

**STAC Meeting Minutes  
March 18, 2016**

**Location:** CDOT Headquarters Auditorium

**Date/Time:** March 18, 9:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.

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

**Attendance:**

In Person: Vince Rogalski (GV), Kevin Hall (SW), Norm Steen (PPACG), Doug Rex (DRCOG), George Wilkinson (SLV), Mack Loudon (SC), Chuck Grobe (NW), Andy Pico (PPACG).

On the Phone: Elise Jones (DRCOG), Stephanie Gonzales (SE), Adam Lancaster (CFR), Buffie McFadyen (PACOG), Scott Hobson (PACOG), Elizabeth Relford (UFR), Barbara Kirkmeyer (UFR), Sean Conway (NFRMPO).

<b>Agenda Items/ Presenters/Affiliations</b>	<b>Presentation Highlights</b>	<b>Actions</b>
<p>Introductions &amp; January Minutes / Vince Rogalski (STAC Chair)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of February 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>• This month all of the meetings occurred in one day.</li> <li>• HPTE is concerned about SB 16-123, which would remove the requirement for HOV transponders. The bill has passed the Senate and is moving to the House. Several groups have publically opposed it, including DRCOG.</li> <li>• HPTE says that C-470 bids are good so far; the I-70 Viaduct project is now referred to as “Central 70” and we’ll have a presentation on that later; US 36 bike lanes are now completely open and Phase 2 tolling will start on March 30th; Phase 2 of I-25 N is open and they’re taking bids on Phase 3.</li> <li>• HPTE is discussing the sharing of costs between CDOT and HPTE in relation to I-70 express lanes.</li> <li>• TC discussed TIGER VIII and other grants; revised budget for FY2015-2016; final draft budget for FY2016-2017 should be going forward now; discussed cash management, approved the draft STIP (posted on the website on 3/17/16 for 30-day review period); rules for MAP-21 are now</li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>

	<p>coming out (first segment that came out was related to safety but others will follow) hopefully these will incorporate the FAST Act.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No issues to report this month related to Bridge Enterprise.</li> </ul> <p><b>STAC Comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Mack Louden</u>: Why is DRCOG opposing the transponder bill?</li> <li><u>Vince Rogalski</u>: If drivers don't have a transponder then you have to take a license plate photo and then send a bill, and if the driver qualifies to use HOV they have to call in and get the bill refunded. One solution might be to give transponders free to HOV users. In either case the bill would complicate accounting and make the system less convenient for users.</li> <li><u>Doug Rex</u>: That captures it well, but we also think it's not the best public policy to change a well-defined system like this after the fact.</li> <li><u>Elise Jones</u>: We're working with legislators to let this move forward without some of the most harmful elements, perhaps by CDOT paying for carpoolers' transponders. But another issue is that the legislature is also trying to insert itself into the decision about when to switch from HOV 2+ to HOV 3+. The more recent amendments make it worse in that regard, but also potentially more likely to fail in the House. A number of communities along the US 36 corridor have also come out against this bill.</li> </ul>	
<p>Response to STAC Comments / Debra Perkins-Smith (Director of CDOT Division of Transportation Development)</p>	<p><b>Presentation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We want to respond to a number of questions that arose during the last meeting and that we've researched since.</li> <li>I-25 North tolled express lanes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The northbound lanes opened this past week and the southbound lanes will open on March 21st, with tolling to start in early summer.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>STAC Comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Sean Conway</u>: I want to commend Region 1 and other CDOT staff for working diligently on this since it came up at the last meeting. We beat up on you sometimes and I think we need to recognize when you do a good job too, so thanks.</li> </ul> <p><b>Presentation</b></p>	<p>No action taken.</p>

- I-70 Glenwood Canyon:
  - We're planning a lessons learned activity on the Glenwood Canyon closure to see how we can improve in the future, and we're also going to discuss at our April FAC meeting to get the private sector perspective as well.
  
- **STAC Comments**
  - Vince Rogalski: I want to note that the cost of that event so far is about \$5 million, including all the repairs and operations.
  
