



COLORADO
Department of
Transportation

Statewide Transportation Advisory Committee (STAC)

May 17, 2019

9:00 AM – 12:00 PM

CDOT HQ Auditorium
2829 W. Howard Place
Denver, CO

Agenda

- 9:00-9:05** Welcome and Introductions – Vince Rogalski, STAC Chair
- 9:05-9:10** Approval of April Meeting Minutes – Vince Rogalski, STAC Chair
- 9:10-9:20** Transportation Commission Report (Informational Update) – Vince Rogalski, STAC Chair
- Summary report of the most recent Transportation Commission meeting.
- 9:20-9:40** TPR Reports (Informational Update) – STAC Representatives
- Brief update from STAC members on activities in their TPRs.
- 9:40-10:00** Whole System Whole Safety (Informational Update) – Johnny Olson, CDOT Deputy Executive Director
- Overview of CDOT's new safety initiative Whole System Whole System.
- 10:00-10:30** Break – Statewide Plan Reset Kickoff with Lieutenant Governor Dianne Primavera
- 10:30-10:45** Federal and State Legislative Report (Informational Update) – Herman Stockinger & Andy Karsian, CDOT Office of Policy and Government Relations (OPGR)
- Update on recent federal and state legislative activity.
- 10:45-11:00** Program Distribution Update (Informational Update / Discussion Item) – Tim Kirby, Division of Transportation Development (DTD)
- Update on the Status of Statewide Plan Formula Programs.
- 11:00-11:15** BUILD Discretionary Grant Program (Informational Update / Discussion Item) – Rebecca White, (DTD) and Herman Stockinger, (OPGR)
- Overview of candidate BUILD discretionary grant projects.
- 11:15-11:30** Timing of STAC Meetings (Discussion Item) – Vince Rogalski, STAC Chair and Norm Steen, STAC Vice-Chair
- Discussion of the timing of STAC meetings.
- 11:30-11:40** STAC Statewide Plan Working Group (Discussion Item) – Rebecca White, DTD
- Solicitation of participants for the STAC Statewide Plan Working Group.
- 11:40-11:55** Upcoming Multimodal Efforts (Informational Update) – David Krutsinger, Division of Transit and Rail (DTR)
- Overview of upcoming multimodal efforts.
- 11:55-12:00** Other Business- Vince Rogalski
- 12:00** Adjourn

STAC Conference Call Information: 1-601-526-1860 PIN: 156 053#

Web Conference: meet.google.com/uvy-dyrr-uxs

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

STAC Meeting Minutes
April 26th, 2019

Location: CDOT Headquarters Auditorium

Date/Time: April 26th, 2019; 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Chairman: Vince Rogalski, STAC Chair

Attendance:

In Person: Vince Rogalski (STAC Chair and Gunnison Valley TPR), Michael Yohn (San Luis Valley TPR), John Liosatos (Pikes Peak Area COG), Norm Steen (Pikes Peak Area COG), Dick Elsner (Central Front Range TPR), Elise Jones (Denver Regional COG), Ron Papsdorf (Denver Regional COG), Roger Partridge (Denver Regional COG), Suzette Mallette (North Front Range MPO), Dave Clark (North Front Range MPO), Becky Karasko (North Front Range MPO), Barbara Kirkmeyer (Upper Front Range TPR), Elizabeth Relford (Upper Front Range TPR), Bentley Henderson (Intermountain TPR), Gary Beedy (Eastern TPR), Walt Boulden (South Central TPR), Stephanie Gonzales (Southeast TPR), Terry Hart (Pueblo Area COG), Rebecca White (CDOT Division of Transportation Development), Herman Stockinger (CDOT Office of Policy & Government Relations), Jeff Sudmeier (CDOT Chief Financial Officer), Josh Laipply (CDOT Chief Engineer), Sophie Shulman (CDOT Office of Innovative Mobility).

On the Phone: John Adams (Pueblo Area COG), Amber Blake (Southwest TPR), Andy Gunning (Pikes Peak Area COG), Myron Baker (Ute Mountain Ute Tribe), Pete Baier (Grand Valley MPO), Dana Brosig (Grand Valley MPO).

Agenda Item / Presenter (Affiliation)	Presentation Highlights	Actions
Introductions & March STAC Minutes / Vince Rogalski (STAC Chair)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review and approval of March STAC Minutes without revisions. 	No action.
Transportation Commission Report / Vince Rogalski (STAC Chair)	<p>Presentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Transportation Commission</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The TC established a new \$11 million Strategic Safety Program that will fund improvements including wider striping, interstate cable rails, rumble strips, variable speed limits, and improved safety rails. ○ The TC also discussed the draft CDOT budget and how funds might be moved between multiple projects without negatively affecting them. 	No action.

- The TC approved a \$7 million Park & Ride facility to be located in the interstate median on North I-25 at Kendall Parkway / US 34 that will result in faster transit connections and greater reliability for travelers.
- There is an ongoing conversation around the potential to add \$250 million in additional funds to the existing North I-25 Segments 7 & 8 project in order to put the road into a permanent alignment rather than a temporary one (as currently planned). It is anticipated that by spending the extra \$250 million now the state will avoid an additional \$200 million in the future.
- Several Transportation Commissioners are approaching the end of their current terms and the Governor will be considering who to appoint for the new 4-year terms. The existing Commissioners expressed their belief that it's important for the appointees to be knowledgeable about transportation issues rather than learning on the job. Herman Stockinger from CDOT's Office of Policy & Government Relations will be reaching out to STAC members in the coming months to get their input on potential TC membership in the future.

STAC Comments

- Suzette Mallette: Are there plans to bring the proposal of adding funds to the I-25 project back to the TC for their consideration in May?
- Josh Laipply: I think we want to have a more robust discussion here before we go back with a final ask for the TC.
- Suzette Mallette: I was just thinking that May could be the critical path due to some timing issues with the contractor.
- Josh Laipply: Yes, we are aware of those constraints and are working within them.
- John Liosatos: A number of the MPOs are in the middle of their RTPs and have been holding off a bit on the RPP distribution piece since it wasn't yet approved. Are all the other numbers good to use or no?
- Tim Kirby: As you know this body made its recommendations to the TC about those amounts, but we've pushed the pause button as we visit all 64 counties this summer, and we plan to return to this topic in the fall.
- John Liosatos: Are any of the formula funds approved at this point?
- Tim Kirby: To be clear, the TC has not approved any of the five formula fund distributions at this point.
- John Liosatos: How would the FHWA like us to proceed without having those numbers?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Bill Haas</u>: We would like those numbers to be approved as soon as feasible by CDOT and the TC, but in the absence of that final decision the MPOs probably need to take the best numbers they can come up with at this point. I know that CDOT is working with the MPOs to check the numbers that they have come up with. That's where we are now, even if it's not a great response. • <u>Rebecca White</u>: We do have this on the agenda for the Statewide MPO Meeting this afternoon, so we can discuss in more detail then if the group would like. • <u>Ron Papsdorf</u>: There is adopted program distribution already in place, so in the absence of new TC action this is our current guide for expected distributions. There was an adjustment made since then to the planning funds available to smaller MPOs that isn't reflected in the previous version. My question is what is CDOT expecting will change that would prevent us from finalizing program distribution now? • <u>Rebecca White</u>: I don't know that we expect any wholesale changes but we want to respect the planning process and the fact that we're talking to 64 counties across the state. • <u>Tim Kirby</u>: I agree that you do already have adopted 2040 program distributions that span the 25-year period that need for this purpose. To Ron's point about the smaller MPOs, those adjustments were just about \$15,000 so we can have individual conversations with Pueblo and Grand Valley about how much of an impact those amounts are likely to have on their planning processes. • <u>Barbara Kirkmeyer</u>: When will we rural folks be informed about program distribution? We won't be at the robust conversation this afternoon. • <u>Tim Kirby</u>: In terms of keeping STAC informed on the overall program distribution conversation we will be bringing that information to this group as we develop it, while at the same time we're working through those 64 county meetings across the state. • <u>Barbara Kirkmeyer</u>: We are all supposed to have fiscal constraint, that's in the statute. So we need you to give us that information as soon as possible. • <u>Tim Kirby</u>: We will definitely abide by the requirements of the statute and the bylaws of the STAC. 	
<p>TPR Reports / STAC Representatives</p>	<p>Presentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>DRCOG</u>: Looking to adopt several 2040 RTP amendments in May; the big thing we're working on is the new TIP process, which for the first time will direct the majority of funding through sub-regional (county-level) forums, with 60% of proposed projects so far going to improvements supporting the state highway system, we will update you on that once it's finalized. 	<p>No action.</p>

- GVMPO: No update.
- NFRMPO: An interdisciplinary staff team attended the 2019 “Step It Up” Action Institute to increase walking and walkability in Decatur, Georgia in April, representatives included individuals from Loveland, Weld County, CSU, North Front Range MPO, and the Town of Berthoud; the North Front Ranges first-ever freight plan, called Freight Northern Colorado, is in the final stages of work and is expected to be approved by Council in July; development of 2045 RTP moving forward with a September adoption anticipated; on the I-25 North Segment 7& 8 discussion we are obviously very interested in that, the base project is \$344 million and about \$58 million of that came from local contributions, and we’ve also committed another \$5 million in local dollars if the new \$250 million is allocated, and the whole point is that by spending the \$250 million now we can save up to \$200 million in the future.
- PACOG: Coming to conclusion of I-25 Ilex project, we’re just waiting for higher temperatures to finish paving some of the bridges, speed is down to 45 mph and there are some bumps that the citizens are hoping won’t be part of the final build; trying to make sure that all I-25 projects to the north of the existing one are still in the hopper since we’ve got the oldest portion of I-25 and hoping to get all those necessary upgrades done; US 50 West is also moving along well, nearing completion, and this year we’ll be starting US 50 East in the St. Charles Mesa area, with a good deal of prep work occurring under the surface in terms of drainage; in the process of narrowing the list of our potential new transit facility sites down to 3 finalists; also completed our UPWP mid-year review with CDOT, FHWA, and FTA.
- PPACG: A few things outside of our Board meeting that might interest the group; Chuck Attardo came down to talk about the I-25 South PEL, a very useful presentation so thanks to him; thanks also to Cathy Bird from DRCOG who came to talk about I-25 congestion reduction; Congressman Doug Lamborn has been talking with Governor Polis about SH 94 that connects to Schriever AFB, which is up for possible selection as the new Space Force HQ; CDOT’s Division of Transit & Rail awarded VW Settlement funds to Mountain Metro for electric buses in the Colorado Springs area; recently completed the UPWP mid-year review with CDOT, FHWA, and FTA, demonstrating our integrated transportation network.
- Central Front Range: Winter is (we think) over, but we’re never sure in the mountains; Phantom Canyon Tunnel was completed in Freemont County during the winter; 18 miles of resurfacing with some passing lanes on US 285, may also replace one of the bridges close to the burn area that’s very old and closes at least

