer to negotiate with the owners regarding the amount of damages, and tender such damages as estimated by him, and authorizes CDOT to proceed with condemnation of the Property in the event negotiations are unsuccessful.

**Appointment of Nominating Committee - Approved unanimously on May 19, 2016.**

The appointed and approved Nominating Committee includes:

- Commissioners Gifford, Hall and Hofmeister





## National Highway Freight Network

---

The [Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act](#) (FAST Act) repealed both the Primary Freight Network and National Freight Network from Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21), and directed the FHWA Administrator to establish a [National Highway Freight Network](#) (NHFN) to strategically direct Federal resources and policies toward improved performance of highway portions of the U.S. freight transportation system. States and in certain cases, Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs), are responsible for designating public roads for the CRFCs and CUFCs in accordance with section 1116 of the FAST Act.

The NHFN includes the following subsystems of roadways:

- **Primary Highway Freight System (PHFS):** This is a network of highways identified as the most critical highway portions of the U.S. freight transportation system determined by measurable and objective national data. The network consist of 41,518 centerlines miles, including 37,436 centerline miles of Interstate and 4,082 centerline miles of non-Interstate roads.
- **Other Interstate portions not on the PHFS:** These highways consist of the remaining portion of Interstate roads not included in the PHFS. These routes provide important continuity and access to freight transportation facilities. These portions amount to an estimated 9,511 centerline miles of Interstate, nationwide, and will fluctuate with additions and deletions to the Interstate Highway System.
- **Critical Rural Freight Corridors (CRFCs):** These are public roads not in an urbanized area which provide access and connection to the PHFS and the Interstate with other important ports, public transportation facilities, or other intermodal freight facilities.
- **Critical Urban Freight Corridors (CUFCs):** These are public roads in urbanized areas which provide access and connection to the PHFS and the Interstate with other ports, public transportation facilities, or other intermodal transportation facilities.

The NHFN is an element of the [National Multimodal Freight Network](#) (NMFN), which also includes freight rail systems of Class I railroads, public ports of the U.S. that have total annual foreign and domestic trade of at least 2,000,000 short tons; inland and intra-coastal waterways of the U.S.; the Great Lakes, the St. Lawrence Seaway, and coastal and ocean routes along which domestic freight is transported; the 50 airports located in the U.S. with the highest annual landed weight; and other strategic freight assets.

The initial NMFN will be designated by December 4, 2016. There is no deadline for [designating and certifying CRFCs and CUFCs](#), although no formula funds from the National Highway Freight Program (NHFP) may be expended on a corridor prior to its designation. Designations may occur at any time, may be full or partial designations of the CRFCs or CUFCs mileage, and the two types do not need to be designated at the same time. Designations and certification may be provided to FHWA on a rolling basis. FHWA recommends that State Freight Plans are updated to include these routes once designated.

Excluding the CRFCs and CUFCs, the [NHFN in Colorado](#) currently includes the interstates, small segments of E-470, US 6, US 85, and SH 2 in the metro Denver area and eight intermodal connectors in the metro Denver area.

- 1,217.17 miles
  - PHFS: 789.94 miles
  - PHFS Intermodal Connectors: 13.52 miles
  - Non-PHFS Interstates: 172.67 miles
  - CRFC: 160.69 miles
  - CUFC: 80.35 miles

## National Highway Freight Program

---

The [National Highway Freight Program](#) (NHFP) provides formula funds to the States to improve the efficient movement of freight on the NHFN. Colorado is anticipated to receive approximately \$15 million annually through this program, beginning in FY 16. In order for a project to be eligible for funding under the NHFP, a project must be located on the NHFN, or be a freight intermodal or freight rail project.

## Critical Rural Freight Corridors

---

- 160.69 miles, designated by the State

### Criteria

- Is not inside an Adjusted Urbanized Area Boundary (areas over 50,000)



- Meets at least one of the following criteria:
  - Rural Principal Arterial with a minimum of 25% of AADT of the road measured in passenger vehicle equivalent units from trucks
  - Provides access to:
    - Energy exploration, development, installation or production areas
    - Grain elevators
    - Agricultural facilities
    - Mining facilities
    - Forestry facilities
    - Intermodal facilities
    - Significant air, rail, water or other freight facilities in the State
  - Connects the PHFS or Interstate System to facilities that handle more than:
    - 50,000 20 foot equivalent units per year
    - 500,000 tons per year of bulk commodities
  - Is determined by the State to be vital to improving the efficient movement of freight of importance to the economy of the State.
- States are encouraged to consider first or last mile connector routes from high-volume freight corridors to key rural freight facilities including manufacturing centers, agricultural processing centers, farms, intermodal, and military facilities

### ***Process of Identification***

- Analysis of criteria and locations of established project needs as identified in the State Highway Freight Plan and Development Program (May-June)
- Identification of potential corridor segments (July)
  - Focus on Colorado Freight Corridors identified in the [State Highway Freight Plan](#)
  - Identify smaller corridor segments aligned with areas of project need as identified in the State Highway Freight Plan, rather than entire corridors
- Review and input by Transportation Planning Regions (TPRs), Statewide Transportation Advisory Committee (STAC), and Freight Advisory Council (July-October)
- Submittal of initial Critical Rural Freight Corridor designations by November, 2016 for inclusion in initial National Multimodal Freight Network (NMFN) to be finalized on December 4, 2016 (November)
- More detailed analysis of corridors and priorities to be completed as part of Multimodal Freight Plan development.
- Corridors to be updated annually as projects are completed, needs change, etc.

### **Critical Urban Freight Corridors**

---

- 80.35 miles, designated by the State in consultation with MPO, or in urbanized areas with a population of 500,000 or more, designated by the MPO in consultation with the State.

### ***Criteria***

- Is inside an Adjusted Urbanized Area Boundary (areas over 50,000)
- Meets at least one of the following criteria:
  - Connects an intermodal facility to the PHFS, Interstate System, or an intermodal freight facility
  - Is located within a corridor of a route on the PHFS and provides an alternative highway option important to goods movement
  - Serves a major freight generator, logistics center, or manufacturing and warehouse industrial land, or
  - Is important to the movement of freight within the region, as determined by the MPO or the State.
- States and MPOs are encouraged to consider first or last mile connector routes from high-volume freight corridors to freight-intensive land and key urban freight facilities, including ports, rail terminals, and other industrial zoned land.

### ***Process of Identification***

- Work with MPOs to determine approach and timeline.
- States and MPOs determine how to distribute the CUFC mileage among the urbanized areas.