

**Draft STAC Meeting Minutes
September 23, 2016**

Location: CDOT Headquarters Auditorium
Date/Time: September 23, 9:00 a.m. - 11:30 a.m.
Chairman: Vince Rogalski, STAC Chair
Attendance:

In Person: Vince Rogalski (GV), Terri Blackmore (NFRMPO), Sean Conway (NFRMPO), Jody Rosier (SUIT), George Wilkinson (SLV), Elise Jones (DRCOG), Jacob Riger (DRCOG), John Adams (PACOG), Norm Steen (PPACG), Chuck Grobe (NW), Jim Baldwin (SE), Walt Boulden (SC), Todd Hollenbeck (GVMPO), Turner Smith (PPACG), Craig Casper (PPACG), Peter Baier (GVMPO), Thad Noll (IM), Trent Bushner (EA), Gary Beedy (EA), Barbara Kirkmeyer (UFR).

On the Phone: Kevin Hall (SW).

| Agenda Items/ Presenters/Affiliations | Presentation Highlights | Actions |
|---|---|--------------------------|
| <p>Introductions & August Minutes / Vince Rogalski (STAC Chair)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review and approval of August STAC Minutes. No corrections or additions. | <p>Minutes approved.</p> |
| <p>Transportation Commission Report / Vince Rogalski (STAC Chair)</p> | <p>Presentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CDOT Division of Transit & Rail provided an overview of funding for 5311 funding changes (see packet). • PD 14 was discussed and is on the agenda for later today. • Budget reconciliation for FY15/16 identified surplus of \$85 million, Federal Distribution added another \$48 million. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No discussion this month but TC approval and decision-making is scheduled for October. • Resiliency committee emphasized that there is no new funding identified for improvements in this field but identified a pilot study for I-70. • RoadX presentation was given to the TC and will be shared with the STAC at a future meeting. | <p>No action taken.</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|-------------------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approval given for the Region 2 building location following a long discussion. A site in Pueblo has been selected, as has a design that includes Colorado State Patrol. • Vince Rogalski is serving on the reinstated Efficiency and Accountability Committee, which is currently in the process of evaluating the FASTER motor vehicle fees in terms of how they were collected and documented. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Held one meeting thus far and will go until December 2016 before going into recess and restarting after the legislative session. | |
| <p>TPR Reports / STAC Representatives</p> | <p>Presentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>DRCOG</u>: Metro Vision 2040 public review is occurring with a hearing scheduled for November and final release anticipated in December. Other complementary documents will be distributed thereafter. • <u>GVMPO</u>: Two CNG buses approved for funding from federal program (only system in state to receive them); working with Region 3 on funding for SH 340 project. • <u>NFRMPO</u>: FY 2020 and 2021 projects have been scored by TAC and gone to the planning council and there will be a call for projects in October; will host an EV drive event in Johnstown before the next council meeting; US 34 PEL Loveland to Kersey will announce contractor soon; construction on Berthoud Hill is moving along and we're looking forward to completion in the next 60 days; NFRMPO offices are being reconfigured; I-25 crossroads project is underway; VW settlement public outreach is being developed. • <u>PACOG</u>: US 50 west of Pueblo almost complete; alternatives for West Pueblo Connection have been identified by stakeholders and will host public meeting on 10/20 to discuss; preparing to do a transit feasibility study for potential route restructuring. • <u>PPACG</u>: I-25 Cimarron interchange still on schedule and under budget, completion next fall, recent lane closures went smoothly; some discussion of potential projects in the area to use VW settlement money on; working with local legislators to add Development Program projects to the Transbond I bill. • <u>Central Front Range</u>: • <u>Eastern</u>: Attended the Ports-to-Plains meeting in Texas, I-27 corridor to extend possibly south, maybe link to I-25, will continue conversations on this or maybe consider options to link to I-70, noted that Texas is the 10th | <p>No action taken.</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>largest economy in the world, also that significant freight traffic is shifting from California to Texas as a result of a new bridge build in Mexico.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <u>Gunnison Valley</u>: US 50 project east and west of Gunnison is almost finished but experiencing some delays; working to rebuild slipping sections west of Blue Creek Canyon; next year will begin on the east side of Blue Creek Canyon with \$18 million from the FLAP program; last TPR meeting had strong turnout and largely focused on safety issues due to two recent fatalities and CDOT is investigating center lane rumble strips to improve safety in that area and evaluating tradeoffs; at the next TPR meeting crash data will be discussed to help set priorities for the area.• <u>Intermountain</u>: Preparing for winter project shutdown; Vail underpass RAMP project on I-70 continuing work and will not be ready until next summer; SH 9 Frisco – Breckenridge making decision on new alignment, will either leave one lane open on new alignment or use the old alignment; TAP grant applications are in and currently being scored, will be reviewed with TPR chairs in the next few weeks, \$3 million available for the region, but \$10 million have been requested.• <u>Northwest</u>: Finishing up some projects in the region, nice to have asphalt all the way along SH 9 at this point.• <u>San Luis Valley</u>: Projects wrapping up in the San Luis Valley including SH 17 shoulder widening, Wolf Creek Pass guard rails and paving; Trout Creek Pass project is also moving along.• <u>South Central</u>: Not much to report, just wrapping up summer projects.• <u>Southeast</u>: US 50 chip seal ongoing; CDOT county meeting was held two weeks ago and went well.• <u>Southwest</u>: TPR will meet two weeks from today; RAMP project dedication will be held on October 13th.• <u>Southern Ute Indian Tribe</u>: Region 5 held a tribal coordination meeting and identified a number of good projects for future collaboration.• <u>Federal Highway Administration</u>: End of the fiscal year is approaching on September 30th and we're in need of a continuing resolution from Congress, FHWA anticipating multiple extensions in the next 6 months based on the outcomes of the November election. | |
|--|---|--|