	<p>once per year; in Freemont County there are also some passing lanes going in by Howard some bicycle and pedestrian improvements upcoming in Canyon City.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Eastern</u>: I did the interview stuff before the meeting and it's not painful, so I would encourage you all to do that; had our TPR meeting in April and one of the projects we're talking about is bundling 10 similar bridge projects that we have into one package to make it more viable and get more for our money, we encourage CDOT to keep looking at that sort of process; continued concern about the use of overlays on our regional highways, which make things look better and feel smoother for a while but don't address the long-term need; again I would emphasize the importance of the Eastern Plains to our statewide system. • <u>Gunnison Valley</u>: We all remember the avalanches on Red Mountain Pass that closed it for a long time this winter, and I've heard that when they finally pushed all that snow off the road and into the valley below it's now even with the level of the road - that's a lot of snow; construction on US 50 Little Blue Creek Canyon will start next spring with a current plan for two 4-hour closures per day plus all night, openings will be one at mid-day and one in the evening, and a big question is how they will work through cutting off the queue and also how emergency management will be addressed; on Tuesday we had CDOT come out to our Gunnison County meeting to talk about the SWP, and the county commissioners engaged in a really good discussion about transportation, including identifying US 285 as a priority for the region even though it's outside of our boundaries, given the connection to Denver and the need for safety improvements there, so I would encourage other counties and TPRs to think about priorities <i>outside</i> of your areas as well. • <u>Intermountain</u>: Held a TPR meeting last Friday, thanks to Tim for coming out and providing an update on the Planning Reset, it generated a lot of good conversation and will be well-received by the folks at the TPR; in Summit County we're trying to work our way through about 20 feet worth of avalanche debris to dig out bike paths while over in Silt they're mowing their lawns; SH 13 project that is up for an INFRA grant is getting started soon; Glenwood Springs has a couple bridge projects that they're starting to do; SH 9 Gap project also getting ready to go, finally a number of maintenance and resurfacing projects that Region 3 will be getting to on the Interstate. • <u>Northwest</u>: <i>No report.</i> • <u>San Luis Valley</u>: Lots of springtime activity in the Valley; CDOT replaced a culvert on SH 17 in anticipation of some run-off; restriping underway on US 285; \$3.6 million overlay on SH 112 between US 285 and SH 17, which is a big project for us. 	
--	--	--

- South Central: Had our meeting in March and talked through the planning process, talked about Bustang and the importance of that to our part of the state; Highway of Legends study is a big upcoming project and we're getting community input on that; bridge work on I-25 in Huerfano County is progressing well; driving between Colorado Springs and Castle Rock made me realize how small our projects are compared to some other parts of the state but also how much that project is going to improve things for us.
- Southeast: The Downtown Lamar project is coming to its conclusion, just smoothing some bumps at this point; south of Lamar we have two new passing lanes connecting two smaller existing passing lanes to make a full mile; in Otero County we're looking at a SH 10 bridge replacement starting in mid-April and lasting 90 days; at our TPR Meeting we've had great conversations about Bustang and we're seeing improved ridership on US 50, so that's great; our Regional Coordinating Council in the area is helping to bring our transit folks to the table at the TPR and connecting transit, mobility, and general transportation, which is a good thing; the next TPR meeting will be June 26th.
- Southwest: Shoshana Lew provided a Planning Reset update at our last TPR meeting which was fantastic, so thanks for that, I would recommend it to other TPRs; we have a number of projects in the region including culverts, Wolf Creek Pass is challenging as always, a number of ADA ramp improvements going through on US 550 in Silverton and Durango; also some upcoming signals projects that have had great communication with the public, so kudos to our staff for that; more projects coming up this summer and we're looking forward to construction season.
- Upper Front Range: Started discussions on the 2045 RTP with FHU selected as a consultant and the UFR has already prioritized its projects, so we're heading in the right direction; talked about Bustang service and potential expansion in the future; working on the IGA process with Region 4 for the CMAQ fund swap; also discussed the SH 71 study and the needs identified between Brush and Limon.
- Southern Ute Indian Tribe: *No update.*
- Ute Mountain Ute Indian Tribe: *No update.*

STAC Comments

- Gary Beedy: Another issue that came up at our meeting was the potential for an application for a FLAP grant for SH 71 through the Pawnee National Grassland, which also accesses several missile sites in that area. We think that may qualify given the military connection on a deteriorating section of that highway.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Vince Rogalski</u>: Just a reminder that those FLAP applications are due on June 5th, so I encourage you to apply if you have a project that might be suitable. There are about \$40-\$50 million available for the State of Colorado. 	
<p>Federal and State Legislative Report / Herman Stockinger & Andy Karsian (CDOT Office of Policy & Government Relations)</p>	<p>Presentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>State Update</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The legislative session is coming to a close and there are still a number of potential bills being discussed. Not a lot of specific bills right now, but more behind-the-scenes conversations. ○ The Joint Budget Committee (JBC) included a \$100 million transfer to the Highway Users Tax Fund (HUTF) but a bill to allocate the funding has yet to be introduced. That bill will be introduced likely later today and would divide the funds via the HUTF using the 2nd stream allocation with 60% to the state, 22% to counties, and 18% to cities. ○ Last year’s SB 1 included a directive to put a \$2.3 billion transportation measure on the November 2019 ballot for consideration by the voters. However, the Senate came to agreement last night that the measure should be postponed to November 2020 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This will protect the anticipated SB 267 transfer of \$500 million for this year, which we had been concerned about. ▪ An additional \$50 million will also be allocated to CDOT this year as part of the SB 1 compromise from last year. ▪ The status of this bill is pending at the time of the STAC meeting. ○ There is also a proposed bill to “De-Bruce” the state, i.e. allow the state government to keep excess tax revenues collected above the TABOR limit rather than issuing refunds. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Current discussions revolve around putting a 20-year time limit on this proposed De-Brucing. • <u>Federal Update</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ BUILD grant applications are now open, with \$900 million available nationwide. Applications are due July 15th and CDOT staff will present suggested project submissions with the STAC in May. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The maximum grant amount is \$25 million and staff are considering projects with existing partial funding that can be leveraged as match. ▪ Some potential projects include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Statewide Cable Rail Project 	<p>No action.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Statewide Passing Lanes Project ❖ El Paso County Military Access Project (I-25 Gate 19, Schriever AFB) <p>STAC Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Norm Steen</u>: Is there any discussion of SB 19-239 related to assessing technological change? Don't we already do that? • <u>Andy Karsian</u>: That bill would require CDOT to convene the TNCs, peer-to-peer services, car-sharing services, rental car companies, and taxi companies, and the like to think about how new technologies are creating impacts on our roads and how we can address them. That group would also consider the growing impacts of last-mile delivery services like Amazon and how those can be addressed. • <u>Ron Papsdorf</u>: Any insight on why they moved the ballot initiative rather than just getting rid of it? • <u>Andy Karsian</u>: Kudos to Senator Zenzinger, Senator Cooke, and Senator Rankin for being leaders on the JBC and in transportation more generally. Throughout the session we've been trying to get folks to talk with us about the SB 1 ballot measure, but it hasn't been a high priority until just now. There was a proposal in the Senate Transportation Committee for the whole session to put about \$300 million into transportation in a bipartisan way via SB 51, but that fell through for a variety of reasons. As a result, Senators Zenzinger and Senator Cooke felt the best option was to save the progress made this year and postpone the ballot measure until the future in case the landscape changes in that time. 	
<p>CDOT Organizational Structure / Josh Laipply (CDOT Chief Engineer) & Herman Stockinger (CDOT Office of Policy & Government Relations)</p>	<p>Presentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CDOT is making an internal reorganization by incorporating the former Division of Transportation Systems Management and Operations (TSMO) into the updated Division of Maintenance & Operations, led by Kyle Lester. • A few of the other former TSMO functions are being integrated into Division of Engineering, led by Josh Laipply. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Office of Traffic and Safety will return to the Division of Engineering, where it formerly was. ○ The Central 70 project will also be managed through the Division of Engineering to allow for more direct engagement by the Chief Engineer. • Sophie Shulman is the new Chief of Innovative Mobility and will lead the new Office of Innovative Mobility, which will include the Division of Transit & Rail as well as programs related to advanced mobility and electrification. 	<p>No action.</p>

- The Office of Innovative Mobility is focused on supporting transit, providing new modal options, and increasing vehicle electrification. We don't have a fully-developed organizational chart yet, but we're happy to answer any questions and provide further information as we develop it.

STAC Comments

- Bentley Henderson: What is in Program Management Services?
- Josh Laipply: Program Management right now is a group of about 5 people working to set up a platform for project management and standardizing procedures statewide. We stood that up when we went to Cash Management, because we needed to know where all of our projects were and what their spend rates were, look at their spend-down curves, all of that. Right now we have a Project Support Branch that has contracts and estimating within it. When we ran risk-based estimates for the ballot list projects it was our that was the group that ran through those, and I thought it made sense to consolidate some of those administrative functions. We already have regional PMOs that work to track local projects and shift resources as necessary, and this is extending those principles.
- Barbara Kirkmeyer: Why does Central 70 report directly to you rather than Region 1?
- Josh Laipply: Good question - that's because that project by itself is the size of our typical annual budget so I wanted to have direct eyes on it.
- Herman Stockinger: There are some projects that are so large that it's hard for a region to track them in addition to all of their usual project responsibilities.
- Bentley Henderson: Have these changes been in the works for a while, or are they requested by the new Executive Director?
- Josh Laipply: I can speak for myself, I started batting around this concept when we were talking about the potential size of the program if either of the ballot measures had passed in 2018 and that I would have needed a design lead, a construction lead, and a controls person focused on the critical path to make a sort of 5-year emergency response center. I didn't want to make any major changes before a new Executive Director started, but once she came on board and as working with Kyle on the reorganization of TSMO into Maintenance I suggested we do this at the same time to minimize the impacts on the Department.
- Gary Beedy: Where is the process on hiring a new R4 Director?
- Herman Stockinger: We have a number of candidates that we're looking at but who haven't been interviewed yet (in addition to the existing interviewed candidates). We're hoping to get to those scheduled within 2 weeks and hopefully have a decision within a month.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Josh Laipply</u>: I'd like to add a plug for Sophie - in the past Transit & Rail was under me and many of you have worked with that Division closely in the past. She is much more knowledgeable than me on that topic and now David will be working for her so I think you've all gained in this change. • <u>Gary Beedy</u>: A question on the I-70 incident last night - it sounds like a runaway truck may have been involved so I'm interested to know about what kind of infrastructure we might be able to provide to mitigate these types of things in the future. • <u>Josh Laipply</u>: I've been out there several times since last night and we've seen other incidents in the area in the past, but I haven't seen any evidence that there is an identified relationship or causal factor there that we can address. I think that the lesson here might be that most crashes are avoidable if the driver is paying attention and doing what they should be doing. 	
<p>Planning Reset / Rebecca White (CDOT Division of Transportation Development)</p>	<p>Presentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building on last month's discussion of the Planning Reset, staff discussed the upcoming Statewide Transportation Plan (SWP) and Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) approach, including the themes of Connections, Choice, and Colorado for All. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The goal is to focus the conversation on the system we want, rather than the price tag, and to kick off the public process in May. • Meetings with all 64 counties have already begun and will intensify in the summer months. The goal of these meetings is to develop a broad statewide understanding of local needs and priorities that can be vetted, modeled, and integrated into a 10-year data-driven strategic pipeline of projects. • Plan development calendar milestones include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <u>SWP Kick-Off</u>: May 2019 ○ <u>County Meetings</u>: May - August 2019 ○ <u>TPR Meetings</u>: June 2019- February 2020 ○ <u>SWP/RTP Adoption</u>: March 2020 ○ <u>STIP / 10-Year Pipeline Creation</u>: June 2020 • The Statewide Travel Model is a new tool at CDOT's disposal and will help staff to simulate changes in the transportation system and better understand their ability to help us achieve local, regional, and statewide goals. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The model incorporates a vast number of data points including housing and employment locations, travel behavior, system risk and resiliency, modal connections, and more to help answer questions about our present and future transportation system. 	<p>No action.</p>

- It is a tool to support decision-making, but transportation stakeholders and experts will continue to direct the process.
- At the outset of the SWP process, CDOT staff will use the model to reflect a “No Build” scenario showing how the transportation system would function in 2030 in the absence of any new investments. Later on, once project prioritization has occurred, staff will model a second scenario showing the impacts of those projects on their regions and the state as a whole.
- Public Engagement will occur at multiple levels: via 4P County Meetings, TPR Meetings, and outreach to the public at large.
 - Staff intend to use meetings, telephone town halls, web surveys, and attendance at key community events to help broaden the conversation and reflect the needs of all Coloradans.
 - We also want to engage with sister agencies and stakeholder partners like CML, CCI, the agricultural community, the health community, etc. to bring those specialty groups into the conversation and make sure we’re support each other’s goals and efforts.
- STAC members and their TPRs will play a key role in the development of the SWP and RTPs, and CDOT staff will return to the STAC with additional updates moving forward.