- **Presentation**
  - SB 228:
    - We have been sidetracked this last month on a variety of discretionary grant applications that we'll discuss later, but I want to assure you that we will be getting back to a deliberative process on prioritizing SB 228 projects as soon as possible.
  - Freight Funding Programs:
    - We confirmed that we are allowed to combine the FAST Act formula freight funding and FASTLANE grant funding for one project.
    - We researched the potential for swapping FASTLANE funding for the Bridge Enterprise funds for the Central 70 project, but the FASTER Audit criticized CDOT for not using Bridge Enterprise funds on projects in order of priority. We can discuss further during our Central 70 presentation later if there are any questions.
  - Loveland Park and Ride Issues:
    - We have another item on the agenda that will address this.
  - Rest Area Issues:
    - CDOT is undertaking a study of this issue: Phase 1 is inventorying rest area condition, safety, amenities, and frequency of use for rest areas; Phase 2 will include a discussion with CDOT staff about rest stop usage; and Phase 3 will have a public-involvement focus by gathering community input.

<p>Chief Engineer Updates / Josh Laipply (CDOT Chief Engineer)</p>	<p><b>Presentation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CDOT is continuing to work with local agency coordinators on the De-Federalization Pilots. We think there are potential benefits to this approach, though our partners have noted that CDOT should also look at its <i>own</i> process, not just the federal ones.</li> <li>• We are being specific about the types of projects that we select. One reason for this is the potential impact that receiving state funds may have on local TABOR limits. We will need locals' help in self-certifying that they are within those.</li> <li>• The idea is to build this process from the ground-up to see how it can be improved.</li> <li>• Currently we are expecting to have one project per region for the first round of this de-federalization effort.</li> <li>• We didn't want any projects that are too small or too large at this point, focusing instead on projects that are large enough to see an impact but small enough not to be overly complex.</li> <li>• We're trying to get a variety of projects with different types of funds since they all have different requirements and nuances.</li> <li>• Regional planners will have the best idea at this point of the types of projects that are going to be selected for the first round of pilots.</li> <li>• Apart from the De-federalization Pilots, we are also looking at a possible FASTLANE grant application to partner with railroads on ROW issues along the US 85 corridor. We think that the partnership and leveraging private fund elements could set such an application apart and we're hopeful that we can do something good together.</li> </ul>	
<p>TPR Reports / TPR Representatives</p>	<p><b>Presentation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Southwest TPR</u>: Not much to report, it's dry and sunny in Durango so the RAMP project is starting back up; CDOT did a transit town hall a week ago with good attendance, Durango is in a tough spot because funding is shifting away from transit but people are reliant on a functional transit system.</li> <li>• <u>PPACG</u>: Approved an MOU with CDOT to allow administrative approval for emergency funding, rather than waiting for Board approval; I-25 Cimarron is progressing and Region 2 is doing a good job of communicating to the public about it; HB-1018 (which would have STAC to directly advise the TC)</li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>

	<p>was discussed and the group is supportive; PPACG is working on TIP amendments for FY2017 – FY2020 and should have them completed by June.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <u>DRCOG</u>: Also not much to report; DRCOG Board approved 9 amendments to 2040 RTP plus 3 amendments to the TIP, including a new RoadX pool; DRCOG will begin the process of integrating DRMAC into itself based on a study that determined it would eliminate redundancies and better serve the public.</li><li>• <u>San Luis Valley TPR</u>: Getting ready to start work on Trout Creek Pass project; otherwise nothing to report.</li><li>• <u>South Central TPR</u>: Current projects include bridge work on I-25, rockfall on Raton Pass, and I-25/US 160 in Huerfano County, where county and city staff are looking at constructing a bike path.</li><li>• <u>Northwest TPR</u>: Looking to start on SH 9 in April; have discovered an unintended consequence related to the new wildlife overpass – ice forms under the overpass and combines with accelerating vehicles climbing the hill, causing a dangerous situation (a family nearly went off the road). Region 3 is working to put up some signage to warn drivers as they solve the underlying drainage issues.</li><li>• <u>NFRMPO</u>: The newly-formed US 34 coalition has been meeting with Region 4 RTD Johnny Olson and Commissioner Kathy Gilliland, and have unanimously requested the use of North Front Range MPO’s RPP funds for a PEL on the corridor to plan for expected growth in this area, hopefully to start by the end of the year.</li><li>• <u>PACOG</u>: Work on I-25 ILEX project and US 50 eastbound lanes is continuing; PACOG Board is looking at adding 2020 projects to the TIP in April; Eden-Dillon Overpass continuing and ahead of schedule; PACOG Board looking at a transit operations study, RFP is out on the street, hoping to award by end of April, includes potential expansion of transit to Pueblo West area and others.</li><li>• <u>Upper Front Range TPR</u>: Working with FHWA to define what projects are eligible for CMAQ funds, since some that were previously funded are apparently not eligible now – we feel that this change is an overreach by FHWA headquarters; the TPR also discussed the US 34 PEL study and will continue during June meeting; discussed TAP and the barriers that smaller communities face in getting these funds; discussed SB 228 list and feel that</li></ul>	
--	---	--