| | | |
|--|--|-------------------------|
| <p>Policy Directive (PD) 14 Current Performance and Strategies / Debra Perkins-Smith (CDOT Division of Transportation Development)</p> | <p>Presentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviewed goals for performance measures with TC this month and will use this information for budget setting that decides where to direct funding. • Maria will talk afterwards about budget impacts. The main goal areas are safety, infrastructure condition, maintenance, and system performance. • Maintenance goals are currently not being met. • In safety, a third of fatalities are not wearing seat belts and the TC supports a primary seatbelt law; also developing a new measure for bike/pedestrian crashes to help assess locations to identify themes. <p>STAC Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Peter Baier</u>: 48% of statewide crashes occur in rural areas despite only 15% - 18% of the public living there, so we need to make sure that the Highway Safety Improvement Plan (HSIP) talks about rural roads and the disparities, such as rural drivers being six times more likely to crash while texting as compared to intoxicated. • <u>Debra Perkins-Smith</u>: Agreed, and distracted driving is being investigated as part of providing better numbers to breakdown crash factors. There are eight emphasis areas in the HSIP and one of them is distracted driving. DTD will send out additional information on this topics to STAC. • <u>John Adams</u>: Are you considering the impacts of autonomous vehicles on these performance targets? • <u>Debra Perkins-Smith</u>: We are definitely hopeful that these will contribute to a decrease in crashes, but we don't yet have enough data to estimate the impacts. • <u>Vince Roglaski</u>: Newer vehicles already have lots to crash prevention technologies and soon will be connected to infrastructure and other vehicles. One key question will be whether driver licenses will be needed in the future. • <u>John Adams</u>: We understand that these vehicles may cut crashes by as much as 80%, and also increase capacity by grouping vehicles closer together. <p>Presentation</p> | <p>No action taken.</p> |
|--|--|-------------------------|

- Proposed changes for performance measures in PD14 are highlighted in red on handout. The PTI goal is for 90% of interstates to achieve a 1.05 PTI – currently the figure is 85.4% so there’s work to do there to meet that goal.
- RoadX and operations projects will hopefully contribute to meeting the PTI goal.
- Instead of making changes to safety targets right now, we have decided to assess how well they are currently being met and wait for new federal rule-making before determining new measures.
- Transit ridership data is still forthcoming to help status of meeting performance goals.
- The previous infrastructure goal for transit was for each provider to have a transit asset management plan (TAM), but this has been replaced by a statewide goal due to new regulations from FTA. The goal is for 65% of rural transit vehicles to be at fair, good, excellent condition, and actually we’re currently at 81%.
- For surface treatment, we are anticipating a big dip in overall condition in the next ten years based on the infrastructure lifecycle, and in response will dedicate an additional \$10 million to surface treatment maintenance projects to help make up the gap.
- In terms of bridges we are doing well generally but not meeting performance goals for preventative maintenance, for example addressing scour, unsealed decks, and leaking expansion joints. A proposal to transfer \$15 million in funds from Bridge Enterprise (BE) to preventative maintenance has been recommended to address this.
- Also proposing to add funds to Asset Management for other assets, including buildings, ITS, traffic signals, walls, tunnels, etc. that are currently below our goals in terms of condition.
- Next month, the TC will be requested via resolution to approve proposed changes to PD 14. None of these changes are major; most are technical changes or changes relating to new federal guidance.

