

**STAC Meeting Minutes
February 11, 2011**

Location: CDOT Headquarters Auditorium
Date/Time: February 11, 2011 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Chairman: Vince Rogalski
Attendance: A sign-in sheet was distributed to note attendance at the meeting.

Agenda Items/Presenters/ Affiliations	Presentation Highlights	Actions
Introductions	<i>Everyone in the room gave self-introductions.</i>	No action taken
January Meeting Minutes	<i>January minutes approved with corrections. Two comments were removed from the minutes.</i>	Minutes approved with corrections
Transportation Commission Report- Vince Rogalski	<p>Items discussed at the January Transportation Commission (TC) meeting included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workshop on the Bridge Enterprise - Discussions are underway to identify an alignment for the I-70 viaduct. Also discussed an update on right-of-way acquisition for bridges and how to handle maintenance issues upon completion of improvements. • Workshop on the Division of Transit and Rail (DTR) – TC approved all local FASTER transit projects as presented. • TC discussed a new emerging small businesses program. This program, similar to the Disadvantage Business Enterprise program, is designed to simplify processes and improve eligibility and involvement. 	No action taken
Federal & State Legislative Update- Mickey Ferrell & Herman Stockinger	<p>Federal Update (Mickey Ferrell) – The Vice President announced that the President will be asking Congress to invest \$53 billion over 6 years in high speed passenger rail. This will be a component in the President’s FY12 budget.</p> <p>Last Friday, the House Budget Committee announced its discretionary federal spending targets for the remaining months of FY11. Programs will be reduced by at least 16% compared to FY10 levels. This is the first indicator of what type</p>	No action taken