STAC Discussion

- John Liosatos: Are we tying in funding to these conversations? We all know there isn’t enough money and we want to public to understand that.
- Rebecca White: I think that’s one of the notable things that’s changing in this process is less of an emphasis on that \$9 billion need and more of a discussion of what we want to achieve. To use Executive Director Lew’s metaphor, talking about the house rather than the mortgage.
- John Liosatos: I see the value of that, especially in light of Prop 109 and 110, to get a true understanding of our total need across all regions and modes that doesn’t start with an artificial limit. But I also think that if you start a conversation with the public that creates the impression that we can do anything they want then you’re setting yourself up for disappointing them later on. I can talk about my dream house but if I go to a realtor they’re going to bring me to the places that fit my budget.
- Vince Rogalski: I think one of the elements of the walking in your shoes approach is broaden the input at the meetings, getting more people in the room, and then the idea of “convince me of your vision and then we can work on getting there”, but if I don’t know what you’re aiming for then I can’t help you.

- Tim Kirby: A required federal element of any SWP is a needs and gaps assessment, and we're definitely going to do that, but what we're trying to do is re-frame the conversation from a different perspective than we have in the past. It's not asking for a wish-list; it's telling us what your needs really are so we can help to address those.
- Vince Rogalski: And as in the case of Gunnison, what matters *outside* of your area since this whole thing has to work as a system.
- Walt Boulden: In this comprehensive conversation that is meant to bring all the different modes and needs together, is there a mechanism to bring the funding challenge into that so we don't have the Legislature continuing to pass individual one-off bills that don't address the whole system need.
- Rebecca White: I see the point that you're making, and we should think about how to do that in the best manner. We don't want to keep hitting people over the head with how much money we need, but also don't want to give the impression that the problem is solved so just tell us whatever you want and we'll do it.
- Gary Beedy: Perhaps by asking the public what they're willing to contribute, not just what they would like done.
- Suzette Mallette: The other thing that might confuse people is that 10-year window. Folks are used to seeing a 4-year STIP and a longer 25-year plan, but what does that 10-year period really represent? What level of constraint is that?
- Bentley Henderson: That Planning Process Approach graphic might play well at a TPR meeting but with the general public there's a lot going on there and you're going to lose people.
- Rebecca White: Would it work at a county meeting?
- Bentley Henderson: I think so, for those that have been around for a bit, but if they're new to the process this would be a sharp learning curve.
- Suzette Mallette: One thing to be aware of is that in some counties you'll have a split between a TPR and an MPO, and those processes are distinct, so this graphic could become much more complicated in certain parts of the state.
- Ron Papsdorf: There is a distinction in the MPO areas that needs to be recognized. Also some of the terminology here might confuse people in our regions because the same terms have specific but different meanings within the MPOs. DRCOG is in the midst of an ongoing RTP development process and it would be great if we can coordinate our two sets of conversations so that we're not working at cross-purposes or confusing people.
- Norm Steen: A few comments on messaging - you mentioned before that the general public doesn't think about pavement, they think about purpose. As much as you can move the conversation towards a road's function rather than its

construction, I think that would be beneficial. We also use a lot of transportation terminology in daily speech that we could incorporate into this conversation in order keep people's attention and engage them where they are. Things like "intersection of ideas", "off-ramps", "green-lighting", etc. to help people engage with this topic more comfortably.

- Suzette Millette: If you have a 4-year, fiscally-constrained STIP plus another 6 years of projects after that, what percentage of those projects will eventually be on the STIP and what percentage will be dropped at some point?
- Tim Kirby: Projects that have statewide significance will be highlighted in those 6 out years. If we think about how the rural RTPs were done, we constrained some of the priority projects for each region based on anticipated RPP funding, but we also identified broader corridor needs without look at specifically how to fund them. I think we're applying that same approach here on the out years of the STIP, which is less-constrained than the first 4 years of it.
- Elizabeth Relford: If we create this 10-year list, then add a project to it, will something else fall off? Otherwise it will just keep growing and we'll have the problem we did with the 7th Pot where we had projects on the list that we never got to address.
- Tim Kirby: If we're looking at what we have today, we don't have a lot of money for anything other maintenance. So for Years 5-10 we can apply some level of constraint, but the other ones don't drop off the list entirely.
- Elizabeth Relford: Yes, but in our case our top priority project is about \$4 million over the constraint. We don't a new project to come in and jump to the top while bumping everything else down.
- Rebecca White: Also keep in mind that those 10 years will always be moving forward and adding new projects to the bottom of the list. There would have to be a pretty good reason for something to jump that queue if we just spent a year building a 10-year list.
- John Liosatos: Will this STIP be one statewide list or divided by CDOT Regions? I worry that as elected official change and priorities change we need to have that documentation of how decisions were made in the past and why some areas may be getting more or fewer projects moving forward.
- Tim Kirby: There's really not a lot of change here, we're just migrating things in new ways. Back when we put together the Development Program, you all worked with your CDOT Regions to build those out, and those conversations will remain intact. Now with a 10-year STIP we will have this new "staging area" to highlight key priorities in the near future, while the broader Development Program will continue behind the scenes.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>John Liosatos</u>: Is the Development Program a statewide list? • <u>Tim Kirby</u>: It is a statewide list that is built from regional input and the regional autonomy of the RTDs. So it's more about the process than the final list of projects - it's all driven by the regional needs. • <u>Rebecca White</u>: Are you saying that you want that list delineated by region? • <u>John Liosatos</u>: I think as long as we have documentation and the existing DP isn't going away and that in rolling this up to a statewide level we aren't losing some of those details. • <u>Suzette Mallette</u>: One of the things we've seen in the past is that we have a prioritized list from top to bottom and all the sudden someone comes to the table with money and they jump right to the top. I think that you will have to wrestle with that just as we do - how do you handle that situation? Do you honor the planning process, forgo that money for the sake of fairness, or do you jump at whatever opportunity comes up? There's no easy answer. 	
<p>Web Survey Tool Demonstration / Marissa Gaughan (CDOT Statewide & Regional Planning Section)</p>	<p>Presentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff shared a sample online survey format that is being developed for gathering broad public input on the Statewide Transportation Plan (SWP). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It asks the user to identify their top transportation trends and issues, map their specific concerns related to safety, transit, bicycle/pedestrian, freight, and other needs in their community, rank potential goals and strategies for CDOT to pursue, and provide optional demographic data such as age, ethnicity, income, geographic location, and user type. ○ As the user selects their preferences they will also be shown images, text, and statistics that help educate them on key issues at the same time. • The survey and other outreach efforts will also point members of the public to the Your Transportation Plan website URL (not yet up and running) that will have lot of additional information and resources for those who would like a deeper dive. • CDOT staff will provide future updates to the STAC as this and other public engagement tools are developed in the coming months. <p>STAC Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>John Liosatos</u>: It seems to me that the way some of those questions was phrased might imply local issues and solutions versus the areas that CDOT controls. You might want to consider that so you're not getting "false positives". • <u>Rebecca White</u>: Good point - we're going to try to emphasize the state system visually to avoid any confusion by the user, but that said we're expecting to receive 	<p>No action.</p>

	<p>some more locally-focused input as part of this process and ideally we'll be able to pass that along to the pertinent folks at your level to ensure it isn't going to waste.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <u>Gary Beedy</u>: Whether the information is local or state, I think it would be great if we can use this process to help educate the public about those differences since many people don't realize that there are different levels of jurisdiction.• <u>Walt Boulden</u>: In addition to that, helping to show people how the multiple transportation systems interact with one another. It's not an either/or, it's both of them together.• <u>Norm Steen</u>: How are you going to manage your sample in terms of who you get input from? There might be a given segment of the population that you'd like information from but you don't have a way to get it. How are you going to grab them?• <u>Rebecca White</u>: One of the ways will be by working through partners like you and taking advantage of your networks. Also as you said it might be hard to know the age of your respondents since that demographic information is voluntary. I think that by engaging with those broader stakeholder groups outside of the transportation sector we may also be able to tap into networks that we don't usually have access to.• <u>Dick Elsner</u>: My concern is that when you talk about web-based outreach, that doesn't work for all types of people in all areas of the state, particularly the rural areas that lack internet connectivity.• <u>Rebecca White</u>: I couldn't agree with you more, that's why the other elements of our outreach plan are things like the telephone town halls and participation in those community events in the summer that allow us to connect with people where they already are. So I'd love to work with you on identifying those key events so we can be sure to be at them.• <u>Norm Steen</u>: Dick brings up a good point, which is whether that survey is going to app-capable?• <u>Rebecca White</u>: Yes, it will be and we'll also translate it into Spanish to address that community need.• <u>Rebecca White</u>: What I heard today was to think carefully about how we present this, double-check our terminology, think about how we reach the broadest possible audience, and finally don't use this as our only tool given its limitations for rural communities. Thank you for your input and we'll keep working with you moving forward.	
--	--	--

<p>4P Meeting Presentation Preview / Tim Kirby (CDOT Multimodal Planning Branch)</p>	<p>Presentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• This is an example of the 4P County Meeting presentation that was delivered to Gunnison County last week.• It begins with some background on the process - the “why” and “how” of these meetings.• Then we go into an overview that begins with county-level demographic and economic information before using visualizations to address the unique geography, employment, safety, resiliency, recreation, infrastructure condition, and other elements for the given county.<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ By comparing data layers showing the interplay between different economic, social, and infrastructure factors, we can help the participants draw conclusions about what is happening and what is needed.• Each section of the presentation includes 2-3 key questions to spur conversation among the County Commissioners, but of course we are happy to talk about whatever topics they feel are most important to discuss. <p>STAC Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <u>Bentley Henderson</u>: Did the conversation go right to funding?• <u>Rebecca White</u>: Actually it didn’t really come up at all in Gunnison, we talked mainly about project priorities. I don’t know in Kiowa and Prowers.• <u>Marissa Gaughan</u>: Yes, similar to Gunnison we approached it as “tell us your priorities and we can think about how to fund it later.”• <u>Tim Kirby</u>: Another interesting point about talking funding with the public is how do you decide where to start? When we did our Road Usage Charge pilot a few years back we surveyed folks to see how well they understood the current system, and there was a measureable percentage that believed we funded transportation through “adopt-a-highway” programs. The public’s knowledge of transportation is all over the map, so how do you tackle that problem?• <u>Walt Boulden</u>: And I think that’s important because as we talk about electric vehicles, multimodal options, and things like that, does the public really understand the connection between these things and the funding issue? If they don’t know how things are funded, then they won’t know the impacts of these new modes on the broader system.• <u>Elizabeth Relford</u>: That also goes into conversation on the RPP funding for the rural areas and what we’ve been accomplishing with fewer and fewer resources.• <u>Ron Papsdorf</u>: I actually think that at this early stage in the context of the SWP conversations the funding discussion is fairly irrelevant.	<p>No action.</p>
--	--	-------------------