STAC Comments

- Trent Bushner: Something to consider is that due to our continued growth in population and VMT, CDOT’s statistics may not accurately reflect the true change in crash rates, deaths, and other safety measures.

| | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Debra Perkins-Smith</u>: CDOT has accounted for this in previous years to show that increases in crashes were not as bad as they might seem due to concurrent population and VMT growth because the overall rate decreased, however this year the crash rate itself has actually increased beyond just population and VMT growth. • <u>Trent Bushner</u>: Does any of this safety change hinge on the legal use of marijuana? • <u>Debra Perkins-Smith</u>: It is difficult to track the instance of drivers under the influence of marijuana because it is harder to test for that than alcohol, so those rates may be underreported. • <u>Sean Conway</u>: My impression is that DUI is still considered the most common contributor to fatalities. Is it still the leading cause? • <u>Jeff Sudmeier</u>: Like with marijuana, distracted driving is difficult to show statistically since it's hard to document at the scene of a crash. Our safety folks are trying to develop better metrics for tracking these types of new challenges. • <u>John Cater</u>: In terms of targets, do you feel that these require further adjustment or are they pretty good as is? • <u>Debra Perkins-Smith</u>: This is only our second year so at this point we're thinking of keeping them in place and assessing how appropriate they are. For instance with the transit goal we didn't have good data before and now find that we're significantly above the target that we set. We're also waiting for some upcoming rulemaking before we change these to make sure they align with that. | |
| <p>Revenue and Contingency Reconciliation / Maria Sobota (CDOT Division of Accounting and Finance)</p> | <p>Presentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CDOT's cash balance will be impacted by the schedule of federal continuing resolutions since we would receive our expected funding at various points throughout the year rather than all at once in October as we normally do. • However, for cash balance in general, CDOT has had lots of success this year and the overall cash balance has been reduced over \$800 million in the past 2.5 years. The team has practices and policies in place to ensure that projects continue to be built and to flag areas of risk related to continuing resolutions or other unexpected changes, and currently our | <p>No action taken.</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>model shows only a 1 in 1,000 chance of a project not being completed as a result of this federal funding change.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The description of the budget being shared today is for a 3-year horizon. Information will be at a high level, and next month we will come back with a one-page budget and other more detailed documentation.• Updated SB 228 economic forecasts were obtained earlier this week and indicate the following:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ CDOT has already received \$199 million for FY15/16 and 10% went to transit.○ CDOT is set to receive \$158 million for FY16/17, with 10% of this transfer also dedicated to transit. At this point it would require new legislation for this transfer to be cancelled. DTD will be discussing SB 228 project selection – we want to demonstrate what projects would be foregone if funding were eliminated.○ The latest forecast from OSPB for FY17/18 is \$100 million (the Legislative Council forecast is for \$200 million) and for FY18/19 is \$100 million (with both forecasts in agreement).• For FY15/16 CDOT has received a federal redistribution sum of \$48 million in additional federal obligation (the highest we've ever received) – as well as additional state revenues of \$34 million. After subtracting some funds that must be spent on damaged roads, we have about \$75 million in extra funds that we can apply to projects. We have made recommendations to TC about how best to use these funds and will request approval in October.• Debt service payments of \$167 million expire in December 2016, and TC has already approved moving these new funds into asset management to help meet our goals in that area.• Currently the Transportation Commission Contingency Reserve Fund (TCCRF) has approximately \$108 million available from a combination of increased revenue, federal redistribution, roll-forwards, and the like. Requests for how to use this money include:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ \$15 million transfer federal funds to Bridge Enterprise with the intention of improving preventative bridge maintenance.○ \$1 million for a striping initiative.○ \$11.5 million for TSMO for projects including cover bottleneck reduction, expanded safety patrol operations in Region 1 and I-25 North, and enhancement of operations and training. | |
|--|--|--|

