

**DRAFT STAC  
January 14, 2011 Meeting Minutes**

**Location:** CDOT Headquarters Auditorium  
**Date/Time:** January 14, 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.

<b>Agenda Items/Presenters/ Affiliations</b>	<b>Presentation Highlights</b>	<b>Actions</b>
Introductions	<i>Everyone in the room gave self-introductions.</i>	No action taken
December Meeting Minutes	<b><i>December minutes approved with one correction.</i></b> On Page 3, Steve Rudy’s comments should read “STAC” recommends, not “staff” recommends.	<b><i>Minutes approved with corrections</i></b>
Transportation Commission Report- Vince Rogalski	<p>Items discussed at the December Transportation Commission (TC) meeting included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Workshop – I-70 Zipper Lanes (A movable jersey barrier that resembles half of a zipper and allows for the number of lanes to be changed in a direction.) Possible trial project will be a future TC decision.</li> </ul> <p>Tony De Vito: 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, etc. of the Zipper Lane concept. At the request of the TC, we have conducted additional outreach with our partners on the Western Slope. CDOT is awaiting further comments/direction.</p> <p>Commissioner Wayne Williams: Are we for or against the Zipper Lanes?</p> <p>Tony DeVito: We did not take a stand. We just presented the facts.</p> <p><i>Because of the interest in this concept and the numerous questions,</i></p>	No action taken

	<p><i>CDOT will make a more detailed presentation to STAC next month. CDOT will provide a link to the report later today and will invite someone from the I-70 Coalition to present the I-70 Coalition's views on the concept.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Workshop - Bridge Enterprise – to be discussed later in the meeting.</li> <li>• Luncheon - Aeronautics Board - Wide Area Multilateral (WAM) System being installed in all airports in the state. Important safety improvement.</li> <li>• Workshop - Statewide Transportation Plan Amendment - Draft will be released in February. TC approval expected in April.</li> <li>• FASTER Statewide Transit Grants – projects approved by the TC. I-70 AGS was approved in a special phone conference subsequent to the TC meeting. The Transit and Rail Advisory Committee has been appointed.</li> <li>• Devolution Resolution – passed by TC.</li> </ul>	
<p>Federal &amp; State Legislative Update- Herman Stockinger, Mickey Ferrell &amp; Melissa Nelson</p>	<p>Federal Update (Mickey Ferrell) Changes to the 112<sup>th</sup> Congress will affect transportation and the Colorado Congressional Delegation. The Senate is not yet set on committee assignments, but we don't expect our senators to get an authorizing or appropriations committee slot. In the House, the Democrats will finalize committee slots this week, but we don't expect an authorizer or an appropriator for transportation to be selected from Colorado.</p> <p>The 112<sup>th</sup> Congress opened with a Rules change. CDOT opposed the Rule change and communicated this to STAC and our Congressional Delegation. In summary, a deal was struck in 1998 that locked in, through the Rules package, that the authorizing committee through the authorizing bill was the determiner of the level of spending on transportation on a yearly basis. The authorizer set the annual mark and the appropriator had to follow it. The Rule change took out that provision. Any bill the budget committee or appropriations committee touches now has the ability to change the levels of funding for transportation. Consequently, we will now have to track different bills more closely.</p> <p>The President's State of the Union address is January 25<sup>th</sup> and the budget is due out the first week of February. The Continuing Resolution was extended</p>	<p>No action taken</p>

through the first week of March. We will be watching numerous items in the next few weeks. Also, the debt ceiling will have to be raised before March. All of these items could affect transportation funding.

Bill Moore asked about the status of federal earmarks last November. With staff help, all 142 earmarks received by CDOT since 2004 were reviewed. These earmarks totaled approximately \$359M. We further identified 30 earmarks totaling \$35M in projects. CDOT has taken action on 13 projects, totaling about \$14.88M. Actions are pending on 6 projects, totaling about \$5M. Eleven projects, totaling \$16.2M, were identified as in the NEPA process or needing to be watched closely. Also, during the review process, we identified a structural issue regarding communication with FHWA.

Pam Hutton: We had a conversation with FHWA about our official notification of awards. We had gotten away from official, agency-to-agency communication. Now FHWA will send us an official communication, notifying us of an award in the form of an earmark, and it will go to the new Executive Director with a copy to the appropriate departments. Often, monies aren't transferred until we ask the feds to fund a budget action. So, we had a hard time tracking the dollars because they didn't show up in our system. Now, in the interim period between notification of award and receipt of the funds, we will be able to better track the money internally.

Mickey Ferrell: Thank you for raising the issue. This is an example of the positive things STAC can do.

State Update (Melissa Nelson)

*A 20-page bill was distributed to STAC and items in the bill were highlighted. The bill proposes to eliminate the planning process outside the MPO areas and eliminate the STAC and the TPRs. The CDOT Transportation Commissioners would be required to work with the local governments to determine project priorities. MPOs are not affected because they are federally recognized. Rep.Vaad is the bill sponsor. HB 11-1046.*

Commissioner Diane Mitsch Bush: What is the justification for doing this?