	<p>of reductions we could see in the FY12 budget. It is undetermined as to what the appropriations committee might or might not cut. It will be interesting to see what they come up with for FY11, as they are 30 days away from the FY11 deadline. Conversations continue on this topic.</p> <p>The FY12 Congressional Notebook has been developed and includes all surface treatment and RPP projects in the desired funding range. The Congressional Notebook helps members of congress understand the local planning process, serves as an educational tool, and informs them of what projects are being funded in their area. It is also instrumental in showing the projects that will not be done if Colorado sees significant reductions in funding.</p> <p>Vince Rogalski: Regarding \$53 billion in rail funding, for comparison purposes, Amtrak is investing \$13.7 billion into their rail program for improvements between New York and New Jersey. Outside of the US, China has invested \$600-700 billion into their rail program.</p> <p>Mickey Ferrell: At a recent Democratic senatorial retreat, Senator Udall talked about raising the gas tax approximately 15 cents per gallon. This was a significant step for a CO senator to introduce the topic of raising the gas tax.</p> <p>Commissioner Diane Mitsch Bush: How much does the 16% budget reduction affect new or make significant shifts in existing funding?</p> <p>Mickey Ferrell: Congress is advancing a continuing resolution. Congress took the FY10 bill and copied it to FY11. The only thing that could be new is the reduced amount.</p> <p>Bill Moore: Is the 16% reduction a flat percentage across the board for all programs?</p> <p>Mickey Ferrell: Yes.</p> <p>State Update (Herman Stockinger) – CDOT testified at the capitol yesterday on the Devolution Study resolution. Rep. Vaad asked CDOT to explain the</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>resolution to better understand the TC's and STAC's positions. There was a general lack of interest by most committee members. The devolution concept will probably be discussed further next year.</p> <p><i>House Bill 1046</i>, the planning bill, has also died. We need to acknowledge CCI and CML for their efforts on this bill.</p> <p><i>Senate Bill 64</i> which would have CDOT pay for owner access has been defeated. This bill would have cost the department \$32 million per year. There was also a bill that would have required future State lease purchase agreements to go to the legislature for approval that was defeated.</p> <p><i>House Bill 1075</i>, which would have eliminated the \$5 million FASTER local transit grant program and redirected funding to counties and municipalities, was pulled by the sponsor.</p> <p><i>House Bill 1084</i>, Rep. Baumgardner's bill to reduce car registration fees to \$10 dollars made it out of committee. We expect that it will make it out of the House, but are hoping it will not make it out of the Senate.</p> <p><i>Senate Bill 95</i> will get its first hearing next week. This bill would eliminate all of FASTER except for the Bridge Enterprise. We are hopeful that this bill will not make it out of Committee. The Governor recognizes that there is no replacement for FASTER funding and so those funds should remain in place until something else is identified.</p> <p><i>House Bill 1210</i>, sponsored by Rep. Hamner, would hold CDOT accountable for I-70 improvements. It does not contradict the collaborative effort or any long range planning for the corridor. It does look at smaller short-term improvements like shoulders and operations improvements and asks CDOT to report findings to the legislature.</p> <p><i>House Bill 1220</i>, sponsored by the City and County of Broomfield, would allow state general fund money/future sales tax revenue to help pay for transportation. The current process under CDOT's Policy Directive 1601 states</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>that the developer should pay for improvements, like interchanges, that benefit new developments. Under this bill, there is no new money for the state for transportation; it provides a reimbursement for the developer building a roadway improvement. CDOT has no position on the bill.</p> <p>Eric Bergman: CCI voted yesterday to monitor H.B. 1220.</p> <p><i>House Bill 1192</i> is the long vehicle combinations bill. In 1991, the federal government put a freeze on long vehicle combinations. Long vehicle combinations are only allowed on interstates. This bill would increase the routes that allow long vehicle combinations. If this bill passes, CDOT would need to certify with USDOT compliance with existing law and any failure to comply could cost \$35 million per year in fees and penalties. We are hopeful this bill will be defeated.</p> <p>Herman Stockinger: About 5 years ago, CDOT shifted position on long vehicle combinations because there is an economic impact especially to eastern plains communities. CDOT also has a responsibility to move goods as well as people. CDOT has pushed the issue with USDOT to make progress on long vehicle combinations at the state level. The USDOT was resistant to changes on this issue.</p> <p>Commissioner Gary Beedy: The other issue is that other states allow long vehicle combinations and so it creates problems when you get to the state line.</p> <p>Commissioner Diane Mitsch Bush: Are the bill sponsors aware of the potential federal penalty?</p> <p>Herman Stockinger: I think they are aware of the penalty and are not willing to push the issue to the point where it would cost the state \$35 million. It is an important issue; we just do not want it to become law.</p> <p>Eric Bergman: The bill sponsors were considering a resolution to Congress on the long vehicle issue.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>John Cater: That is an appropriate issue to rise. There are many other states facing this issue.</p> <p>Commissioner Trent Bushner: CCI is working on a bill that would classify crude oil as a non-hazardous material. This bill would allow crude oil to travel on more routes throughout the state.</p> <p>Herman Stockinger: CDOT is looking into this issue and is in discussions with State Patrol. No conclusions have been reached yet.</p> <p>Commissioner Trent Bushner: There were safety concerns, especially in mountain communities. Not sure that it would affect eastern plains communities, but it is worth having a discussion on the topic.</p> <p>Elizabeth Relford: Weld County passed a resolution that does not limit or restrict the movement of crude oil throughout the county.</p> <p>Herman Stockinger: CDOT is currently participating in a study to look at hazardous material routes that is led by State Patrol. State Patrol is doing educational outreach throughout the state. CDOT, in cooperation with State Patrol, now has a process in place to change hazardous routes.</p> <p>John Cater: FHWA will have information on the transportation budget on Monday. Now is a good time to discuss transportation funding issues with members of Congress.</p>	
<p>Division of Transit and Rail Update – Mark Imhoff</p>	<p>Mark Imhoff: The first Transit and Rail Advisory Committee (TRAC) meeting was held on the last day in January. The first meeting was to set up agreements between the group on administrative issues, such as minutes and agendas. The next meeting will be Feb 28th, and at that meeting the committee will brainstorm on policy and vision issues. There was a question concerning interaction with STAC. It might be worthwhile to have a joint meeting with STAC once a year. Todd Hollenbeck is the STAC’s representative on the TRAC and will provide STAC with future monthly reports.</p>	

<p>I-70 Zipper Lane Study Presentation – Tony DeVito</p>	<p>In accordance with the language of the bill, CDOT has completed and submitted to the General Assembly a 20-page report that summarizes CDOT's findings on safety, cost, travel time, and other considerations of the Zipper Lane concept.</p> <p>A copy of the report was sent to STAC members. The problem is weekend traffic on I-70, which includes 79 minutes of delay on average. From October through December, CDOT has had to meter the tunnel for 10 days totaling 472 minutes of delay. If there is 1 mile of queuing in the tunnel, the gates are lowered and traffic is held.</p> <p>The Zipper Lane study area is from Georgetown to Floyd Hill and is approximately 13 miles. The concept is implementable on about 17 Sundays a season. The machine would reduce westbound traffic to one lane and expand the eastbound traffic lanes. Once cars enter the lanes, there are no exits. Deployment takes about 1 ½ hours. The study recommended restricting eastbound trucks through the tunnel. The Colorado Motor Carriers Association is okay with restriction through the tunnel.</p> <p>The first part of the study determined that zipper lanes are technically feasible. The second part of the study examined in further detail the needed improvements and operations issues.</p> <p>Weather plays a major role and if more than 1 inch of snow were falling per hour for an extended period, we would not deploy the zipper lanes. With existing traffic, we anticipate a 2 ½ mile back up at the top of Floyd Hill. With anticipated 10% annual traffic growth, we could expect a 6-mile backup. This would give us a useful life of the zipper lane system of 5-10 years.</p> <p>The traffic modeling shows approximately 11,000 person hours saved, a 13% improvement with zipper lanes. The traffic model shows 12,000 person hours saved with the hybrid alternative with a shorter reversible lane. When we include the traffic growth factor the person hours saved is reduced. The traffic growth factor raises concern whether this is a viable option in the future.</p>	<p>No action taken</p>
--	--	------------------------

