

**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 our 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 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 to see if it makes sense to modify the</li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>

number and/or location of commissioners. Will look at lane miles, population, funding, etc.

- 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.
- All the transportation funding bills failed despite general support voiced among many leaders in the Senate, and House, and the Governor.
- 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.
- A FASTER fee bill would have taken away FASTER Transit funding and diverted it to FASTER Safety, but that died in the House.
- 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 proposed that CDOT address administratively and "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.

**STAC Comments**

- Elise Jones: 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.
- Andy Karsian: 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.

**Presentation**

- 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, 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 health care, 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 were raised around 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 all 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 enhancing 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 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 on 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 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, and Weld Co, 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 dedicate 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, with the TC hoping to fill the 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 versus only

	<p>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 North 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 (DTD) 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 (submitted by La Plata County)</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 RidgeGate 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 Louden</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>

- \$7 million expended
  - Adams Co. has the most vehicles based in it (as a transport hub), followed by Denver Co. and Weld Co.
  - Transit vehicles are now eligible and the RAQC is working with CDOT's Division of Transit & Rail to coordinate the process and requirements.
  - Next round opens June 6<sup>th</sup> and applications will be due by July 8<sup>th</sup>.
- Fueling Stations*
- Thanks to those STAC members participating in the AFC Advisory Council:
    - Barbara Kirkmeyer, Norm Steen, Terri Blackmore, Thad Noll, and Pete Fraser (former).
  - The goal is to establish a sustainable statewide alternative fuels market in Colorado.
  - The AFC program has awarded 14 CNG stations so far, 5 of which are currently operational.
    - The remainder will be within the year.
    - Among awarded stations, 3 included co-located EV and propane fueling.
  - The top funding priorities are along interstates and major transportation corridors, defined as those with >1,000 mid- and heavy-duty trucks per day.
    - Tier 1 Corridors: I-25, I-70, I-76, and US 287.
    - Lamar is in a gap area of focus.
  - Secondary funding priorities are along corridors with >250 mid- and heavy-duty trucks per day.
    - Tier 2 Corridors: US 160, US 550, and US 285
  - 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.
  - Key target areas are gaps on I-70 between Denver and Glenwood Springs.
  - Planned community engagement activities focused on:
    - Silverthorne-Dillon-Frisco-Eagle
    - Grand Junction
    - Central, South, and West Denver Metro
    - Lamar

- 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 Nebraska 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> <li>• <u>Thad Noll</u>: 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</li> </ul>	<p>Tentative date set for September 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2016.</p>

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.</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 (DTD 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 will be added.</li> <li>▪ Not intended to include every project, only the major ones as defined by each region.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>

- May include smaller projects on a programmatic basis (i.e. regional intersection priorities).
- The 10-Year Development Program is a subset of the \$8.5 billion that are the highest priority over the next 10 years.
- 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.
  - Aiming for roughly \$2.5 billion total.
- 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.
- 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.
- The Development Program will be a living document to be updated as needed by the CDOT Regions.
- The 10-year Development Program will have more process established around updates, for instance alignment with the yearly STIP update.
- We want to avoid having this information become stale over time.
- 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.
- One question is whether a project needs to be in the Development Program to be included in the STIP?
  - The answer is no – most STIP projects are smaller than what the Development Program would capture. Larger projects are probably already in the Development Program, and if not we'll adjust..
- Development Program Next Steps:
  - Regions coordinate with TPRs/MPOs over the summer.
  - Final draft of 10 Year Development Program in the fall.
  - Ongoing discussions with STAC and other stakeholders.
  - The FAQ document is on the website alongside the broad \$8.5 billion inventory, so you can find updated information there.

**STAC Comments**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Mack Louden</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-construction phase then it should include those costs.</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. I anticipate that we'll update annually, and probably maintain a 10-year window.</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. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Organized by items to keep, items to improve, and new items to add.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>	
Statewide Travel Model Overview & Coordination / Erik Sabina (Information Management Branch Manager)	<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><b>STAC Comments</b></p>	No action taken.

- 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?
- Erik Sabina: 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

	<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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**