Melissa Nelson: Rep Vaad thinks there is too much "scope creep" in projects and the prioritization of projects. He thinks that locals are dictating much more than is necessary for the maintenance of the system.

Commissioner Diane Mitsch Bush: So, he basically wants to go back to pre-ISTEA days. He does not recognize the issues that face the rural areas of the state and the necessity for multiple rural counties and municipalities to work together. This becomes even more important when there is limited funding. This speaks to a lack of understanding of transportation and economic issues facing rural areas.

Bill Moore: NADO/AMPO have been strongly pushing states, without structures similar to Colorado, to create RTPOs. This bill would be going in an opposite direction from the rest of the country. Also, there have been discussions about raising the population limits for an MPO. We want to keep the TPR structure in place, so that if necessary, the MPOs could become TPRs.

Commissioner Wayne Williams: We're not going to change Rep Vaad's mind. So, we need to talk with the other legislators from our areas and express our concerns.

Steve Rudy: Were this to happen, could the TC continue the current process as a right of assisting with fulfillment of its duties?

Herman Stockinger: Said another way...if the statute were to go away, could the TC continue the process informally? It's questionable. Since it would not be statutorily authorized, the question then is, "What gives you the right to do this?" Certainly, things such as travel reimbursements would go away.

Steve Rudy: The TC has established a permanent Transit and Rail Advisory Committee and that's something not written in state statute.

Jennifer Finch: Staff has a lot of the same questions. We are proud of our grass roots process. A lot of other states have followed a similar model finding

	<p>there is logic and benefit to building a pyramid structure, so to speak. There are still federal requirements that we have to coordinate with local government in the long range planning process, so we must continue to communicate in some way and then bring the pieces back together. If the TPRs and STAC were to go away, the process might look different than what we have today, but we'd need to continue to adhere to the federal requirements. Also, we'd have to go through a Rules process. The statewide plan is in Rules. We have flexibility to change but we need to think about what this would look like and the legislative intent.</p> <p>Commissioner Diane Mitsch Bush: Much lip service is currently given to efficiency and accountability in government. This will lead to a period of great inefficiency for CDOT and local governments. We have a collaborative process now. I fear that the level of cooperation in the Regions may disappear.</p> <p>Commissioner Jim Austin: Could we get a list of talking points on this bill?</p> <p>Melissa Nelson: This is an opportunity for us to educate the new members of the legislature, so I would be happy to put together talking points. I encourage you to contact your representative. I also want to point out that there is no co-sponsor for this bill. CCI and CML do not support this bill. Additionally, there will be a substantial fiscal impact. On another topic – We do know that there is legislation out that affects FASTER funding and transit.</p> <p>Jennifer Finch: Regarding the fiscal note, more staff time would be required to coordinate with local governments.</p> <p>Commissioner Wayne Williams: Since the Governor has announced the new Executive Director, could he brief us at a future meeting?</p> <p>Jennifer Finch: The Executive Director will be joining CDOT mid-February. He has responsibilities to complete before he starts at CDOT and he has asked for a short uninterrupted period to wrap up current business activities. Mike Cheroutes is the interim director.</p>	
--	--	--

<p>Bridge Enterprise Bonding Program Update – Ben Stein</p>	<p><i>\$300M of Senior Taxable Build America Bonds (BAB) were sold in December. Ben discussed the BAB series, created by the ARRA legislation, and explained the differences between BAB and traditional municipal bonds. BAB allowed for a whole new (wider) marketplace to come in so bonds can be sold quickly, which allowed projects to get underway resulting in greater employment. The program expired at the end of December 2010 and the marketplace became very volatile going into the November-December period. Ben showed yield curves for bonds and noted how the interest rates changed during this period. Because the bonds were expiring, there was a narrow window between the election and December 2010 in which to sell the bonds.</i></p> <p>Ben Stein: We had a very good sale and had a great response to our bonds. The more bidders, the tighter the spread and the lower the interest expense. We were able to lower the bonds to 185 basis points. Rates were higher on the days before and the days after the sale, so our timing was good. Our 2040 term bond was index eligible and because of this was more attractive and can trade easily in the secondary markets. Our rating was AA-, which is very good. Our true “all in” cost of issuance was 3.99%.</p> <p><i>Ben then reviewed a memo that explained the thought process on bonding versus pay-as-you-go.</i></p> <p>Commissioner Wayne Williams: What is the percentage of FASTER revenue that goes for bridge?</p> <p>Ben Stein: About 35%</p> <p>Craig Casper: Is the payback on this only through FASTER?</p> <p>Ben Stein: We have pledged the bridge fee. We have also executed a MOU with FHWA, so we can use up to \$15M of federal funds (transfer to Bridge Enterprise) for bond payments.</p> <p>Bill Moore: \$15M once?</p>	<p>No action taken</p>
---	--	------------------------