	<p>the TPR's top priority of SH 52 / I-76 should be included; discussed freight federal grants due to the high volume of freight in the region and hope that CDOT will consider projects of statewide significance, such as US 85 (which passes through three TPRs) as well as I-76.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Southeast TPR</u>: Several bridge projects on US 50 are in progress (Granada-Lamar almost complete, Granada-Holly overpass underway); TPR will be placing 4 EVSE chargers in 4 counties in the area to encourage electric vehicle travel in the region – locations will be Springfield in Baca County, Las Animas in Bent County, Eads in Kiowa County, and Lamar in Prowers County.</li> <li>• <u>Gunnison Valley</u>: Excitement about the upcoming RAMP project in Ridgway (a 3rd lane on SH 62 through town), something folks have been working towards for about 20 years.</li> </ul>	
<p>Federal and State Legislative Report / Herman Stockinger (CDOT Office of Policy &amp; Government Relations)</p>	<p><b>Presentation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The focus of our attention lately has been SB-123 on transponders, and we appreciate those of you helping to oppose it.</li> <li>• We're currently waiting for the next round of economic forecasts, and after those are released the Long Bill will get going. Until then we're in a bit of a holding pattern.</li> </ul> <p><b>STAC Comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Sean Conway</u>: I heard that the number was supposed to come out this week. Do you still anticipate about \$200 million from SB 228 going to Central 70?</li> <li>• <u>Herman Stockinger</u>: We've heard that the forecast is going to be positive and have worked with the Joint Budget Committee to answer their questions – hopefully they won't try to use some of those funds to balance the budget.</li> <li>• <u>Barbara Kirkmeyer</u>: There is a bill related to WC 49 (from I-76 to SH 392) going forward and hoping for someone at CDOT who can help support this item. It would show good partnership between the County and CDOT.</li> <li>• <u>Herman Stockinger</u>: We've heard about the bill and didn't think there were any issues – I'm happy to ask that we support this through the Governor's</li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>

	<p>office and have conversations with some of our transportation allies in the Senate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Sean Conway</u>: So you're thinking that the JBC may take \$100 million out of the \$200 million that we're expecting?</li> <li>• <u>Herman Stockinger</u>: Some people have proposed that the JBC provide a consistent long-term transportation funding source out of the General Fund and swap this for the current SB 228 plan – i.e. \$100 million over 5 years in place of \$200 million this year.</li> <li>• <u>Sean Conway</u>: If they decide to go that path, will it change the allocation to Central 70?</li> <li>• <u>Herman Stockinger</u>: I think that whether it is \$200 million or \$100 million, Central 70 will likely get the bulk of that in the first year.</li> <li>• <u>Norm Steen</u>: HB 1304 – the Transportation Priorities Communities Conversation Bill – would require CDOT to have a conversation in each TPR with robust funding from CDOT and OEDIT (although no new funding is provided for this purpose). PPACG is opposed to this bill because it's redundant to what we're already doing. DTD is working on something very much like this right now, so if it did pass we'd be in good shape to follow through. The other thing to consider is that depending on what is on the ballot in November we would have to be very careful to avoid spending state money to promote any side of the issue. Also, while we're not opposed to having the conversation with the public, without additional funding to support projects you're just creating an expectation that you can't realistically meet.</li> </ul>	
<p>SWP Lessons Learned / Michelle Scheuerman (CDOT Statewide Planning Manager)</p>	<p><b>Presentation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The goal of this effort is to learn what went well, what can be enhanced, and how to move forward for the future.</li> <li>• We are planning to host the STAC workshop in April and roll everything into a document in May.</li> <li>• 20 interviews of internal and regional staff have been completed to-date. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Positive Feedback: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Plans had right amount of content.</li> <li>▪ People liked ability to drill down on website.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>

