

**DRAFT STAC Meeting Minutes  
February 10, 2012**

**Location:** CDOT Headquarters Auditorium

**Date/Time:** February 10, 2012 9:00 a.m. – 12:00

**Chairman:** Vince Rogalski

**Attendance:** Sign-in sheets were distributed to note attendance at the meeting.

<b>Agenda Items/Presenters/ Affiliations</b>	<b>Presentation Highlights</b>	<b>Actions</b>
Introductions/January Minutes/Vince Rogalski/STAC Chair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Everyone in the room gave self-introductions. The January minutes were approved.</li> </ul>	<b>Action-</b> Approve minutes.
Transportation Commission (TC) Report/Vince Rogalski/STAC Chair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vince discussed the Boundary Revision Letter that had been sent out from DTD, adding that if anyone is interested in pursuing such a change, there is a 60-day limit to meet the requirements noted in the letter.</li> <li>• Vince reported that the TC was working to ensure that bond funds are expended in a timely fashion.</li> <li>• The TC is also evaluating the process for requesting Contingency funds, examining each request to see if the need can be met with funds from another source, along with the need for a formal request process, to provide consistency.</li> <li>• The TC held a workshop on communications, discussing methods to better get CDOT's message out, especially with respect to the "silent crisis" in transportation funding in Colorado, and how best to get the public engaged.</li> </ul>	No action taken.
Federal and State Legislative Update/Herman Stockinger/CDOT Office of Policy & Government Relations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kurt Morrison provided a brief update on state legislative issues.</li> <li>• House Bill 1021, which would have eliminated the TPRs and STAC, was defeated along party lines.</li> <li>• Ballot Measure Update – Current discussions on a ballot measure are currently on hold. That being said, any conversation about the need for transportation funding is a good conversation – anything that raises</li> </ul>	<b>Action-</b> Approve motion recommending CDOT submit two applications for I-25 North and I-

	<p>awareness.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CDOT recently had the opportunity to talk with USDOT regarding applications submitted under previous rounds of TIGER. USDOT had good things to say about previously submitted projects, but suggested CDOT make clear the state's top priorities by submitting only a few applications for the highest priority projects.</li> <li>• They also want to see complete funding packages, with financial support from other entities. USDOT feels that if a state won't help fund a project, then it must not be a priority.</li> <li>• The recommendation from USDOT is that Colorado limit itself to one or two projects. The North I-25 project may have the best chance, assuming regional participation. However, Transportation Secretary La Hood recommended Colorado submit two projects, one in Denver and one in Colorado Springs. The I-25 Fillmore interchange reconstruction may be a good candidate, as this would address severe safety issues that may likely worsen with the planned construction of a new Veterans facility. If we want to try for a third application one option would be to include a rural project such as the Eisenhower-Johnson Memorial Tunnel Fire Suppression System. Grand Junction also has a diverging diamond interchange project that USDOT is excited about, has state and local support, and would only request about \$1.5 M from USDOT. These may be the four most competitive projects. In addition, USDOT noted they like the local commitment for Pueblo's Dillon-Eden interchange project, with several partnerships in place. It is ready for construction next spring, and improvement to this area is certain to be a catalyst for future job growth in the Pueblo area. Another question is whether one of the projects should incorporate transit or rail elements.</li> <li>• Wayne Williams made a motion recommending that CDOT submit two applications for I-25 North and I-25 Fillmore Interchange projects, and submit two letters of support for the Pueblo Dillon-Eden interchange and Grand Junction Diverging Diamond projects. Motion passed.</li> </ul>	<p>25 Fillmore Interchange projects, and submit two letters of support for the Pueblo Dillon-Eden interchange and Grand Junction Diverging Diamond projects</p>
--	--	---