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• <u>Vince Rogalski</u>: One thing that I'll mention is that many of the transit services in the Gunnison Valley are free because the voters have chosen to tax themselves through an RTA, which is an interesting element there.• <u>Rebecca White</u>: The thing I've heard most today is that we need to focus on how we have this conversation in the MPO areas. We recognize that each MPO is in a different stage of its planning process, some at the beginning, others nearing the end. We don't want to exclude you from a statewide process because it's such a wide swath of the state but we also want that to be coordinated so that we're making that conversation meaningful, useful, and not counterproductive. We can talk more about that at the SWMPO meeting this afternoon. I would also like to ask about getting some volunteers to be in the "kitchen cabinet" to provide ongoing guidance to use related to the SWP/RTP development as we move forward.• <u>John Liosatos</u>: I have a question about how we incorporate 4P Meeting input into the TPR meeting process. At what point do you "smooth" the data in terms of input that was an area of focus on the day of the meeting but doesn't reflect the broader community need or factual reality of the situation.• <u>Tim Kirby</u>: We're taking really detailed notes from these meetings so that if a Commissioner uses an anecdotal example we can follow up on that with some quantitative data that will verify or refute that input before it gets too far through the process.• <u>Norm Steen</u>: I think that you'll also hear not just about projects but also about process, things like co-locating equipment, coordinating closures, aligning operations.• <u>Tim Kirby</u>: This process has broad support across the Department and Rebecca has pulled a number of her counterparts into this to make sure that we're able to talk about whatever topic comes up. When Marissa was out in Kiowa they wanted to talk about mowing, so that's what we talked about. We're not excluding any input that we receive. Here's a good example - just last month at STAC Dick made a comment about people getting off of I-70 and driving on US 285 in a way that creates risk. If we hear something like that we don't just say "oh, that's interesting". We take it back here and figure out who at CDOT can address this problem that we're hearing about. That's one of the great benefits of this effort since we will get to start conversations on a variety of issue areas throughout the process, not just the ones we're expecting to hear about.	
<p>SB 1 Multimodal Option Fund Update / Tim Kirby (CDOT)</p>	<p>Presentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• We will quickly review the recommendations made by the Multimodal Option Fund Committee to the Transportation Commission.	

<p>Multimodal Planning Branch)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Three STAC members participated in the Committee: Amber Blake, Elise Jones, and Heather Sloop.● The Committee was tasked with two key tasks:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Develop a formula recommendation for the distribution of the local portion of the SB 1 Multimodal Options Fund based at least in part on population and ridership.○ Recommend an approach for reducing or exempting local match requirements for certain communities.○ CDOT staff also asked for thoughts on a potential administrative set-aside to help mitigate the costs incurred by CDOT in managing the program.● Recommendations included:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Overall division of 81% for urban areas and 19% for rural areas based on the differences between the two and complexity of developing a single formula that applied well to both.○ Local match levels ranging between 0% and 50% based on county-level economic health measures (recommended by DOLA), with flexibility for TPRs to adapt them as needed for local context. Factors used included:<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Population Change (1990-2017)▪ Population Change (2010-2017) of Labor Force (ages 24-44)▪ Total Percentage Employed by Single Large Employer▪ Local Government Share of Total Employed▪ Agriculture Percentage of Total Employed▪ Employment Growth (2002-2017)▪ Percentage with a Bachelor's Degree or Higher▪ Percentage in Poverty + Percentage Elderly (65+)○ Programmatic set-aside of 5% for CDOT administrative costs, with potential to decrease or increase based on the specific project types selected.<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ This amount of money in new contracts and support to the local agencies in implementing them represents a potentially significant load for CDOT's Local Agency Program to manage, so it's important to have some amount of money available to offset this.▪ The actual amount could vary widely based on the work-intensity of the actual projects that end up being selected.○ Recommended minimum project sizes of \$150,000 for Infrastructure and \$25,000 for Transit, with flexibility for TPRs to adapt as needed for local context.	
------------------------------------	---	--

- As with the above, the size of projects will determine the amount of Local Agency Program support work needed, so there needs to be some flexibility there.

STAC Discussion

- Ron Papsdorf: There was a lot of compromising that occurred in order to get here, I can tell you that Elise Jones sat on this committee, as did Heather Sloop from NW and Amber Blake from SW, who fought hard to guarantee fairness for the rural parts of the state. There was a lot of compromise that occurred here to get to the 19% figure even though none of the originally-proposed formulas would have directed that high of a percentage to the rural areas. We support this and hope that the TC will approve it posthaste.
- Suzette Mallette: Are the numbers that we see on this spreadsheet before or after the 5% set-aside has been taken out?
- Tim Kirby: These numbers show the administrative set-aside already deducted. I will send this out as part of the STAC Addendum Packet this afternoon.
- Elizabeth Relford: Can you explain exactly what that Administrative Set-Aside is going to be used for?
- Tim Kirby: This is to cover the burden to CDOT in terms of the contracting work that we do, with these funds potentially adding another 200 contracts to the usual workload, so this is meant to offset that with temporary or contract staffers who can fill the gap efficiently. The other piece is to assist the local governments, who often look to CDOT subject matter experts to help them deliver a project, by providing more resources for us to do that.
- Walt Boulden: Earlier we were talking about the level of projects that Coloradans are willing to fund. I think that in the rural areas of the state we acknowledge that urban areas have given up some portion of what they could expect from the overall pot in order to help us get a meaningful amount. That's not always part of the conversation in rural areas, who sometimes believe that the urban areas are getting more than they deserve even though that's not accurate.
- Tim Kirby: I agree with that and kudos to DRCOG, as the urban representative on this Committee, for operating in good faith and helping to make that happen here.
- John Liosatos: What are the next steps here? Does the STAC make a recommendation to the TC?
- Tim Kirby: Technically the STAC doesn't have an advisory role on this process. The Multimodal Options Fund Committee will make a recommendation to the TC, and the STAC had three members participating in that committee. But there's nothing to

	stop the STAC from saying that we saw the recommendations and we endorse them.	
Other Business / Vince Rogalski (STAC Chair)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">The next STAC meeting will be Friday, May 17th, 2019 at CDOT HQ (2829 W. Howard Place, Denver, CO 80204.	No action.

STAC ADJOURNS

The Transportation Commission Workshops were Wednesday, April 17, 2019 and the regular meeting was Thursday, April 18, 2019. Both the workshops and the regular meeting took place at the Colorado Department of Transportation Headquarters at 2829 W. Howard Place, Denver, CO 80204.

Documents are posted at <https://www.codot.gov/about/transportation-commission/meeting-agenda.html> no less than 24 hours prior to the meeting. The documents are considered to be in draft form and for information only until final action is taken by the Transportation Commission.

Transportation Commission Workshops

Wednesday, April 17, 2019

3:00 pm – 6:00 pm

Attendance: Commissioners Zink, Thiebaut, Gifford, Hofmeister, Hall, Gilliland, Peterson, Stuart, and Connell were present.

Right of Way Workshop (Josh Laipply)

Purpose: The purpose of the workshop was to discuss four right-of-way (ROW) acquisition projects (negotiations), and seven settlement affirmations & authorization requests.

Action: Prepare to act on agreed upon proposed acquisitions, and settlements, at the regular Transportation Commission (TC) meeting.

The four projects with requests for authorization of property acquisitions that will be part of the consent agenda at the regular TC meeting for April 2019 included:

- Region 1
 - Region 1 Traffic Signal Updates Phase IV Project Code: 22841
 - SH7 Lafayette M.P. 62.13 to M.P. 62.38, Project Code: 21792
 - I-70 Central, Project Code: 19631
- Region 4
 - I-25 North SH 402 to SH 14, Project Code: 21506

The seven projects with requests for settlement affirmation & authorization that will be part of the consent agenda at the TC Regular Meeting for April 2019 included:

- Region 1
 - I-70 Central, Project Code: 19631
- Region 2
 - US 50 Passing Lanes East of Salida, Project Code: 20401
 - Pueblo FY17/18 Signal Capital Improvement Replacement, Project Code: 20927
 - US 50 Purcell to Pueblo Widening, Project Code: 22079
 - M-22-Z Bridge Replacement and Widening, Project Code: 21020
 - SH 71 Bridge over the Arkansas, Project Code: 21012
 - Powers Mining Museum, Project Code: 18318

Discussion:

- No comments were raised by the TC on the April 2019 right-of-way acquisition requests, or the April 2019 settlement affirmation requests.
- Josh Laipply, CDOT Chief Engineer, noted that a state statute regarding the Amerco case has recently included a safety clause as a part of a required TC process. This statute with the new clause will become

effective in July. The intent is to reconvene the TC sub-committee that developed the current response and process to comply with the new statute clause.

- It was noted that the TC will be traveling across the state during the normal workshop and regular meeting times for June.
- CDOT staff will work out details to reconvene the subcommittee and get back to the TC.

Budget Workshop (Safety Funds/Penalty Funds) (Jeff Sudmeier)

Purpose: To review a proposal to repurpose Highway Safety Improvement (HSIP) Funds to support a new Strategic Safety Program, and to review funding options associated with the completion of repair and rehabilitation work on US 36 (“US 36 Initial Works”) required by CDOT’s agreement with Plenary Roads Denver.

Action: Staff requests approval of the establishment of a new Strategic Safety Program, and the allocation of funding. Staff also requests input on approach to funding “US 36 Initial Works” and will return in May with any necessary approval actions.

Strategic Safety Program

A Section 164 penalty requires states that are out of compliance with federal standards relating to multiple driving under the influence (DUI) offenders to direct an additional portion of their flexible federal funds to safety programs. Under the Section 164 penalty, CDOT was directed by FHWA to allocate \$11,361,130 in flexible federal funds to the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP). In January the Commission approved the allocation of \$11,361,130 from HSIP to the RoadX Program. With recent changes in the direction of this program, these funds are now available for other purposes. Staff is recommending these funds now be reallocated to establish a new Strategic Safety Program focused on decreasing the frequency and severity of accidents. As discussed at a March Commission workshop, staff are recommending several systematic statewide safety improvement programs to more proactively improve safety. These are best practices proven by research, used by states, encouraged by FHWA, and supported by CDOT staff as being effective in reducing our crash patterns. These improvements include:

- **6 inch striping to prevent run off the road accidents** – highly effective in reducing run off the road crashes, especially on rural highways and interstates; could be implemented by crews this summer, and further installed by contractors in later summer/fall for epoxy.
- **Interstate cable rail to prevent cross over accidents** – there are still gaps in the interstate system for cable rail; this is a highly effective countermeasure at preventing high speed head on crashes. While currently being recommended on projects, 640 miles are still needed.
- **Rumble strips, both center line and edge line on rural roadways** - centerline rumble strips on rural highways are also effective at reducing high-speed head on crashes.
- **Variable speed limits during weather events on interstates and mountain corridors** – adjusting speeds based on conditions can be very effective in reducing crashes and improving traffic operation. Several corridors would benefit from conditions-based speed limits.
- **Manual for Assessing Safety Hardware (MASH) compliance on guardrail** – an extensive need exists to continue to inventory the state’s guardrail systems, prioritize upgrades to new MASH standards, develop a strategic replacement plan, fund that plan and deliver it.

These are improvements that can be quickly deployed, resulting in immediate safety improvements on corridors where applied. An attached resolution authorizes the establishment of this program, including the creation of a new budget program to be incorporated into the CDOT budget. If the Commission concurs with authorizing the creation of the new program, the Commission will be asked (via approval of the April budget supplement) to approve the transfer of the \$11,361,130 in HSIP funds from the RoadX program to the new Strategic Safety Program. Staff will return in subsequent months to seek authorization via the budget supplement of the amount of funds to be deployed to specific projects and/or improvements within the (i.e. 6-inch striping, cable rail, etc.) Strategic Safety Program. Staff is recommending that HSIP funds associated with the Section 164 penalty be programmed to this same purpose in the FY 2019-2020 budget and FY 2020-2021 budget.