	<p>There were additional concerns on snow removal and incident response within the zipper lanes. It is estimated that there would be 13 crashes per year during deployment.</p> <p>Potential business impacts include a 20% reduction in annual retail sales in Clear Creek County and Idaho Springs. On the other hand, increased traffic flow could be a positive, so for now the business impacts are inconclusive.</p> <p>CDOT, if directed to move forward with the project, could clear this project with a documented NEPA categorical exclusion.</p> <p>With the Pilot and Enhanced Program options, the study considered three questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When could we implement? • What would be the costs? • Could the risks be mitigated? <p>Pilot Program cost estimate: One-time capital (roadway & barrier systems) - \$22.1M and Annual (operations & emergency response) - \$710K</p> <p>Enhanced Program cost estimate: One-time capital (roadway & barrier systems) - \$39.9M and Annual (operations & emergency response) - \$1.76M</p> <p>There would be a 45-day FHWA approval process.</p> <p>User fees were considered to pay for the pilot.</p> <p>There have been 12 members on the project leadership team and more than 40 technical committee team members. Concerns remain with trade-offs/risks. At the request of the business community, CDOT has invited outside experts to look at the tunnel and provide new perspectives on the corridor.</p> <p>Wayne Williams: Considering the cost for the 10 year project period, for comparison purposes what would it cost to add a permanent 3rd lane coming down the hill?</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>Tony DeVito: Looking at some of the capacity improvements we are not sure if it is a constructed third lane or a hard shoulder - the real cost is what to do with the tunnels. We have not yet arrived at costs yet. The entire corridor improvements cost \$7 billion.</p> <p>Commissioner Diane Mitsch Bush: What is the cost of a new bore at the twin tunnels?</p> <p>Tony DeVito: We are waiting to hear from experts and the approximate cost ranges from \$30-50M. This is the best guess currently available.</p> <p>Commissioner Diane Mitsch Bush: What would be the source of funding for the zipper lane implementation?</p> <p>Tony DeVito: No funding source has been identified yet.</p> <p>Cliff Davidson: If we charged a fee to go through the tunnels in the peak period, would you make money?</p> <p>Tony DeVito: Any fee or tolling options would require community support.</p> <p>Thad Noll: What is the volume on Sundays through the tunnels? Comparing the volume and the cost of the project, it is a lot of money to pay for just a few days of benefit.</p> <p>Tony DeVito: We know we cannot build our way out of the problem; the long-term solution is a multimodal approach.</p> <p>Commissioner Trent Bushner: Safety is a major concern with this project. I am concerned with emergency response times and do not want to spend money to have something that is obsolete in 10 years. More lanes and mass transit are the ultimate solution.</p> <p>Tony DeVito: This solution would only last 6 to 10 years, considering</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>latent/suppressed demand.</p> <p>Commissioner Peter Runyon: What is the total number of person hours or travel hours we are trying to save? How do we develop a formula to calculate savings? There is also an increase in travel time for those going westbound and an increase in accidents. My guess is when we include all these factors the project will probably not be worth the effort.</p> <p>Tony DeVito: We have everything calculated except the cost benefit analysis per person.</p> <p>Commissioner Will Toor: If there is any location in the state where we need to look at fees and/or tolling it is at the I-70 tunnels. Perhaps a pilot study that would examine how congestion pricing could help during those 17 days during the winter season might be a better option.</p> <p>Commissioner Diane Mitsch Bush: Clearly, some type of Advanced Guideway System (AGS) is the only long-term solution. I would encourage others to look again at the executive summary from the Rocky Mountain Rail Study. The study found positive cost benefits and positive operating ratios.</p> <p>Tony DeVito: We are now able to move forward with the AGS Study funded by FASTER.</p>	
<p>Budget Update – Ben Stein</p>	<p>OFMB is doing the second part of the FY12 budget cycle and is in the process of developing a draft budget that needs to be finalized at the April TC meeting.</p> <p>OFMB has updated the new budget model and the comparison shows the difference between old and new budget items. The model is projecting \$22 million in additional FASTER revenue. However, OFMB is uncomfortable with those numbers because of the lack of historical data.</p> <p>The model recommends dropping federal apportionments by \$24 million. Once we know more about the continuing resolution we will have clarity on the reduced federal amount.</p>	<p>No action taken</p>