	<p>Ben Stein: \$15M, one time only for the entire program.</p> <p>Steve Rudy: Thank you Ben, for providing this information. It's a good assessment to undertake when you engage in an endeavor like this.</p> <p><i>Handout – Analysis of the Present Value of the Bridge Enterprise Bonding Program; Presentation to the Colorado Bridge Enterprise, 12.15.10.</i></p>	
<p>Non-metropolitan Local Official Consultation Process – Sandi Kohrs</p>	<p><i>Sandi Kohrs stated that per federal requirements, DTD put together a documentation of CDOT's consultation process with non-metropolitan local officials. STAC received the document in November and the 60-day public comment period has now closed. Only 2 comments were received from the public. The document will now be forwarded to FHWA and FTA to meet a February 24th, 2011 deadline.</i></p>	No action taken
<p>2035 Statewide Transportation Plan Amendment - Michelle Scheuerman</p>	<p><i>Michelle Scheuerman provided an update on comments received from the TC and STAC Members on the 2035 Statewide Transportation Plan Amendment. Only minor comments were received and the document is now being revised. DTD will be coming back to STAC next month for a recommendation to the TC to release the Amendment for a 30-day public comment period, which will run from February 17th through March 18<sup>th</sup>.</i></p> <p>Steve Rudy: Last month, Commissioner Williams said this report might be too optimistic. Is there going to be an adjustment in tone, making it more somber?</p> <p>Michelle Scheuerman: We can take a look at that again. However, a different way to address this concern might be to address this in a cover letter from the Executive Director and TC Chair that will accompany the document.</p>	No action taken
<p>FASTER Local Transit Grants – Mark Imhoff</p>	<p>Last month we discussed Statewide Transit projects, which were all approved. Today we are discussing Local Transit projects as shown in the handout. A total of 111 applications or projects (Statewide and Local) were received totaling approximately \$84M. We conducted meetings with each region and they brought input from the MPOs and TPRs. Both statewide and local projects were reviewed for consideration.</p>	<p><b>Motion Approved – Recommend TC approval of FASTER Local Transit</b></p>

	<p><i>Mark reviewed the 2010-2012 FASTER Local Transit Projects selection process as outlined in the STAC meeting materials. He noted the next step after the STAC presentation was to present and discuss projects at the Transportation Commission Transit workshop on January 19<sup>th</sup>, followed by a resolution on January 20<sup>th</sup>.</i></p> <p><i>Three regions exceeded the regional allocations, so the excess projects were programmed into 2013. Of the 62 recommended projects from 37 organizations, Mark noted the distribution of projects as follows:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>\$8.5M for vehicles and rolling stock</i></li> <li>▪ <i>\$2.1M for park-n-rides</i></li> <li>▪ <i>\$1.7M for transit stop improvements</i></li> <li>▪ <i>\$1.6M for small facility construction, and</i></li> <li>▪ <i>\$1.1M for transit related equipment.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Mark presented the regional allocation breakdown, the General Contingencies &amp; Conditions and the process for moving the projects through the STIP and CDOT financial system.</i></p> <p><i>Commissioner Wayne Williams recommended approval, Commissioner Barbara Kirkmeyer seconded.</i></p> <p><i>Motion approved- Recommend to the TC approval of the list of Local FASTER Transit projects.</i></p> <p><i>Handouts – Transit Workshop Materials for FASTER Local Transit</i></p>	<p><b>Projects</b></p>
<p>Transit and Rail Advisory Committee – Mark Imhoff</p>	<p>The proposed Transit and Rail Advisory Committee (TRAC) members were reviewed with the TC last month and Russ George made committee appointments at the end of December. There is great representation from around the state.</p> <p><i>Mark recognized STAC members on the TRAC as Todd Hollenbeck and Gary Beedy. Craig Blewitt is also a TRAC member and was in attendance. The first meeting is January 31st, the second will be at end of February with a workshop in March.</i></p>	<p>No action taken</p>

	<i>Handout – List of Transit and Rail Advisory Committee Members</i>	
Draft 2035 Regional Transportation Plan Summary for GVMPO – Todd Hollenbeck and Ken Simms	<i>One of the roles and responsibilities of STAC is to review and comment on the MPO Regional Transportation Plans. Todd and Ken presented a brief overview of the Grand Valley 2035 Regional Transportation Plan. Ken noted that the planning effort was an opportunity to work with and build on recent local planning efforts. All communities had recently updated their land use plans. Ken reviewed the public involvement conducted, the non-motorized, transit and roadway funding scenarios and the emerging issues.</i>	No action taken
Other Business	<i>Bill Moore will present a MPO Update on PACOG at the February STAC meeting. He invited all to visit <a href="http://www.pacog.net">www.pacog.net</a> as the website has been recently revamped. Thanks to NFRMPO website for generating a lot of ideas.</i>	No action taken