- Needs & Gap Analysis was an improvement over previous years.
- Best products included Telephone Town Halls, Videos, and Infographics.
- The length and balance of content in the RTPs was good and they have potential use as future reference and for project identification.
- Negative Feedback:
  - Need shorter documents.
  - New content: asset management, technology, freight, big data, minority and low income, multimodal considerations, linkages to PEL, data to inform decision making.
  - Earlier coordination and information sharing during RTP development process.
  - Hold workshops / working sessions with STAC, TPRs, and stakeholders during RTP development.
  - Need better integration of RTPs into the SWP.
  - Better synchronization of plan time frames.
  - More explicit linkages between data and decision-making.
  - Timing of the ballot initiative list was disruptive and confusing.
- Potential Themes for April STAC Workshop:
  - Topics for future STAC workshops.
  - How to hold better TPR meetings during plan development.
  - Topics to discuss with TPRs prior to development.
  - RTP customization.
  - Relationship / roll-up of RTPs and MPO plans into the SWP.
  - Connection of SWP to policy development, priority corridors, and project selection.
  - Data use and presentation and additional data for future plans.

**STAC Comments**

- Kevin Hall: I didn't get a lot of feedback from the TPR because Southwest liked the process – timing issues were a concern but for the most part it was well-done and very inclusive.

- Barbara Kirkmeyer: Another topic is the correlation between all the planning efforts that are going on: SB 228, Freight, Transit, etc. are all too siloed and should be coordinated closely.
- Andy Pico: I notice that you're proposing to make the documents more public-friendly by reducing their size, but you're also talking about new additional content. Those may prove to be contradictory goals.
- Norm Steen: As a business owner I would think about what the customer thinks – in our case we should try to get more input from the highway users on this. That's another audience that we need to engage. I'd also extend that to contractors, bus companies, mobility groups, E-470, etc. to see what they think about our work and how to improve it.
- Michelle Scheuerman: One approach would be to develop focus groups to get that input.
- Vince Rogalski: One of the items you mentioned is education – our TPR has been working with CDOT on bringing educational topics to each meeting to help representatives better understand how things work. If that's not happening elsewhere then it should be.

#### **Presentation**

- It sounds like we should bring a few items for a group workshop with the entire STAC, focused on plan coordination/alignment and education. If the group feels there should be other topic workshops then we can return again in the future.
- We will send an invite and survey in preparation for the upcoming workshop so we can address the areas of greatest interest.

#### **STAC Comments**

- Kevin Hall: A few months ago we went through a process of ranking the FAST Act topics that we're interested in discussing further, but I'm not sure where that went.
- Jeff Sudmeier: Yes, we got minimal feedback on that so far but today we're going to talk about freight and then next month we'll discuss transit.

<p>Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Update / Jamie Collins (CDOT Office of Financial Management and Budget)</p>	<p><b>Presentation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met with the TC on Wednesday of this week and they released the draft STIP for public comment.</li> <li>• The STIP is federally required, is fiscally constrained, is developed every 4 years, and maintains consistency with the long-range SWP, RTPs, and TIPs.</li> <li>• The annual STIP update is needed to maintain 4 years of projects at all times between the full update (4P Process) that occurs every 4 years.</li> <li>• Draft FY2017 – FY2020 STIP is on the website for public review here: <a href="https://www.codot.gov/business/budget/statewide-transportation-improvement-program-stip-reports-information">https://www.codot.gov/business/budget/statewide-transportation-improvement-program-stip-reports-information</a></li> <li>• Schedule: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ April – STIP Public Hearing</li> <li>○ May – TC approval of STIP</li> <li>○ June – FHWA / FTA Approval</li> <li>○ July 1st – FY2017-FY2020 STIP goes into effect.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>STAC Comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Norm Steen</u>: Where do changes in the STIP come from? You mentioned it's a grass-roots process, but sometimes it feels like the MPOs are told that a STIP amendment has been made and we feel like we're playing catch-up.</li> <li>• <u>Jamie Collins</u>: Most of the STIP changes are administrative, small in nature, like adding some funds based on a project going to ad. When they are larger we consult with the MPOs to update their TIP and only amend the STIP after your Board has approved. Generally for the MPOs the TIP process drives it and we follow your lead. In rural areas where there's not an MPO we have a 30-day public comment period to ensure that there is a chance for public input. For more information, we also have a flow chart of STIP changes included in the document that shows how those occur.</li> <li>• <u>Norm Steen</u>: And how does it work if the MPO TIP isn't approved prior to the TC approving the STIP?</li> <li>• <u>Jamie Collins</u>: That's fine, we can include language saying the TC adopts contingent on the MPO action occurring later. The timelines don't always align precisely and that's fine, thought we'd like to get them closer in the future.</li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>
--	---	-------------------------