	<p>No recommendations will be made to TC this month. This is just for informational purposes. We will talk about recommendations in March.</p> <p>There has also been a drop in FTA funding.</p> <p><i>Ben outlined the areas of the budget that were reduced by formula and cannot be changed by the TC and the areas where the TC could make changes. As it stands now, it would appear that there would be additional FASTER funds to program and less federal funds to program.</i></p> <p>Bill Moore: What was the percentage increase in FASTER?</p> <p>Ben Stein: Approximately 20% increase. The new FASTER revenue data comes in monthly and the program has only been in place for a 1 ½ years.</p> <p>Steve Rudy: Could you provide the total national federal amount and the Colorado portion that comes from the model?</p> <p>Ben Stein: Yes, we can provide that number.</p> <p><i>Handout – Draft FY 2012 Revenue Comparison, Draft FY 2012 Budget Comparison as of February 16, 2011</i></p>	
<p>Bridge Enterprise Update – Pam Hutton</p>	<p>The Colorado Bridge Enterprise Board of Directors will review the bridge enterprise program and should approve the goals this month.</p> <p>Staff has developed a delivery program for the \$300 million in bonds that will be reviewed by the Bridge Enterprise Board of Directors.</p> <p>Project managers consolidated all information from the regions into a schedule and intend to phase the bridge improvement construction over time. The program also looks at new ways to increase participation of disadvantaged businesses. The delivery program proposes three different contracting methods.</p>	<p>No action taken</p>

	<p>The delivery plan shows how we can get \$339 million spent in 3 years, which will exceed our goal. We think we will reach our goal in the 4th quarter of 2013.</p> <p>Craig Casper: Has there been any pre-NEPA work that would identify any potential red flags that could delay the work before 2013?</p> <p>Pam Hutton: Yes, regions have done preliminary project scoping for each bridge to identify cost and any major environmental issues.</p> <p>Cliff Davidson: Will we be seeing regular progress reports on the news?</p> <p>Pam Hutton: We hope so. We need to let the public know about this program. We are working with our public relations office to get the word out.</p> <p>Bill Moore: Are indirect costs taken off the top of the total project estimate?</p> <p>Ben Stein: Indirect costs and construction engineering costs are factored into the total project costs.</p> <p><i>Handout – Colorado Bridge Enterprise, \$300M Bond Program Delivery Plan</i></p>	
<p>2035 Statewide Transportation Plan Amendment - Michelle Scheuerman</p>	<p><i>Michelle Scheuerman provided a brief status of the 2035 Statewide Transportation Plan Amendment. STAC and TC members provided a few comments on the draft. The document is now being translated into Spanish. The public review period will run from February 18th to March 21st. Staff has mailed 4,200 notification postcards and sent the document to libraries; the document will be available on CDOT's website.</i></p> <p>Commissioner Diane Mitsch Bush: Is there a way to comment on the website?</p> <p>Michelle Scheuerman: Yes, one can submit comments directly on the website. Additionally, we will also do a press release.</p>	<p><i>Motion Approved – Recommend TC approval of release for public comment.</i></p>

	<p>Sandi Kohrs: The MPOs have done a rigorous public involvement process and this amendment is primarily to reflect the MPO updates.</p> <p>Commissioner Diane Mitsch Bush: We should take every opportunity to present this to the public.</p> <p>Jennifer Finch: The Governor is putting together regional Economic Development Plans throughout the state and staff may be able to assist in some of the transportation and economic linkage discussions and messaging.</p> <p><i>Motion Approved- STAC recommended to the TC that the Plan Amendment be released for a 30-day public comment period.</i></p>	
2035 Regional Transportation Plan Summary – Bill Moore	Bill Moore presented a brief overview of the new 2035 PACOG Plan Amendment. The plan is being amended rather than updated. The Pueblo Technical Advisory Committee has reviewed both the plan and the TIP. The amended 2035 RTP is scheduled for adoption on February 24 th .	No action taken
Other Business	PACOG will present a TPR profile to the STAC next month.	No action taken