<p>Development of the next Statewide Long Range Transportation Plan/Michelle Scheuerman/CDOT DTD Planning Section</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CDOT is beginning this process with a look at existing policies needing updates, and will be bringing any proposed revisions to STAC for comment, as well as any proposed revisions to the methodology for development of the Plan.</li> <li>• Peter Runyon questioned the need to do another new plan, noting that the federal government continues to extend the Authorization through ‘Continuing Resolutions’. Sandi responded that there are several new planning requirements from both the state and federal government, and a new or updated plan is needed to support a new STIP. Vince added that, in his experience, there is a growth that happens with each new plan development process – the plan becomes better as crucial elements are better integrated, including the ability to be truly multimodal.</li> <li>• The TC will take action next week formally “kicking off” the plan development process.</li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>
<p>FY 2013 Budget/Laurie Freedle/CDOT Office of Financial Management and Budget (OFMB)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For FY 12, a mid-year analysis of revenues has prompted OFMB to recommend a decrease in the HUTF revenue projection, and an increase in the Federal funding revenue projection, netting to an overall increase in funding for FY 12 of \$72.3 million, of which \$12 million is flexible. Greg Schulte made a motion that the STAC endorse CDOT staff’s recommendation on the allocation of the “extra” funding. Motion passed.</li> <li>• Staff is not recommending any change in revenue projections for the FY 13 budget. The TC will be asked to take action on the budget next month, prior to forwarding to the Governor.</li> <li>• Steve Rudy commented that, if CDOT starts the year with a lower expectation for funding, there is a very high probability that our plans and TIPs will be forced to start the year by cutting projects on the funding side, meaning that CDOT can’t start the year planning or doing design work or other efforts, until later in the year when a the official determination is that we can assume more funding. He suggested that CDOT take a less conservative approach to allow CDOT staff to actually get projects going. In the current climate, it is preferable to get more</li> </ul>	<p><b>Action-</b> Approve motion recommending STAC endorse CDOT staff’s recommendation on the allocation of the “extra” funding.</p>

	<p>projects underway, even if they must be deferred later. Starting with such low numbers may be doing us a disservice.</p>	
<p>Asset Management/Scott Richrath/CDOT DTD Planning &amp; Policy Analysis Unit</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While discussing Tiering last month, the TC requested information on asset management. The new authorization will likely have us coordinating at a higher level with FHWA on asset management, with more requirements to quantify information and evaluate results.</li> <li>• The AASHTO definition of Asset Management is “a strategic and systematic process of operating, maintaining, upgrading and expanding physical assets throughout their lifecycle, focusing on business and engineering practices, for resource allocation utilization, with the objective of better decision-making.”</li> <li>• Asset Management helps better manage different assets, and better cross-manage those assets to make strategic decisions at the highest levels. This involves looking at priorities placed on assets by CDOT and how we manage them, both individually and collectively, and considers the impact of moving dollars between programs, year after year.</li> <li>• We hope to provide management the ability to do more real-time analysis and quickly see the impacts of funding decisions, including sudden changes like “de-rescissions”.</li> <li>• We used SAP to ensure we had a financial tool that did what we needed it do do. In the area of Maintenance, SAP has met our needs, and we’ve analyzed the cost to achieve certain levels of service. But we have not yet begun to integrate the analysis we are doing for bridge and pavement. We now have a high level of confidence in data going in and reports coming out, so the focus is now on the best ways to leverage this capability.</li> <li>• By TC Policy Directive, CDOT is moving toward use of a linear referencing system to geographically track the location of all of its assets.</li> <li>• Next week’s TC workshop will look at what information we can provide to senior management and the TC to assist in better decision-making.</li> <li>• We are working to develop an Asset Management Tool that will cross-manage our assets and show impacts to each asset resulting from different funding scenarios.</li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>

<p>Transit and Rail Advisory Committee (TRAC)/Division of Transit and Rail (DTR) Update/Mark Imhoff/CDOT DTR</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mark introduced David Krutsinger, the new Program Manager for Transit and Rail. He will manage the Interconnectivity Study and the AGS Study.</li> <li>• DTR is also embarking on an Asset Management Program for assets statewide. The difference from other CDOT asset management efforts is that DTR doesn't actually own those assets. This effort will focus on management plans and replacement schedules which will provide a much better picture of statewide need. David Averill is spearheading this effort.</li> <li>• Mark was in Washington, D.C. this week with CASTA. CASTA has been making a plea that the formula program used by FTA shortchanges Colorado, as it focuses on population and land mass, with no recognition of ridership. Colorado has been the number one rural provider these last few years, and we'd like to see an amendment to include ridership in the formula. This could bring another \$1.5 - \$2 million to Colorado.</li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>
<p>FASTER Transit Grants/Tom Mauser/CDOT DTR</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The recommendations for FY 13 FASTER transit grants were presented to the TRAC and the TC, and DTR was asked to provide reasons why projects were not selected. DTR has done so, identifying the primary reason for each project not selected. The motion to approve the list was approved unanimously.</li> <li>• FTA Discretionary Programs were announced this week. Discretionary programs include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ State of Good Repair</li> <li>○ Livability Program</li> <li>○ Clean Fuels Program</li> <li>○ Rehabilitation and Purchase of Vehicles and Facilities</li> <li>○ Veterans Transportation Program</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Projects from rural areas need to be submitted to CDOT, and will be part of a consolidated state application. Urbanized areas can apply directly to FTA. If a small urbanized area wishes to apply through</li> </ul>	<p><b>Action-</b> Approve motion recommending TC approval of projects for FY 13 FASTER transit grant funding.</p>