| | | |
|--|---|------------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ \$13.7 million for RoadX for \$4 million Smart 70 connected vehicle corridor, \$8.5 million for Big Data platform blueprint, \$750,000 to establish statewide broadband office in conjunction with OEDIT, \$500,000 to study bike/pedestrian interface with autonomous vehicles. ○ \$12 million for Risk & Resiliency, including required state match for flood repairs. ○ \$38 million for monthly emergency set-aside for next fiscal year. ○ Also includes funds for significant right-of-way acquisition currently underway. • None of the above items have been approved by the Transportation Commission at this time, but the TC will meet in October to approve or reject these and other staff proposals for the budget. <p>STAC Comments <u>Craig Casper</u>: For the debt service, what is the color of money? <u>Maria Sobota</u>: Those are state funds, so very flexible.</p> | |
| BREAK | | |
| National Highway Freight Program / Jeff Sudmeier (CDOT Multimodal Planning Branch) | <p>Presentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New FAST Act Freight programs are prompting several new corridor designations: critical urban, critical rural, and national multimodal freight corridors. • A project must be on the National Highway Freight Network in order to be eligible for funding under the new formula freight program, which provides about \$15 million in funding annually. • CDOT is kicking off the Multimodal Freight Plan (MFP) and the State Freight and Passenger Rail Plan (SFPRP), which will identify the long-term process to continue freight programs through that planning process for FY18/19 and beyond. • In order to deploy funds quickly, we'll select projects for FY 16 and FY 17 this fall/winter. • CDOT will try to stretch these formula funds as much as possible and include geographic equity as an important consideration. • A work group has been formed and CDOT region planners and environmental staff are included to help identify criteria that are robust, | No action taken. |

straightforward, transparent, and easily understood. A broad range of eligibility will be retained to provide flexibility.

- Basic eligibility criteria have been identified, three of which are federally required and two that are at the state level.
- A long list of federal activities are eligible for this program.
- Other evaluation criteria are taken from State Highway Freight Plan and Statewide Transportation Plan goal areas, including Safety, Mobility, Maintenance, and Economic Vitality. Others being considered are resiliency and ability to leverage funds.
- Next Steps: the working group will focus on criteria refinement and how to measure each, depending on what data is available to do so. Regions will then identify projects from various sources for consideration.
- The timeline for completing the process will be from November to December of 2016.

STAC Comments

- Thad Noll: Overall I like the criteria, but I'd advise you to take care regarding the leveraging fund criteria. A lot of the areas on the Eastern Plains that need these types of improvement have less opportunity to contribute. We don't want to establish a "pay to play" system.
- Jeff Sudmeier: That's a great point and we've discussed internally with staff that there needs to be some regional context to that criteria given the differences in need and resources throughout the state.
- Vince Rogalski: Economic vitality and connectivity are important, and having tools to plan routes is a top goal for drivers.
- Norm Steen: Sometimes when we have a dedicated fund for something we consider it taken care of and spend the rest of our money elsewhere. Freight is important to the general economy and transportation system, so we should be sure not to spend this money on freight and then ignore all other funding sources and project needs.
- Jeff Sudmeier: Agreed, and CDOT sees the potential to mix and match SB 228 and other funds with these two freight programs to maximize our resources.
- Norm Steen: How does this funding of projects align with the designation of specific corridors, and when do those corridor designations change?

| | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Jeff Sudmeier</u>: CDOT is planning to conduct the project selection and corridor identification process in tandem, synthesized at a statewide level to identify key projects first and designate corridors thereafter. We're going to be designating more corridors than we'll have money to fund projects for right away. We just want to make sure that corridor designations are consistent with the projects we are considering. • <u>Gary Beedy</u>: It might be a good idea to ensure that corridors seeking designation or funding are maintaining limited access control policies and local zoning that encourage the free and open movement for freight. • <u>Turner Smith</u>: Is CDOT talking to industry leaders about this? • <u>Jeff Sudmeier</u>: Yes, through the Freight Advisory Council (FAC). The next FAC meeting is on October 11th and we will have a similar discussion to the one we're having today at STAC. To date, the FAC has provided input on short-term needs such as truck parking and commercial vehicle safety. • <u>Turner Smith</u>: Is the FAC just for trucks or does it include rail and pipelines as well? • <u>Jeff Sudmeier</u>: Rail is included, with BNSF, Union Pacific, and Great West currently represented on the FAC. To date, no pipelines are included in the discussion. • <u>Sean Conway</u>: Please encourage pipeline representatives to be included in the future. Up north there is a lot of truck-to-pipeline traffic occurring and building out that infrastructure also reduces the amount of truck traffic on the roads. | |
| <p>10-Year Development Program / Jeff Sudmeier (CDOT Multimodal Planning Branch)</p> | <p>Presentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Last winter we started a process to inventory major investment needs using Regional Transportation Plans (RTPs) and other project lists. • In spring we identified an extensive list, without priority, of about \$9 billion. • Needed input to identify higher priority projects to address over the next 10-year window. • Regions, TPRs, and MPOs provided input over the spring and summer. • Now we are down to a Tier 1 list totaling \$2.5 billion and a Tier 2 list of another \$5 billion. | <p>No action taken.</p> |

- The yellow projects in the handout are the Tier 1, 10-Year Development Program projects representing some of the highest project priorities. Staff are near finalizing the list.
- We are requesting that STAC review the document and submit any additional comments to the region planners over the next few weeks.
- Related to the I-25 North project, the TC has pledged \$130 million but the specific source is not identified. Local communities contributed \$30 million to the project.

STAC Comments

- Terri Blackmore: Is this document showing only the Development Program highway projects, or transit and bike/ped as well?
- Jeff Sudmeier: The Development Program will include highway, transit, and bike/ped projects. However, the transit portion is still under development. Please feel free to submit your comments on transit projects to DTR as they work toward the final list, which represents \$500 million for the Tier 1 portion and a total of \$2 billion for all transit projects. Bike/Pedestrian priorities will also be identified. An updated policy and procedural directive will ensure that bike and pedestrian accommodations are provided, when appropriate, on all CDOT projects as a matter of course. We are also conducting an inventory of bike/ped facilities, so staff will add more project information in later based on the results of those two efforts. Additionally, many of the highway and transit projects included here have bike and pedestrian elements.
- Debra Perkins-Smith: Additional operations and freight projects have also been identified and are included.

Presentation

- For SB 228 funds, there are between \$380 and \$490 million that may become available in the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th years of transfers.
- A workshop is scheduled for October 2016 to discuss the Development Program and SB 228 with the Transportation Commission and solicit their

advice on how to use this new tool to identify project priorities for those funds.

- We're working with the RTDs to identify projects that are shovel-ready by the end of 2018 and strategic in nature. All of the original candidate SB 228 projects are included in the Development Program. Geographic equity will also be a consideration, as will the ability to leverage outside funds and the fulfillment of other statewide goals such as safety, mobility, maintenance, economic vitality, and resiliency.
- We would like to ask this group for input on criteria.

STAC Comments

- Terri Blackmore: Are the yellow areas at the bottom showing the totals? Can those be broken out by area to emphasize the geographic area? And also show a total for all the tiers?
- Jeff Sudmeier: We can add that for easier viewing. We'll update it to better show those items.
- Terri Blackmore: Please find a way to reflect geographic equity on the table.
- Jeff Sudmeier: For Tier 1 we worked with the regions to reflect historical expectations around equity, but Tier 2 was more fiscally unconstrained so it varies a bit more by region there since it's more of an inventory.
- Craig Casper: Can we combine the EA segments for PPACG into one project on the Development Program?
- Jeff Sudmeier: The Regions, in many cases, tried to break projects into smaller phases to reflect different options to move a project forward at different levels of funding.
- Debra Perkins-Smith: The Transportation Commission will hold a SB 228 workshop to discuss this topic further and staff will provide an update to the STAC in October.