<p>Central 70 Update / Tony DeVito (Central 70 Project Director)</p>	<p><b>Presentation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Glad to hear that the rebranding to Central 70 is taking hold. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Central to communities, commerce, and Colorado.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Project Overview: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Restriping I-25 to Brighton Boulevard, remove viaduct, lower highway, widen from I-270 to Chambers.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Funding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ \$850 million from Bridge Enterprise</li> <li>○ \$180 million from SB 228</li> <li>○ \$50 million from DRCOG</li> <li>○ \$37 million from City of Denver</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Delivery method will be Design-Build-Finance-Operate-Maintain <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ CDOT maintains ownership and keeps all toll revenues while making annual payments to the private sector partner, who must meet stringent performance standards.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• P3s are viewed positively by the public: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 50% somewhat support</li> <li>○ 21% strongly support</li> <li>○ 15% strongly oppose</li> <li>○ 13% somewhat oppose</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Project Schedule: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Spring 2016 – Third RFP Draft</li> <li>○ Fall 2016 – Final RFP</li> <li>○ Spring 2017 – Team Selection</li> <li>○ Summer 2017 – Financial Close</li> <li>○ Early 2018 – Start of Construction</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>STAC Comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Andy Pico</u>: Do I understand right that the \$850 million from Bridge Enterprise will be financed by the tolls?</li> <li>• <u>Tony DeVito</u>: Tolls tend to cover operational costs but not capital costs. That \$850 million will come out of CDOT's annual budget over the coming years. We've set an upset limit (\$41 million per year) that the teams have to be responsive to in order to qualify. We get \$100 million per year in Bridge Enterprise funds so \$41 million is well within our commitment of</li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>
--	---	-------------------------

	<p>being under 50% of the total. The TC instructed us not to leverage more than 50% of yearly revenue in debt service. Milestone payments will depend on the team that is selected because they each have a different project development schedule.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Josh Laipply</u>: We don't know exactly what the availability payment is until financial close, but we have a commitment that we will never exceed 50% of our yearly Bridge Enterprise allocation of about \$100 million per year.</li> <li>• <u>Debra Perkins-Smith</u>: So to put it another way, how much Bridge Enterprise money will be left for other projects when you take out Central 70?</li> <li>• <u>Josh Laipply</u>: At least \$50 million.</li> <li>• <u>Barbara Kirkmeyer</u>: So if DRCOG is putting forward \$50 million towards a \$1.2 billion project, how much does that equate to? Why doesn't DRCOG have to put forward more money than that if UFR is always funding its own projects at a higher percentage?</li> <li>• <u>Elise Jones</u>: This is a project of statewide significance, so while DRCOG is happy to contribute we also think it's appropriate that this be addressed from a statewide perspective.</li> <li>• <u>Tony DeVito</u>: This is the last of the original 33 bridges identified by the FASTER legislation to be completed, so that's why we're addressing it using Bridge Enterprise funds.</li> <li>• <u>Barbara Kirkmeyer</u>: I will keep bringing this up because when we heard about this project originally it was \$650 million, now it's twice that largely because we're adding a lot of features that should normally be paid for by the local government, not the DOT.</li> <li>• <u>Herman Stockinger</u>: I just want to clarify that the price difference is not because of the school location, that's a simplistic explanation. Also we've had 6 or 7 years of Bridge Enterprise funding at about \$100 million per year, so we've spent in the area of \$600 - \$700 million on more than 100 bridges statewide, very little of that money has gone to the Central 70 viaduct to date.</li> </ul>	
<p>Rural Regional Bus Network Plan / David Averill (CDOT Division of Transit &amp; Rail)</p>	<p><b>Presentation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The goal is to better connect rural areas to existing transit options, including Bustang.</li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>