	<p>CDOT, they may do so, but the project must address the entire area, not just selected operators in that area.</p>	
<p>State Rail Plan/Mark Imhoff/DTR/Mehdi Bazar/CDOT DTD Information Management Branch</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mehdi Bazar, Project Manager for the State Rail Plan, noted that DTR has been working on this effort for the last year and a half and the project is now nearing completion. The plan is not constrained to a horizon year. Instead it identifies short, medium, and long-range projects. Without real funding sources identified, however, these are policy recommendations.</li> <li>• Mehdi provided a presentation on the process and findings, adding that the project will provide direction for improving rail in the state and identifying best practices from other states, including funding sources, and serve as an educational tool for rail transportation. Best practices from other states include funding methodologies that might apply in Colorado. Outreach efforts identified public safety projects, including overpasses, underpasses, corridor preservation projects, short line improvements, and rail facility relocations.</li> <li>• A question was raised regarding whether rails-to-trails effort might fit into this plan. Mark suggested language to support this might be added to preservation discussions in the plan. Next month, Mehdi will return to STAC to request STAC recommend TC adoption of the plan.</li> <li>• The comment period for the plan has been extended to March 2nd.</li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>
<p>Tiering Discussion/Sandi Kohrs/CDOT DTD Planning &amp; Performance Branch/Scott McDaniel/CDOT Staff Branches</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff presented information on tiering at December and January TC workshops in response to a request from the TC.</li> <li>• Within tiers, there would be targets or achievement levels. This helps address volatility of revenues, and to prioritize. If you were to tier, you might have different goals for different corridors or different programs, and this would provide direction for making decisions. The TC would also like to establish a consistent process, one that works for both urban and rural.</li> <li>• Different states have approached this different ways. DTD researched 18 states, and presented approaches from five different states: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Utah – tiers by traffic and truck volumes, using an “overall</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>

	<p>condition index”, which is mostly geared toward pavement and surface treatment;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Michigan – uses an activity center approach, sizes and types, and the corridors that connect them;</li> <li>○ Virginia – developed high priority corridors based on multimodality, connectivity, volume, and function;</li> <li>○ Minnesota – worked with state university on comprehensive economic analysis of the state. Identified “Regional Trade Centers”, then “High Priority Regional Corridors”, and “High Priority Interregional Corridors”. Then incorporated operations approach and set goals for maintaining flow at certain speeds.</li> <li>○ Georgia – tiered by program instead of corridor. Incorporates cost effectiveness of projects, using investment tiers for a Strategic Plan. Includes different levels of funding.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft legislation for the new authorization speaks to performance management of the system, emphasizing the Interstate, NHS, and Bridges, including an Asset Management Plan, and a Performance Plan, with states and MPOs coordinating on performance targets. The results of such provisions may result in something similar to tiering.</li> <li>• Scott provided a presentation that examined previous efforts to set priorities and current CDOT practices. CDOT does not currently have formal tiers, but its management systems result in decisions that could, technically, be called tiering, as could the distribution of funds by formula. Graphs showing number of lane miles vs. funding distribution revealed a high emphasis on the Interstate and NHS.</li> <li>• The Pavement Management Model focuses primarily on AADT and truck traffic, meaning higher volume roadways receive more attention. However, CDOT does make adjustments for distribution across the state.</li> </ul>	
Other Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>	No action taken.