| | | |
|---|---|-------------------------|
| <p>Rest Area Study / Joshua Laipply (CDOT Chief Engineer)</p> | <p>Presentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CDPHE has closed the rest area at Deer Trail, which spurred the broader evaluation of rest areas throughout the state. • Rest areas cost \$2.3 million to maintain annually. It would cost \$15 million to bring system conditions up to B+ and upkeep of \$5 million to \$6 million per year. There are in total 27 rest areas. • In the past, CDOT adopted an ad-hoc approach to rest areas maintenance. • Priorities for these facilities include serving as welcome centers that are safe, clean, and comfortable, and those with proximity to scenic areas are a higher priority. • The US Forest Service (USFS) is also working on their rest areas and CDOT is considering opportunities for coordination. • This project is just a rest area assessment with criteria, which will eventually be used to develop a policy for CDOT rest areas. • Current criteria include compliance with federal guidelines, safety, crash data, facility quality, customer service, financial obligations, and environmental and health impacts. • Next steps are to develop a draft policy, integrate with the CDOT truck parking study, finalize evaluation, and develop strategies for all sites. <p>STAC Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Joshua Laipply</u>: In terms of criteria, are we missing anything? • <u>Terri Blackmore</u>: Are all rest areas ADA accessible? • <u>Joshua Laipply</u>: Federal requirements are distance based, meaning that we would need about four facilities across the state rather than everything currently on that list. Currently they are not all ADA accessible. • <u>Thad Noll</u>: Is there any way to get concessions at any of these? • Joshua Laipply: That is prohibited by federal law since they would constitute government competition with private business. Exceptions to that rule are only those that were grandfathered in when the policy was made. If a facility is on a tolled roadway then they are permitted, but along state highways only vending machines are allowed. | <p>No action taken.</p> |
|---|---|-------------------------|

| | | |
|---|--|-------------------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Gary Beedy</u>: Has there been any coordination with state tourism officials on this? • <u>Mary Jo Vobejda (CH2M Hill Consultant)</u>: CDOT staff met with the Colorado tourism board in an attempt to form partnerships with CDOT and tourism boards and also in some instances with the USFS, who are interested in divesting some fo their own rest stops. • <u>John Cater</u>: Are you looking at usage statistics as well? • <u>Mary Jo Vobejda (CH2M Hill Consultant)</u>: Yes, we used water usage at each rest area to calculate that figure, though the accuracy of that approach may be not be high. Locals will tell you that rest areas are used much more frequently than what our numbers indicate. • <u>Turner Smith</u>: If a rest stop has been closed, may it be sold to commercial operations? • <u>Joshua Laipply</u>: If we can show no transportation need or use, we are allowed to divest from a given rest area. At this point we are focused on assessing the truck parking situation before we consider selling any rest areas, since some of those may have a better use for trucks than as rest stops. • <u>Jody Rosier</u>: I wouldn't expand rest stops in scenic areas since they are protected, but just improve them. • <u>Turner Smith</u>: I recently heard about an app to help truckers locate parking more easily, are we doing anything like that? • <u>Debra Perkins-Smith</u>: There are several Midwestern states testing an app that would help drivers locate truck parking across multiple states Colorado applied for a grant to fund this sort of program but wasn't selected. However, CDOT is pursuing a pilot through its RoadX Program and based on that we will decide whether to expand it more broadly across the state. | |
| <p>STAC Workshop – Overview & Purpose / Vince Roglaski (STAC Chair)</p> | <p>Presentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Originally planned to host the full STAC Workshop today but scheduling conflict with TC Chair means that he will attend in October. That portion will focus on TC/STAC relations as affected by the new legislation. We need to develop a greater understanding of what that bill means and how it's going to work. | <p>No action taken.</p> |

- Another big topic is how well STAC participants have doing in terms of their contracts and invoicing. We started that process with a webinar earlier in the month.
- The last major item is how well STAC is working together and how we can improve that process. What are some ways to make our meetings more effective?