- In 2004 rural bus providers like Greyhound began shedding over 2,500 rural routes, especially west of the Mississippi, which has negatively affected the state.
- 5311(f) funding supports this type of service by private companies but currently the schedules are inconvenient, there's no common or well-aligned brand, there's a lack of connectivity across the state, and companies employ "operationalized" capital costs where grant funding pays for vehicles and operations.
- In 2007, WSDOT in Washington State launched a new solution:
  - Identified and prioritized routes
  - Purchased the fleet
  - Allocated 5311(f) through competitive bids rather than grant selection
  - The result is a system that gives the state more control over the quality of service and provides more meaningful connections for travelers.
- CDOT is working to better understand the market, scheduling and marketing constraints of operators, maximize local funding and in-kind match, and prioritizing needs based on funding constraints.
  - \$1.65 million is available annually through 5311(f) and FASTER Transit can provide \$500,000 per year.
- CDOT is hoping to eventually add the following routes:
  - Craig to Grand Junction (new route)
  - Steamboat Springs to Frisco (new route)
  - Gunnison to Montrose (new route)
  - Sterling to Denver (existing route with improved schedule)
  - Trinidad to Colorado Springs (existing route with improved schedule)
- Questions to explore with stakeholders:
  - What level of service is needed?
  - Does the trip provide adequate time at regional centers?
  - Are schedules meaningful and convenient?
  - Can we maintain connections with Greyhound?
  - Should we maximize farebox recovery or ridership?
  - Why type of fare medium should be used?
  - What role should equity considerations play?
  - Should there be a threshold or cap for maximum subsidy amount?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ How important should connections to local transit systems be in the decisions?</li> <li>● Next Steps: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Spring 2016 – get input from TPRs and MPOs on policy questions and route prioritization.</li> <li>○ Summer 2016 – seek TC approval of concept.</li> <li>○ Summer 2016 – develop bus specifications.</li> <li>○ Fall 2016 / Winter 2017 – procure fleet of OTR small coaches using SB 228 funds.</li> <li>○ CY 2017 – bid our routes and develop service contracts.</li> <li>○ CY 2018 – implement the rural regional bus network.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>STAC Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <u>Norm Steen</u>: What’s your point of entry into the MPOs? We have an active coordinating committee.</li> <li>● <u>David Averill</u>: We’d appreciate any contacts and support that you can provide and we’re happy to speak to anybody and everybody.</li> </ul>	
<p>TIGER/FASTLANE/FLAP Grant Updates / Herman Stockinger (CDOT Office of Policy &amp; Government Relations)</p>	<p><b>Presentation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Staff went to TC this week with one proposed TIGER project: North I-25 express lanes, 14 miles from Fort Collins to Loveland. We feel that it combines a lot of aspects that will give it a good chance for funding, so that is our one project we plan to focus on.</li> <li>● With TIGER we know from previous rounds what tends to be competitive, but with FASTLANE we don’t have that history. DTD did some analysis and we went to TC with 4 options (3 large projects and 1 smaller statewide project). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ US 287 Lamar Bypass</li> <li>○ US 85</li> <li>○ US 550 / US 160 Connection</li> <li>○ Multi-State Truck Parking Information Management System</li> </ul> </li> <li>● We are only allowed to submit up to 3 projects, so one of those 4 will eventually fall out before the April 14th application due date.</li> <li>● We also requested \$1 million match to contribute to Lamar’s Southwest Chief Phase 3 application, and DTR identified older SB 1 funds that were available to support this.</li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Debra Perkins-Smith</u>: It really was a scramble to put this together since we only had about 6 weeks of knowing about it. I want to talk about some criteria that we had to follow: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Construction to begin with 18 months or by 9/30/19 (whichever comes first) and that eliminated a lot of our larger projects that may appear in future rounds.</li> <li>○ Benefit-Cost Analysis</li> <li>○ At least 25% of funds will be awarded to rural areas (outside the urbanized boundary areas of at least 250,000) – this should help Colorado given the types of projects we’re putting forward.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <u>Debra Perkins-Smith</u>: Another discretionary grant program out right now is FLAP. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Applications are not due until May 21st and some local agencies may be putting in some of their own.</li> <li>○ We went to the TC with an initial suggestion and will refine and bring those back to them in April.</li> <li>○ We identified Top 4 projects for CDOT to advance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ US 160 Passing Lanes north of Towaoc</li> <li>▪ US 50 Blue Creek Canyon</li> <li>▪ US 550 Corridor</li> <li>▪ SH 139 Little Horse South</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ One of the main criteria here is a high-visitation area or high-economic generator, like a national park or military base, and these 4 stood out in that regard.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <u>Debra Perkins-Smith</u>: This whole process was very fast and we didn’t do as much outreach as we normally would like. As we go forward we want to take some time to use our Development Program and other resources to line up future applications with more advanced timing so that we can be less reactive.</li> </ul>	
<p>FAST Act Freight Program / Jeff Sudmeier (CDOT Multimodal Planning Branch)</p>	<p><b>Presentation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The new formula freight program will provide about \$15 million per year to Colorado.</li> <li>• Project eligibility is tied to the National Highway Freight Network (also created by the FAST Act).</li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>