US 36 Initial Works

Plenary Roads Denver (PRD) took over operation and maintenance of the I-25 reversible lanes in March 2014 and US 36 Phase 1 and 2 in July 2015 and March 2016, respectively. As part of the handover process CDOT agreed to bring all assets up to a minimum standard. To determine what work was necessary an asset condition survey was completed. Items found to be below the minimum standards of maintenance in the Concession Agreement were included in the I-25 Initial Works Package. The Initial Works Package has been partially completed, but due to the project completion deadline on US 36 and the project's budgetary constraints, the remaining work was left to be completed by CDOT Regions 1 and 4 at a future time. The funding process for this work has remained undefined as asset conditions on the corridor have continued to deteriorate and have created serious safety and maintenance issues. PRD has provided a Scope, Schedule and Budget Estimate to complete this work on behalf of CDOT and the High Performance Transportation Enterprise (HPTE). The work is estimated to cost \$5,313,175. Staff are assessing which work elements would be best completed by PRD, and which by CDOT. If funding is made available up front and in total, procurement and permit work could begin in May 2019, and construction could be complete by early 2020. An alternative would be for Regions 1 and 4 to assume responsibility for funding, which may result in a more protracted timeline and/or implications to other projects.

Discussion:

- In January 2019 the TC approved approximately \$11.4 million going to the RoadX program: Recently the new intention for these funds is to use for another purpose. These funds are no longer intended for the RoadX program. New direction from the current CDOT administration is to create a Strategic Safety program, and use the funds initially planned for RoadX for this recently created initiative. Staff is bringing a resolution to the TC to approve this proposed change and transfer of RoadX funds to the Strategic Safety initiative.
- Commissioner Thiebat suggested that the resolution remove the mention of RoadX as to date the funds in question are not obligated to any program.
- Jeff Sudmeier, CDOT Chief Financial Officer, agreed that the budget supplement resolution will mention the transfer of funds from RoadX to the Safety Strategy initiative, where it is proper to mention the origin of fund transfers, and should be sufficient.
- Commissioner Hofmeister noted that related to the safety strategy initiative that includes the installation of rumble strips, that often a break in the center seal where rumble strips are worn down cause roadway deterioration. This has occurred in some instances within his district.
- Johnny Olson, CDOT Deputy Executive Director, noted the problem of rumble strips is due to them being improperly placed over the joint. Staff needs to take special care to avoid this from happening.
- Kyle Lester, CDOT Division of Maintenance and Operations Director, provided more information regarding the Strategic Safety initiative, and noted that moving to 6 inch striping throughout the state would be one of the improvements. On High speed routes the six inch stripes are a top priority and interstate striping is underway on I-76, and US highways in Region 5 are another priority for this striping. A longer-term program will be required to build out this initiative fully over 4 years. Rumble strips take more analysis and the plan is to install them this summer, the same is true for cable rail. The intent is to have a strategic plan outlined by mid- summer. We also need to invest in technology. The hope is to leverage Region 1 and Region 3 funds for variable speed limit projects.
- Jeff Sudmeier noted that the intent is for the Strategic Safety program to continue beyond its year of initiation.
- Johnny Olson mentioned that a Whole System-Whole Safety program presentation will be provided to the TC next month.
- Executive Director, Shoshana Lew noted that infrastructure is a key component to pay attention to related to smaller projects with definitive impacts that keep roadways safe. It is understood that rumble strips take more analysis to install properly. CDOT is going for simple to execute improvements to increase safety.
- Commissioner Thiebat commented that it all sounds good, both for the long and short term. And asked if the \$11 million is needed for this month or if TC action could occur next month.
- Kyle Lester responded that the money is needed now as he is already committing funds for striping projects that are occurring at this moment.

- Jeff Sudmeier intends to bring the resolution for the creation of the Strategic Safety Program and transfer of funds for this program to TC for action at the TC April 2019 regular meeting.
- Nick Farber, CDOT Interim High Performance Transportation Enterprise (HPTE) Director, provided an explanation regarding how to conduct remaining work initially assigned to Plenary on the US 36 project between Federal Blvd. and I-25 –as some work in this area is unfinished. The idea is to hand over work to Region 4 or Region 1 as the work is needed now, as it is becoming a safety issue. The options to fund this work is either use TC contingency reserve funding or use Region 1 and Region 4 funding.
- Jeff Sudmeier noted that the CDOT Regions expressed that they have concerns if they are tasked with funding the remaining work on an incremental basis. This is why CDOT staff is considering asking for TC reserve funds, and seeking it as another option.
- If the TC agrees to the use of TC reserve funds, a May budget supplement would be the vehicle to approve this expenditure.
- Commissioner Thiebaut expressed that he feels the Regions should cover these costs.
- No other comments were raised by the Commission.

North I-25 Budget/Project Discussion (Josh Laipply, Heather Paddock and David Krutsinger)

Request for \$250 million for I-25 North Segments 7 & 8 (Heather Paddock)

The Base project scope includes the addition of 14 miles of Express Lane (NB and SB), replacement of two I-25 bridges to pass the 100yr event, a “center loading mobility hub” for Express Bus service, six miles of pavement reconstruction and eight miles of interim “build to the middle” widening and overlay of the existing infrastructure, and two interchanges. This Base program cost is \$344 million, with \$263 million contracted in construction.

The additional \$250 million is program cost and \$195 million would be contract work for construction. This would make the total program cost \$594 million and \$458 million in construction. Local partners have contributed \$58 million to date and are dedicating an additional \$5 million, if the project is successful in receiving \$250 million state funds.

The additional \$250 million to Segments 7&8 will allow the project team to meet the purpose and need, along with the scope identified in the final environmental impact statement (FEIS) and record of decision (ROD). It is important to note that this \$250 million request includes the \$100 million request recently applied for under the federal Infrastructure for Rebuilding America (INFRA) grant program, and an additional \$150 million to complete the Phase 1 FEIS. The additional infrastructure cost is due to pavement reconstruction, replacement of bridges, an additional interchange, and construct the interstate out of the Poudre floodplain at the Kechter Road overpass, where it currently overtops at a 25-year event requiring the interstate to be shut down. If the INFRA grant is approved, the project would not need to utilize the entire \$250 million from the Commission, and those funds would be returned.

Discussion:

- Heather Paddock, Region 4 Engineer, provided an overview of the \$250 million request for I-25 North.
- In the packet it is explained that for Segments 7&8 of I-25 North. CDOT has applied for an INFRA grant for \$100 million. The idea is also to leverage additional dollars from local communities. INFRA grant elements of the project are highlighted in green in project graphic presented. Heather explained that this is an active construction project, which will start construction in June 2019, and we anticipate an INFRA decision in August 2019. We need foundation built for the INFRA grant improvements. If \$250 million is permitted then an extension of the project schedule will occur, approximately 18 months. However, the funding is not needed until the fourth quarter of 2020, but a decision is needed soon to move forward.
- Options for implementation were reviewed. Benefits and risks associated with this proposal are highlighted in packet. CDOT is requesting a change order for funds into existing contract. This will bring design up to 100% but will have severable packages.

- Josh Laipply recommended that the proposed decisions for tomorrow be split into two decisions for approval by the TC. The first would be to permit an additional \$250 million to the I-25 North project. The second decision would relate to how the contracting for the additional \$250 million would be conducted.
- Executive Director Lew agreed to this approach to obtaining TC approval, as \$250 million is a lot of money to consider.
- Commissioner Thiebaut noted that this project is very important and that is not debatable, but how we get there is. Feels uncomfortable using change order term after the internal audit regarding change orders was released.
- Commissioner Connell agreed with Commissioner Thiebaut sentiments.
- Commissioner Peterson agreed as well, and noted that the local contribution aspect of this project is impressive. Timing has reached a critical mass, and he is very uncomfortable with the proposed change order.
- Jeff Sudmeier noted that potential funding sources for this \$250 million are SB 267, SB 1 and the INFRA grant if a grant is awarded.
- Commissioner Thiebaut noted that it is important that other areas of the state need to feel heard
- Executive Director Lew mentioned that regarding thresholds – this is about the sequence of how things are approached, we are re-evaluating the planning process too. Aligning the STIP and planning process – execution is a timing situation. It would be better to wait for planning process changes to occur, but if we want a larger build, there is a point of no return, and this is what we are dealing with.
- Commissioner Gilliland stressed the importance of the project, and that it is critical. Change Order concerns exists, and the reason for a change order are the savings related to doing things now. Ground work has been done to expand this project. Need decision in May 2019 and design changes need to be done now to see benefits. To open up to another RFP process will cost us more. There is justification to change things now. Folks from Northern Colorado business community are here to comment too.
- Josh Laipply, requested the TC to let staff make contracting decisions, and ask TC to only approve \$250 million.
- Commissioner Hofmeister noted he has huge concerns, as the rural areas are not be taken care of with this investment. If this passes, urban areas will need to remember this when rural areas ask for critical needs in the future.
- In terms of the saving calculations, a 3% annual inflation rate was assumed, which is a standard practice.
- Executive Director Lew directed that the record show that this month the TC will not act on the proposed procurement method and only on approval of the \$250 million.
- Josh Laipply concurred to keep TC action to a money/funding decision only for this month.
- David May of the Fix Colorado North I-25 Business Alliance offered his comments on the I-25 North Segments 7&8 project. Thank you to TC for what you do. There are hard decisions to make. This project has interesting timing issues, this is a rare opportunity to save \$200 million by doing it right the first time. Interim solution may not work with increased capacity and tripling of population in the area. The opportunity exists to do this right and to do it now. Others who support this are: Mayor Pro tem from the City of Fort Collins, Dave Bar of the City of Loveland, Barb Kirkmeyer, Weld County Commissioner, who sends her regards, among others. Also, we, Commissioner Kirkmeyer and myself, sent the TC a letter of support for this project. Thank you. Thank you to CDOT staff and to Commissioner Gilliland.

Center Median Express Bus Station at I-25 and Kendall Parkway in Loveland (David Krutsinger)

Purpose: The purpose of this memo is to request approval for a center-median express bus station at I-25 and Kendall Parkway in Loveland.

Action: The Division of Transit and Rail (DTR) is requesting a resolution to approve \$7.0 M in SB 267 funding for design and construction of the new Centerra-Loveland Station.

Details: The originally-approved Kendall Parkway express bus station was funded with \$5.0 million of SB 228 funding. The additional cost is due these items: a pedestrian tunnel under I-25 in addition to the sidewalk under the bridge at Kendall Parkway, tunnel and platform lighting, canopies over the platform access ramps, noise

walls, etc. to improve the user experience. The funding will be from 7th Pot residual funds of approximately \$0.9 million plus \$6.1 million in SB 267 transit funds. At present, SB 267 funding is available for Year 1 only, and in FY 18-19 a total of \$38.0 million is available for transit projects. Of the total, \$9.5 million must be reserved for rural infrastructure projects and program support.

If approved, this center-median express bus station will be the first non-rural project to be funded with SB 267 dollars. Staff has compiled, and will evaluate, a candidate list of strategic projects to be funded with the remaining SB 267 Year 1 funds. The full recommended project portfolio will be presented to the TC for approval in May. This project is being advanced because it is connected to the managed lanes design-build contract and any schedule delays will result in increased project costs.

This project is CDOT's first Mobility Hub project. Key elements of mobility hubs include intercity/regional transit service, supporting and connected local transit service, first/last mile connectivity, bike/pedestrian access, ADA access, bike storage, parking with electric vehicle charging stations, and transit oriented development. Most of these elements are already identified and included in this project, while others, such as the electric charging stations, remain to be worked out with project partners. Several partnerships have formed while working on this station project. From a financial perspective, the project has received funding from USDOT, CDOT Region 4 and DTR, City of Loveland (providing local bus connections) and Centerra Metro District. The transit funding split is ~ 41.46 % local to 58.53% state funded.