STAC Comments

- Terri Blackmore: The memos included in the STAC packet should come earlier and include requested actions or next steps along with when they're expected to go to TC. If you want real, substantive input we need to have time to review and think before the meeting. When it comes at the last minute it looks like you don't really want our input.
- Norm Steen: I'll echo that. We represent larger organizations so we need time to confer with our colleagues before we show up here, and having an idea of how our input fits into the broader process would let us provide more robust input.
- Vince Rogalski: I think that TPR input at this time is working well, we're obtaining good information from the TPRs and we need to continue that.
- Terri Blackmore: It would be helpful to develop an annual schedule for when you expect to bring items to STAC, especially when you expect our input.
- Thad Noll: A year schedule doesn't seem realistic given the limitations in staff to prepare these items. So I would say prioritize those items that you need more input on, and if it's something more informational then feel free to walk it on.
- Todd Hollenbeck: If it is an item that you want input on, set a minimum lead time (such as a week) so that you're not rushing it. If it doesn't come a week in advance, then it may have to wait another month before you bring it to us.
- Vince Roglaski: In the packet is our workshop agenda for next month. Do you want any changes to that or is it alright as is?
- Sean Conway: I think it's pretty clear that the intent of the legislature was to have full collaboration between the STAC and TC, not just the Chair and Vice Chair. I understand they are busy but at least for this first

meeting I think we should have a real interaction so the impression doesn't go back to the legislature that we're not fulfilling their intent.

- Herman Stockinger: I understand that concern and I think that we might see some additional TC members in attendance next month. They've also expressed interest in hosting a yearly lunch around budget approval so that TC and STAC can build an annual dialogue.
- Vince Rogalski: At this month's TC meeting I extended an invitation for *all* TC members to attend the workshop, and I will do so again at this month's meeting since it is a week before our workshop.
- Barbara Kirkmeyer: Has any discussions the new legislation occurred at the TC, or is it just here?
- Herman Stockinger: At this point there hasn't been a lot. I think we're expecting it to pick up after the Chair and Vice Chair report back to the TC.
- Barbara Kirkmeyer: I liken it to the role to a Planning Commission, whereby they set expectations on how they would like our input provided to them. Rather than us figuring it out all by ourselves.
- Herman Stockinger: I think it goes both ways – they should provide input on how they want to receive your advice but STAC should also be proactive about offering their thoughts to the TC.
- Vince Rogalski: In discussions with Representative Terri Carver, it seems to me that the intent was to have greater participation by each body in the work of the other. I think there may be more here than either group realizes.
- Terri Blackmore: When you take things to TC, do you bring them an item one month for discussion and then the following month for action?
- Debra Perkins-Smith: Usually we do a workshop one month and then follow with a resolution the next. Sometimes when there's a rush we'll combine it into one month, with a workshop one day and the resolution the next.
- Terri Blackmore: That would be a good opportunity for us to provide input between the workshop and the final vote, if they give us an indication of what type of advice they would like.
- Barbara Kirkmeyer: I think it would be useful to have copies of the statute on hand at the workshop next month so we can all better understand the intent. Also include the fact sheet from Representative Carver to best

| | | |
|--|---|------------------|
| | <p>indicate her thoughts. We need a clearer understanding of what we <i>shall</i> provide to them and how they <i>shall</i> consider it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Vince Rogalski</u>: Representative Carver will also be in attendance. • <u>Norm Steen</u>: The TC needs to understand that when they connect with STAC they're connecting with hometown Colorado, understanding the personal needs of our local communities, chambers of commerce, and people. They should be hungry for that information. This shouldn't just be pursued by CDOT staff, but by the Commissioners as well. • <u>Andy Pico</u>: The TC needs more direct input, not filtered through the lens of staff all the time. • <u>Vince Rogalski</u>: When I hear both groups talk there seems to be an "us vs. them" attitude, and I want to move past that sentiment. TC and STAC working together, not at odds, will benefit the public. Hopefully we can do that. Commissioners Rieff and Zink plan on attending the workshop next month. • <u>George Wilkerson</u>: In the past, STAC input has not been effective. TC has acted against the STAC recommendation with no response or explanation. • <u>Vince Rogalski</u>: Representative Carver also produced a bill last year to do study considering the potential for changing number of TC members and districts. This effort is continuing and at some point there will be public meetings throughout the state, but we don't know where and when yet. Representative Carver's original intent was for each TPR to have its own commissioner, totaling fifteen. So we'll see where that ends up going. | |
| STAC Elections / Vince Rogalski (STAC Chair) | <p>Presentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It's been two years since our STAC elections, so we will have one next month. • Both Vince and Thad are happy to continue in their current roles as Chair and Vice Chair. • Additional nominations may be submitted in advance or at the next meeting. | No action taken. |
| Other Business | The next STAC meeting will be held on Friday, October 28 th . | No action taken. |

STAC ADJOURNS