- In general, this is comprised of interstates and critical urban / critical rural corridors.
  - Critical urban and rural corridors are not yet identified: CDOT can select 80 miles of critical urban corridors and 160 miles of critical rural corridors, and these can be segments and can be adjusted over time based on need.
- Program development with input from TPRs, STAC, and FAC over the next several months:
  - Program structure and focus.
  - Priorities for funding.
  - Critical Urban Corridors and Critical Rural Corridors.
  - Connection to other efforts - FASTLANE, SB 228, TIGER, etc.
  - FASTLANE match
- Input from February FAC:
  - Identified key focus areas: truck parking, highway safety, low vertical clearance bridges, rail-highway crossings, communications.
- Input from February STAC
  - Use a statewide approach rather than regional allocation – funds are too small to split up.
  - Fund a mix of projects, rather than just a couple big ones.
  - Focus on finishing existing projects.
- Next Steps
  - TPR input
  - FAC input
  - STAC or STAC subgroup input

**STAC Comments:**

- Norm Steen: I would suggest that you take input from the regions to the state level and then rank them somehow based on which will have the biggest return for the state.
- Kevin Hall: I'm curious about TPR input and timing – how are we going to coordinate so that TPRs have adequate time to react?
- Jeff Sudmeier: We're going to have to have some flexibility with schedules, we'll work with the regions to figure that out and when we can come back to STAC to share that input.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>George Wilkinson</u>: I think these projects should coincide with other projects that we have in our areas, such as widening shoulders. We all already have projects in our areas that we could roll into this and leverage our funds to solve multiple problems at once.</li> <li>• <u>Mack Loudon</u>: Are you wanting the local regions to identify what are the freight corridors?</li> <li>• <u>Jeff Sudmeier</u>: I think we're trying to figure out what the best approach is and work with you on deciding that. We have awareness of priorities in the TPRs as articulated in your RTPs but we want to make sure we aren't missing anything from those. We want to take the opportunity for you to give us additional feedback on priorities.</li> <li>• <u>Debra Perkins-Smith</u>: We also want your thoughts on the criteria: we've heard economic generators, finishing projects, but what else? Maybe safety should be a criteria.</li> <li>• <u>Vince Rogalski</u>: One thing to consider are critical areas in the state that can create isolated communities – a resiliency element.</li> <li>• <u>Norm Steen</u>: What's good for freight is often good for other things, so maybe taking a look at the Development Program to weigh those projects that check multiple boxes.</li> <li>• <u>Barbara Kirkmeyer</u>: There seems to be a short-term ask and a long-term ask. The short-term is the grant that needs to be submitted in April and the long-term is this formula program that we're talking about now. The projects you listed earlier seem good – they are all in areas with freight movement needs, they're projects that appear in existing planning docs from completed processes, etc. I think we should follow those same criteria for the formula program to maintain consistency and competitiveness.</li> <li>• <u>Jeff Sudmeier</u>: We will work with region staff to coordinate future input, but in the short-term if you have other thoughts please reach out to DTD or your regional contacts to share that.</li> </ul>	
Other Business / Vince Rogalski (STAC Chairman)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Next STAC meeting will be April 29th.</li> <li>• Norm Steen: In light of the potential new legislation affecting the TC-STAC relationship, we should consider another STAC retreat (with or without the TC) to follow up on the one we held several years ago.</li> </ul>	No action taken.

**STAC ADJOURNS**