Discussion:

- David Krutsinger, Division of Transit and Rail Director, recognized staff working on this project. Dave Clark of Loveland City Council, Heather Paddock of CDOT Region 4 and Sharon Terranova, Planning Manager of the Division of Transit and Rail. David commented that all these folks have been working hard to pull together a solution for the Centerra Park-n-Ride. Now they have arrived at a solution.
- Initial proposal was a simpler design. Now there will be a better functioning hub that is safer and faster travel for all. It will deliver something that CDOT and others can be proud of.
- Local commitments are 41% of total cost for this multimodal hub.
- Commissioner Zink asked about the length of the walk from the bus platform to the Park-n-Ride. The answer was the bus platform is approximately 1,200 feet – less than a quarter-mile long.
- Commissioner Hofmeister mentioned that since passenger rail is a key focus, he wanted to know if enough room is being preserved for bus lanes and rail.
- David Krutsinger responded that it is believed if rail was provided later along this corridor that the potential to recapture 75% of construction for what is built now is possible. The funding source would be SB 267 funding from the Transit funds.
- Executive Director Lew commented that a fair amount internal discussions have occurred and that the collective judgement regarding incorporation of passenger rail later, is that the project is important enough for interim investment now, and planning for future funding of improvements is also an important consideration.

Planning Reset – Public Outreach and Engagement Plan (Rebecca White)

Purpose: Update the TC on the statewide planning process and upcoming outreach plans and solicit input on that process. Input will be used to improve the outreach approach, content, and delivery strategy before that process starts.

Action: Information & discussion only, no action required

Background: As discussed at the March TC workshop on this subject, CDOT has been adapting to the evolving planning requirements of Federal legislation and Federal guidance over the past few years. While these processes have been closely coordinated and connected within the Department, their development as largely distinct efforts has limited CDOT's ability to realize efficiencies and to effectively engage our public and stakeholders. CDOT will take the opportunity presented by the Statewide Transportation Plan, 2045 Update, to fully integrate

modal and asset considerations, to inform decision-making, and to focus those decisions on a 10-year strategic horizon.

In some parts of the state, being more “multimodal” means stronger consideration of freight-delivery needs from farm to market, or from well-head to pipeline/transload facility. In other parts of the state, being more “multimodal” means stronger consideration of congestion-solving and transportation modes such as transit, ridesharing, bicycle, and pedestrian. Other issues, like the threats of wildfires, avalanches, floods, and bomb-cyclone/blizzard events touch all Coloradans. And, every part of Colorado relies on a transportation system to support the economic health of business and the quality of life of residents. In order to create a transportation system that effectively and safely moves people, goods and information, we need to be able to consider all of these “layers” together.

Details: This month, DTD and DTR are together presenting further details on the visuals and materials that will guide this summer’s outreach process as well as how that process will unfold in order to connect with our transportation stakeholders and members of the public. Staff also will present additional thinking on how CDOT’s efforts around various modal plans can come together and how this work will build a 10 year STIP. Lastly, we will provide an update on program distribution and its development as part of the Statewide Plan.

Next Steps: A May 2019 public launch of the planning process. Staff plans to update the Statewide Planning Subcommittee on a monthly basis over the course of the summer.

Discussion:

- Commissioner Stuart noted the TC SWP Subcommittee was convened previously, but due to substantial changes to the planning process, it was decided that the entire TC would have an interest in this topic.
- Plans are to reconvene the SWP Committee at a later point during the development of the 2045 SWP.
- Commissioner Stuart and Commissioner Gifford were asked by Rebecca White if they would like to move the statewide travel modeling discussion to next month. Both agreed to this request. Erik Sabina, CDOT Information Management Branch Manager, will present on the statewide travel model next month (May 2019).
- Rebecca explained that she would provide an overview of the revised and updated planning process, Tim Kirby, CDOT Multimodal Planning Branch Manager, will provide an overview of the public involvement for the counties and Transportation Planning Regions, and Rebecca will end the workshop with an overview of the tools to use for public outreach.
- Reset of process includes a goal to bring planning processes together for the four federally required documents – SWP, Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), Statewide Transit Plan and the State Freight Plan.
- Three themes to brand public outreach will be – Choice, Connection, and Colorado for all; the plan name will be– Your Transportation Plan.
- This is the first time CDOT will bring transit and statewide planning together with a focus on safety, and other topics that unite us.
- A walk in my shoes is a message to link to the daily lives of Coloradans.
- Rebecca noted a move of the conversation from the visionary planning to the bureaucratic elements of the process. We have an Innovative Planning Process, and a complicated chart for a complicated process.
- Regarding the Regional Transportation Plans (RTPs), we have heard how important those plans are – and will integrate them with the Transit Plan, and the history of county outreach under the Project Priority Programming Process (4P) county meetings. 4P has been focused on STIP. We will repurpose discussion to 10-year vision and pipeline of projects. We will bring to the Transportation Planning Regions (TPRs) input from the counties. Plan integration themes will be incorporated also. GIS and modeling results will be presented to the TPRs at sunset of this process
- Commissioner Peterson noted that he really like this process; it is a good model for engaging our stakeholders. This will provide a great forum for conversations that will serve as a conduit for input and will make it personal. This process is a heavy lift. If we can do this and do it right it will be fantastic.

- Commissioner Connell agreed with Commissioner Peterson, and noted that many TC members may not serving on the Commission after terms expire. Asked the Governor to appoint TC members that will reflect on rural areas of the state and demonstrate commitment to the transportation system.
- The intent is to kick-off the county meetings in May, potentially with the help of the Governor.
- County meetings will be the largest component of the “Summer of Outreach”, the finalized plan and STIP are anticipated to be adopted by the TC by June 2020.
- Tim Kirby, Multimodal Planning Branch Manager, provided a summary of the public outreach to counties and TPRs. Tim noted that CDOT staff is excited, this work is a heavy lift but the team is energized. Each county and each region have uniqueness to capture, we can do this through the county outreach approach. In addition, visual portrayals of geographic information system data with maps will help to facilitate conversations with our planning partners. Tim provided a brief overview of how regions differ and have varying characteristics and transportation issues and emphasis areas referring to mapped data.
- As a result of this new outreach, CDOT will have more detailed information by county to bring to TPRs than ever before. Staff will also evaluate the TPR regional priority corridors identified in the 2040 RTPs.
- Three rounds of TPR meetings are planned – 1) primarily to analyze, discuss and identify issues and needs, 2) determine priorities, and 3) develop strategies to address prioritized needs.
- Commissioner Hofmeister commented that the Region 4 slides are not representative of what is happening in rural counties of the Region, generally only 4 counties get the most dollars.
- Tim Kirby responded that the intent of the county outreach is to paint a story for all areas of the state.
- Executive Director Lew also noted that this is why we are going county to county, as CDOT understands rural areas are important too. We will work to avoid city areas competing directly with rural areas for funding.
- Commissioner Connell noted that this is wonderful what CDOT is doing in terms of outreach and data, but a bigger discussion and inclusion of resiliency is needed. It is disturbing not to see resiliency as part of this presentation. Please cover resiliency as it is very important. Commissioner Connell expressed her wish to ensure resiliency is part of the issues and needs conversation beyond her service on the TC.
- Rebecca White concurred and agreed to make include resiliency data that is available along with asset management data and information.
- Commissioner Peterson mentioned that this new and different outreach process allows people to take ownership of their transportation system. This approach is brilliant, as it will provide an opportunity to hear directly from people across the state. This makes transportation personal. This personalization of transportation has not been attempted before. This is the best approach he has seen during his tenure on TC. This is a major step to addressing the funding problem too.
- Rebecca White presented the proposed tools for conducting public outreach for the 2045 Statewide Transportation plan which include: online surveys, telephone town halls, pop up events at county fairs and other community events and CDOT’s attendance at relevant conferences and meetings at sister agencies.
- Commissioner Stuart suggested that all TC comments or concerns related to the 2045 SWP public engagement process be submitted directly to Rebecca White.
- Rebecca White noted that what one will notice that what is missing from the list are public meetings, as observed during experience on the 70 Central project, this type of outreach is no longer considered a good method for engagement.
- It was noted that the Statewide Travel Model presentation from Erik Sabina, the Information Management Branch Manager, will take place next month.

Transportation Commission Regular Meeting Thursday, April 18, 2019, 9:30 am – 11:30 am

Audience Participation:

- Craig Canon of Denver said that his company, Work Zone Product Company, has four products that could make Colorado work zones safer, but his company cannot test them because of Federal Highway

Administration rules. He said he has sent a letter of complaint to FHWA. He expressed concern that Colorado is not as entrepreneurial and innovative as they would like to be.

Call to Order, Roll Call:

Nine of the ten Commissioners were present with Commissioner Rocky Scot excused.

Comments of Individual Commissioners

- Commissioner Kathy Hall mentioned she had taken a recent trip to Australia. She said most of the intercity roads are what they call “pay roads”, not toll roads. The surfaces of the highways she traveled on seemed in very good shape. Sydney is redoing its light-rail system, which is tearing up downtown. She said Sydney is working on an underground rail system, giving the city transportation options underground, and on and over the ground.
- Commissioner Sydney Zink said that Club 20 recently recognized Commissioner Kathy Hall for her long years of service. CDOT Executive Director Shoshana Lew attended the last Southwest TPR meeting by telephone since bad weather closed the airport. Regional state legislators who spoke at a recent meeting focused more on education than on transportation. Commissioner Zink also attended the memorial for CDOT employee Eric Hill of Gypsum, killed while doing maintenance work near Gypsum, and a ribbon-cutting ceremony for a passing lane outside of Towaoc on Ute Mountain Ute tribal lands. She suggested CDOT aggressively publicize rural projects, such as the one near Towaoc.
- Commissioner Kathy Gilliland said the safety of workers on the highways, such as Eric Hill and members of the Colorado State Patrol, is a real concern. She attended the safety meeting one day and the remembrance for a state employee killed in the line of duty in Region 4 the next. The widow and daughter of Eric Hill attended that remembrance.
- Commissioner Karen Stuart mentioned that Governor Jared Polis attended the same safety meeting as she and Commissioner Kathy Gilliland. She added that many changes are happening near I-25 and E-470 as managed lanes on I-25 are under construction for three months. Due to snow and ice, the lane striping along I-25 had almost become invisible. Commissioner Stuart praised the contractor for quickly repainting the lines, a safety improvement that she and others who travel I-25 noticed.
- Commissioner Kathy Connell said one needed safety improvement in her area is repainting of pedestrian crosswalks in some of the towns in her district. She echoed Commissioner Zink’s statement about CDOT needing to publicize more the projects under way in rural Colorado.
- Regarding safety, Commissioner Bill Thiebaut thanked Craig Canon for highlighting safety, and said the Transportation Commission is very concerned about it. He said he has attended six remembrances in the six years he has been on the Commission. At the last remembrance in Pueblo, he made a few comments. One comment he wanted to make but did not was about something the Greek philosopher Socrates made: “Beware the barrenness of a busy life.” In trying to get from one place to another quickly, people ignore work zone signs and other indications they need to slow down and pay attention. He thanked Shoshana Lew, Region 2 Regional Transportation Director Karen Rowe, and John Cater of FHWA for attending the last remembrance.
- Commissioner Shannon Gifford said she is looking forward to the “re-set” of the long-range planning process, which will begin this summer with public input on different transportation modes. She also mentioned that she helped find a place for a fresh-food mobile food market in the Elyria-Swansea neighborhood near the Central 70 project.

Executive Director’s Report (Shoshana Lew)

- Shoshana Lew said it is sad that CDOT has to commemorate so many who have lost their lives working for CDOT on the highways. The state’s rapidly rising fatality rate is one of the reasons for establishment of a safety program. In addition, little things make a difference, such as restriping, filling potholes, and messages and publicity about safe driving habits.
- Executive Director Lew is excited about taking part in outreach for the next long-range transportation plan over the next several months to determine what our transportation problems are and the best way to address them. The connections with individuals and neighborhoods in the Central 70 project are examples of how transportation connects the state.

Chief Engineer's Report (Josh Laipply)

- Josh Laipply mentioned that he and Executive Director Lew went to the Central 70 project area recently to emphasize safety.
- Whole System – Whole Safety initiative that Johnny Olson is leading is a good thing that CDOT is taking on.
- Reorganizations to combine maintenance and operations and to split engineering into three parts (administration, design, and construction) are all steps toward creating a safer environment.
- When the last “bomb cyclone” came in, CDOT could respond much more effectively because maintenance and operations were working together.

High Performance Transportation Enterprise (HPTE) Director's Report (Nick Farber)

- Nick Farber announced that the HPTE Board would not meet in May because several board members will be attending and presenting at a conference in Denver at the same time.
- HPTE will be raising the cost of HPTE transponders from \$15 to \$18 on June 1 due to a change in how the Colorado Department of Revenue figures the state sales tax. HPTE will alert the public to the price hike before June 1.
- He said he has asked the HPTE board for direction on staffing patterns for C-470. The national standard is 4-10 staff persons per express lane project. C-470 has no staff. The HPTE board will decide if HPTE employees or contract staff will handle information technology, support, maintenance, and administration.

Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Colorado Division Administrator's Report (John Cater, Division Administrator)

- John Cater said FHWA has \$900 million to appropriate in 2019 for Better Utilizing Investments to Leverage Development (BUILD) projects, and the application deadline is July 15. He said he hopes some BUILD grants will come to Colorado.
- National Work Zone Awareness Week is an FHWA event.
- CDOT is unusual among state departments of transportation in having remembrance days for those killed while working on the highways. If such events save one life, they are well worth it.
- He also said that CDOT and FHWA in early April sponsored a two-day Planning and Environmental Linkages (PEL) national peer exchange where participants from Florida, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, and Washington departments of transportation and the FHWA North Carolina and Pennsylvania division offices exchanged ideas about coordination of planning and environmental processes. Other states and FHWA recognize CDOT as a national leader in PEL studies.

Statewide Transportation Advisory Committee (STAC) Report (STAC Chair, Vince Rogalski)

- The STAC had a few concerns about the planning re-set that will result in a 10-year State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), or six years beyond the federally mandated four-year STIP. The concerns were about making sure project selection processes are fair to both rural and urban areas, the regional transportation plans incorporate freight, and CDOT allows enough time for a thorough planning process.
- On the state legislative report, a STAC member asked about a bill that could reduce the pool of qualified contractors through increasing apprenticeship requirements for contractors.
- The STAC favorably received a joint CDOT-Colorado Parks and Wildlife presentation on transportation and wildlife interactions on the Western Slope. Some asked about examining such interactions in other areas of the state.
- About \$40 million to \$50 million will be available to Colorado for the Federal Lands Access Program for 2023-2025, and June 5 is the deadline to apply. Projects to improve access to military installations are eligible under the program.

Act on Consent Agenda – Passed unanimously on April 18, 2019 –all items except for right-of-way settlement authorizations were passed unanimously on April 18, 2019.

- Resolution to Approve the Regular Meeting Minutes of March 21, 2019 (Herman Stockinger)
 - Commissioner Steven Hofmeister said TRAC appeared in the minutes as “TRUC”.
- Resolution to Approve Maintenance Requests (Kyle Lester)
- Resolution to Approve Disposal of Parcel 25-EX (Paul Jesaitis)
- Disposal: I-76 & Dahlia (Parcel 83-B Rev) (Paul Jesaitis)
- Resolution to Approve SB267 Transit Funds (David Krutsinger)
 - The resolution approved a total of \$12 million of CDOT transit funds toward a \$20.5 Million "hub" at the Centerra-Loveland location (just north of US 34/I-25). Local government entities are bringing the remaining \$8.5 Million (41%) to the project, in addition to local transit service from Loveland. This project will begin construction later this year, and open in 2022 with the rest of the associated highway improvements. Major elements:
 - 200 parking spaces (roughly double the existing capacity)
 - Bus bays for local bus connections
 - Center of I-25 bus platforms ("station") for Bustang
 - Center access/egress to from I-25 managed lanes, rather than exiting the highway at the regular interchange, saving 10 minutes of travel time each direction
 - Underground passenger walkway connecting developments on both sides of the highway
 - Significant safety improvements (noise walls, shelters, security cameras) for customers
 - This is the first of *potentially* 17 improved or new "hubs" along the Front Range between Fort Collins and Pueblo. Rural hubs and other connecting facilities are under discussion.
- Resolution to Approve ROW Acquisition and Settlement Authorization Requests (Josh Laipply)
 - Commissioner Thiebaut requested to sever the settlement acquisition requests in his district and vote on them separately. Commissioner Thiebaut then abstained from voting on the projects in his district, while the other Commissioners present voted yes to approve the settlement authorization requests in Commissioner Thiebaut’s district.

Discuss and Act on Creation of Strategic Safety Program (Jeff Sudmeier, Kyle Lester) – Passed unanimously on April 18, 2019

Discuss and Act on 10th Budget Supplement of FY 2019 (Jeff Sudmeier) –Passed on April 18, 2019, with Commissioner Hofmeister abstaining.

The following six items were included in the budget supplement totaling \$19.779 million. Money to cover the supplements will come from the FY 2018-2019 Contingency Reserve Fund Balance and the FY 2018-2019 Program Reserve Fund Balance:

- Region 1:
 - \$1.9 million: This addition is for a resurfacing project on I-225 from I-25 to Parker Road.
 - \$611,523: An Aurora signal improvement program.
- Region 2:
 - 1.6 million: To mitigate the risk of debris flows from fires and floods, the Region wants to install seven road closure gates along the six impacted highways from the Spring Creek Burn that occurred in June 2018, as well as an early alert warning system.
- Region 4:
 - 1.3 million: Fund transfer to redesign the layout and relocate existing fiber optic cables due to widening of I-25. CDOT will transfer funds from the HQTIS Cost Center to the Region 4 ITS Pool.

- Strategic Safety Program:
 - \$11.36 million: Transfer from RoadX to new Strategic Safety Program of Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) funds for a new program.
- Division of Highway Maintenance:
 - \$8.06 million: Transfer of \$462,000 from the Transportation Commission Contingency for Snow and Ice and \$7.6 million from the Transportation Commission Contingency Reserve. This is a first payment to fill a projected \$16.12 million shortfall if the need for snow and ice removal continues at its current pace.

Discussion:

- Commissioner Zink asked for the reasons why CDOT decides to seek budgetary supplements rather than rebid projects for which bids come in above budget.
 - Josh Laipply said staff tries to determine if CDOT will get better prices if a project goes out to bid. About half the projects go out to bid again. At this time of year, one of the reasons for higher bids is that bids were made late in the construction season.
- Commissioner Stuart asked if the supplement for snow and ice removal includes removing the snow from the many avalanches.
 - Jeff Sudmeier said the supplement includes removal of snow from avalanches. Generally, CDOT allocates \$82 million a year for snow and ice removal, with \$10 million in reserve. Due to warm winters, the \$10 million often isn't needed, but not this year. CDOT estimates the total cost for snow and ice removal will come to \$108 million.
- Commissioner Hofmeister commented that commissioners discussed bidding several years ago, and suggested that CDOT staff try to advertise for bids for the next construction season by January. He asked why CDOT is asking for bids so late in the year.
 - Josh Laipply said much of the construction program went out for bid by January this year. However, if CDOT has money left over, it tries to use it for other construction projects for the coming construction season, not knowing how much more the same project might cost the following year. CDOT now operates on a cash flow basis. One of the problems is uncertainty in the market.

Discuss and Act on Resolution Amendment for Region 1 Disposal (Parcel 300A) – Passed unanimously on April 18, 2019

Recognitions:

- US 34 Award: Engineering News Record (ENR) Project of the Year (Josh Laipply)
 - Before recognizing the team that won the ENR project of the year, Josh said that CDOT built important bridges to the affected communities and individuals for every bridge rebuilt in the Big Thompson Canyon after the 2013 floods.
 - Johnny Olson, former regional transportation director for Region 4, said the total cost of including as much resiliency in the highway and bridge designs as possible came to \$600 million. Although CDOT spent \$280 million, it still managed to include much resilience in the highway and bridges.
 - The US 34 project team included:

CDOT:

James Usher, P.E., project director
 Monte Malik, P.E., construction manager
 Benjamin Rowles, P.E., project manager
 Samantha Katz, engineer in training
 Corey Stewart, P.E., program engineer
 Heather Paddock, P.E., flood program engineer
 Johnny Olson, P.E., then the regional transportation director for Region 4

Contractors:

Kiewit (Contractor): Jason Hagerty

Jacobs Engineering (Designer): Doug Stemel, P.E.

Rocksol Consulting Group (Construction Owner Support): Ross Butchart

Muller Engineering (Program Owner Support): Gray Clark, P.E.

This is not the only award the team has won for the US 34 project. Others were:

The Build America Award from the Associated General Contractors

AASHTO's TransComm Award for issues and crisis management

The John and Jane Q. Public Competition for communication by the Transportation Research Board

The Colorado Asphalt Paving Association's Best Rural Highway Paving Project

The Engineering Excellence Award from the American Council of Engineering Companies of Colorado

The Best Emergency Construction and Repair Project award from the Colorado Chapter of the

American Public Works Association

James Usher received the Professional Manager of the Year award from the Colorado Chapter of the

American Public Works Association

Commissioner comments were:

- Commissioner Gilliland said it was amazing that CDOT was able to get the highway open on a temporary basis by late November 2013, as then-Governor John Hickenlooper directed. CDOT just recently completed permanent repairs. She said US 34 was an extraordinary project, and that the team deserved all the awards.
- Commissioner Connell said she really would like to see this project in the forefront of public consciousness. She said the project needs celebrating and documenting.
- Commissioner Ed Peterson said that the civil engineering for the project was amazing.

The team received a standing ovation from commissioners and the audience.

WHOLE SYSTEM. WHOLE SAFETY.

Behavior • Organizational • Built

Fact Sheet | 2019–2020

CDOT doubles down on safety by introducing a new strategy to improve safety on our roads. **Whole System. Whole Safety.** *Bringing everyone home safely.* This strategy capitalizes on current and planned safety efforts to help reduce traffic injuries and deaths.

PROBLEM: Despite a three percent reduction in 2018, traffic fatalities are up 40 percent since 2010 (from 450 in 2010 to 628 in 2018).

GOAL: Improve the safety of Colorado's transportation network by reducing the rate and severity of crashes and improving safety conditions for those traveling via all transportation modes.

VISION: Zero Deaths. The *Toward Zero Deaths* initiative was launched in 2015 when the *Strategic Highway Safety Plan* was released.

METRICS: Reduce fatalities and injuries by at least two percent per year – meaning fewer people get hurt and more people live. Those people could include you or someone you know.

PROGRAM: Continue the newly developed systematic statewide safety program that combines the benefits of CDOT programs. This approach addresses human factors, physical assets and organizational culture to fully integrate safety in everything that CDOT does and supports real time operations.

EXAMPLES OF ONGOING SUCCESS:

- Seat belts saved 229 lives in Colorado in 2017.
- Record seat belt use achieved in 2018 (86 percent).
- Highest ownership of personal breathalyzers in the country.
- Cable rail on I-25 and wildlife barriers save lives and prevent crashes.
- For every \$2 million spent on safety programs, a life is saved and 60 fewer persons are injured (proven by before/after analysis).

OVER ↘

SPECIFIC PROGRAMS:

Multimodal Options. Increase choices across the state to provide a more sustainable, efficient and equitable transportation network – reducing per capita Vehicle Miles Traveled by one percent annually. Fewer vehicles on roadways increase safety. Examples include:

- Programming \$50 million in 2019 to advance multimodal hubs.
- Increasing CDOT funding of ride-sharing programs.
- Expanding *Bustang* and *Bustang Outrider* service.

Physical Assets. Safety depends on keeping infrastructure in good repair, better managing congestion and accommodating population growth. Integrating new technology will provide a system with improved efficiency and safety. Goals include:

- Delivering 100 projects each year worth over \$100 million to specifically fix safety issues.
- For every \$2 million spent, a life will be saved and 60 fewer persons will be injured. Because of this dedicated funding, 50 fewer people will die each year and 3000 fewer people will be injured.

Safety Activities. Continue and originate projects delivering low cost and high impacts.

- Six-inch striping • Roundabout • Cable rail • Smart work zone technology
- Crash attenuators • Rumble strips • Wildlife barriers • Variable speed limits

Human Factors. Focus on influencing human behavior to improve safety. Examples include:

- Deploying best-in-class safety awareness campaigns on DUI, seat belt use, distracted driving, and others topics.
- Supporting local traffic safety grantees.
- Collaborating with DMV to help drivers adapt to changes in technology, driving conditions and rules of the road.
- Supporting law enforcement in high-visibility enforcement campaigns.

Organizational Changes. Realign CDOT's structure to improve safety. Examples include:

- Integrating maintenance and operations to streamline incident command and response.
- Rapidly deploying CDOT resources to quickly clear to reduce secondary crashes.
- Maximizing available technology and existing resources for accident and incident detection along congested corridors.
- Using photo, video and data for early detection of crashes and incidents to communicate quickly with maintenance staff to deploy resources to mitigate hazards to the public.
- Developing a comprehensive weather forecasting network and response planning that includes state and local resources.
- Increasing staffing of snowplow operators to maximize CDOT equipment resources during weather incident response statewide.
- Creating new standards for using temporary rumble strips leading into work zones.

Bringing Everyone Home Safely



COLORADO

Department of Transportation

Division of Transportation Development

Multimodal Planning Branch
2829 W. Howard Pl., Fourth Floor
Denver, CO 80204

DATE: May 17, 2019
TO: Statewide Transportation Advisory Committee (STAC)
FROM: Rebecca White, Division of Transportation Development, Director
 Tim Kirby, Multimodal Planning Branch, Manager
SUBJECT: Statewide Plan Formula Programs

Purpose

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide the STAC with an informational update on the status of the Statewide Plan (SWP) Formula Programs.

Action

None. Informational only.

Background

The Statewide Plan Program Distribution process is informed by two key activities: Long range revenue projections and program budgets including the Formula Programs. Long range revenue projections are developed in advance of each Statewide Transportation Plan (SWP) and outline estimated revenues by source from FY 2020- FY 2045. Revenues are forecasted by the Division of Accounting and Finance (DAF) using a revenue model developed for CDOT. Statewide Plan Formula Programs are programs which are allocated by formula to the Regions and/or MPOs, and for which the state generally has discretion over formula distribution methodologies. Traditionally, recommendations for allocation methodologies for Statewide Plan Formula Programs are developed by the Statewide Transportation Advisory Committee (STAC). They include:

- Metro Planning Program (Metro-PL),
- Surface Transportation - Metro (STP-Metro),
- Transportation Alternative Program (TAP),
- Congestion Mitigation Air Quality Program (CMAQ),
- FASTER Safety, and
- Regional Priority Program (RPP).

CDOT also has recently initiated a reset of the statewide planning process that will involve an intense level of stakeholder and public input over the summer months. This input is in keeping with --and further expands--CDOT's grassroots planning approach and will help identify what Coloradans want from their transportation system and what projects best deliver that vision.

Details

While ensuring the integrity of the planning process is important in order to have a better understanding of needs statewide and the potential application of formula program funding to address those needs, recent conversations with STAC and the MPOs have revealed that MPOs are in need of certainty around adopted formula programs in order to proceed with and complete their planning processes. In deference to this request, staff is recommending the adoption of the Metro Planning

Program (Metro-PL), Surface Transportation - Metro (STP-Metro), and Transportation Alternative Program (TAP) in an effort to accommodate the needs of the MPOs. For the remaining programs, existing formulas previously adopted by the Commission for the 2040 Statewide Plan remain in place until modified. Staff intends to bring a recommendation on these remaining formulas at the conclusion of the planning process this Fall.

Staff is proposing that the Commission move forward with recommendations for Metro Planning Program (Metro-PL), Surface Transportation - Metro (STP-Metro), and Transportation Alternative Program (TAP) as agreed to by the Statewide Plan Committee at its February 2019 meeting:

- Metro Planning (Metro-PL):
 - Statewide Plan Committee Recommendation: Use current formula and apply growth rate to minimum floor MPOs of 3% and hold constant; Revisit during the next round of Program Distribution.
 - Proposed Formula: Distribution based on population of MPO with a minimum dollar base of \$340K to Grand Valley MPO and \$360K to PACOG.
- Surface Transportation Metro (STP-Metro):
 - Statewide Plan Committee Recommendation: Maintain current STP Metro formula.
 - Proposed Formula: Funds to be suballocated to MPOs that are TMAs on the basis of population of the TMA Urbanized Areas (UZAs).
- Transportation Alternative Program (TAP):
 - Statewide Plan Committee Recommendation: Maintain current TAP formula.
 - Proposed Formula:
 - For the 50% of funding can be spent anywhere in state us a distribution formula of 45% vehicle miles traveled (congestion), 40% lane miles (extent of the system),and 15% truck vehicle miles traveled (economic vitality).
 - For the 50% of funding allocated based on population, 50% of funding allocated based on population to be spent in TMAs based on UZA population and 50% of funding allocated to non-TMA areas of CDOT regions based on population.

Next Steps

- Adoption of the remaining Statewide Plan Formula Programs at the conclusion of the planning process.



COLORADO
Department of Transportation
Division of Transportation Development

Multimodal Planning Branch
2829 W. Howard Pl., Fourth Floor
Denver, CO 80204

DATE: May 16, 2019
TO: Statewide Transportation Advisory Committee (STAC)
FROM: Rebecca White, Division of Transportation Development, Director
Tim Kirby, Multimodal Planning Branch, Manager
SUBJECT: BUILD Grants

Purpose

To brief STAC on potential upcoming projects for the United States Department of Transportation Better Utilizing Investments to Leverage Development (BUILD) discretionary grant program.

Action

None. Information only.

Background

On April 22, 2019 the United States Department of Transportation announced the Notice of Funding Opportunity for the BUILD discretionary grant program. Applications are due July 15, 2019.

The FY 2018-19 BUILD discretionary grant program makes \$900.0 million available for awards to surface transportation infrastructure projects that will have a significant impact throughout the country at a local or regional level. For this round of BUILD grants, the maximum grant award is \$25.0 million, and no more than \$90.0 million can be awarded to a single State, with a 50% match. Previously, CDOT has received BUILD (previously TIGER) grants for I-25 North in 2016 (\$15.0 million) and 2018 (\$20.0 million)

Details

At the direction of the Executive Director, CDOT staff compiled a list of competitive projects, whose theme is safety, that leverage existing state funds to maximize investments across Colorado. The following projects are proposed for submission to the BUILD discretionary grant program:

1. **Military Access, Mobility and Safety Improvements** - This project would add a median barrier, widen shoulders, replace failing asphalt pavement with concrete pavement, widen and replace failing bridge decks over South Academy, extend acceleration lane for on-ramps and add an exit lane on southbound I-25, and open new access to Gate 19 Fort Carson-Charter Oaks Ranch Road. The project also includes safety, mobility and military access improvements along SH 94 leading up to Enoch Rd. (major access point for Shriever Air Force Base).

2. **Statewide Passing Lanes** - This project would add strategic passing lanes in areas of the state with elevated crash patterns. In addition to adding passing lanes, the project would also provide a number of safety features that include: median barriers, widen shoulders, chain up stations near Kenosha pass and Red Hill, and variable speed limits for weather events on Kenosha Pass.
3. **Statewide Cable Barrier Installation** - This project would mitigate median crossovers and turnovers events along I-25 and other strategic locations statewide through the installation of cable barriers in the median.

Formal Commission approval is expected in June 2019. At this time, it does not appear that any Commission Program Reserve funding will be necessary to provide state match for these applications.

Next Steps

- May 2019: Receive STAC input on proposed BUILD applications.
- June 2019: The Transportation reviews and formally approves CDOT's BUILD applications for FY 2018-19.
- July 2019: CDOT submits BUILD applications.

Attachments

- N/A



DATE: May 17, 2019

TO: Statewide Transportation Advisory Committee (STAC)

FROM: Randy Grauberger, Project Director, SW Chief and Front Range Passenger Rail Commission

SUBJECT: Update from the Southwest Chief and Front Range Passenger Rail Commission

Purpose

This memo provides an update on the activity to release a Request for Proposals for Consultant Services related to the Front Range Passenger Rail

Action

None. Information only.

Background

The Southwest Chief and Front Range Passenger Rail Commission is partnering with CDOT to create a blended team of Consultant and CDOT staff for upcoming planning activities related to the Passenger Rail Commission's legislative charge to implement Front Range Passenger Rail Service. The Consultant team would take the lead in completing the majority of the elements of a Passenger Rail Service Development Plan (SDP). CDOT staff would lead the ridership forecasting effort and NEPA work.

A Rail Passenger Service Development Plan is a federally required planning document that is a pre-requisite to any future federal funding. The SDP will contain the following elements:

- Purpose and Need for Front Range Passenger Rail
- Corridor options/potential feasible alignments, including possible connections to RTD's Passenger Rail Corridors
- Potential speeds/technology
 - Ridership forecasting (using CDOT Statewide Travel model) based on speed/technology
- Levels of service (numbers of trains per day)
- Stations/mobility hubs/transit connections
- High level environmental analysis
- High level cost estimates for pre-construction, construction, equipment, operating, etc.
- Potential service operator (Amtrak, BNSF Railway, Herzog, etc.)
- Governance (Special District, Regional Transportation Authority (RTA), etc.)

The goal of the Passenger Rail Commission and CDOT is to prepare for a possible Front Range Passenger Rail ballot measure referred by the Legislature in 2020. The Commission was provided \$1.5 million by the 2018 Legislature to initiate this planning effort.

Details

An extensive Stakeholder Engagement / Communications Plan will be undertaken this summer. This will include taking advantage of the Stakeholder engagement related to CDOT's upcoming statewide planning effort. Details of that public involvement effort are currently being developed.

In addition to the SDP, this Request for Proposals (RFP) will call for the development of a project level NEPA document for Front Range Passenger Rail. The early stakeholder involvement in 2019 will be utilized for the NEPA work to follow.

The tentative schedule related to the RFP follows. This schedule is contingent on the SW Chief and Front Range Passenger Rail Commission approving the RFP document at its meeting in Denver on May 10th.

- May 10 - Review and approval of the RFP by the SW Chief and Front Rail Passenger Commission
- May 23 - First Advertisement of RFP
- June 13 - Proposals due from Consultant teams
- June 21 - Review Panel meets to create shortlist based on written proposals; notify shortlisted firms
- July 2 - Consultant Interviews
- July 5 - Notification to Selected Consultant
- July 18 - Consultant Submits Contract Compliance Package
- July 18 - Initiate fee negotiations
- July 25 - Audit completed
- August 2 - Contract Award - Notice to Proceed