

DRAFT STAC Meeting Minutes
October 12, 2012

Location: CDOT Headquarters Auditorium

Date/Time: October 12, 2012 9:00 a.m. – 11:45 a.m.

Chairman: Vince Rogalski

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

Agenda Items/Presenters/Affiliations	Presentation Highlights	Actions
<p>Introductions/September Minutes/Vince Rogalski/STAC Chair</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introductions were made and minutes approved. Vince reported that CDOT's email system had changed from Outlook to Google, and, as such, CDOT staff email addresses have changed – "...just take out the 'dot'...". Sandi Kohrs' email address would change from sandi.kohrs@dot.state.co.us to sandi.kohrs@state.co.us. The addresses take in all state agencies, so sometimes more than one person has the same name. In that case, the person's middle initial is tacked onto their first name. As an example, william.johnson@dot.state.co.us becomes williama.johnson@state.co.us. 	<p>Action- Approve minutes.</p>
<p>Transportation Commission (TC) Report/Vince Rogalski/STAC Chair</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wayne Williams and Steve Rudy attended. Wayne stated that they presented STAC's recommendation for the use of the additional funds. Steve noted one change, the continuous flow intersection upgrade at the SH 550/160 intersection in Durango. The change increased the cost of the project from \$ 1.5 M to \$ 3 M. A safety improvement, this upgrade causes left-turning traffic to exit sooner, reducing conflict and delay. The Commission formally approved the change, but did not take formal action on the MAP-21 FY '13 budget. • The Commission has formed new committees, one for Asset Management and one for the next Long Range Transportation Plan. Scott Richrath made a presentation on several items addressing MAP-21 requirements, and CDOT's development of a Multi-Modal Asset Management System (MAMS). The System looks at five assets: pavement management, Bridge Management, Level of Service (LOS), and now, Fleet and Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS). In the future, CDOT Facilities will be added. • The Long Range Plan Committee had its first meeting. Ed Peterson is Chair, Gilliland, Parker and Aden are members. This was an organizational meeting. Members discussed their relationship to STAC: a lot of information will come to STAC first, and then Vince will convey STAC's 	<p>No action taken.</p>

	<p>recommendation to the committee. They then discussed MAP-21, and had presentations from DTD on the planning guidebook, planning factors, and schedules.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Transit and Intermodal Committee, chaired by Commissioner Peterson, with members Connell and Gruen, identified they would meet quarterly, but may have special meetings or teleconferences. They approved moving forward with Safe Routes to School for FY '13 at the \$ 1.5 M level. Steve added that OFMB prepared an examination of the additional funds relative to the MOUs, and, determined that DRCOG is getting about 41%, by the incremental formula, with the two-year look, and PPACG about 12%. 	
<p>Current CDOT Discussions/Tim Harris/Chief Engineer</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The retirement of Reza Akhavan, Region 6 RTD, provides an opportunity to revisit Region boundaries. We are looking at some ideas with the goal of improved customer service. • There is also discussion of Accelerated Program Delivery, and, to support that, approaches for cash management, with the STIP becoming more cash expenditure based. We'd like to try to avoid the situation in which a Region has to save up three years for a project. This week, a group of us traveled to the North Carolina DOT to learn about some new things they are doing there. Their STIP focuses on federal dollars- they have a ten year plan and a five year work program that shows all of the dollars. Their goal is to deliver 95% of the projects in the program on time and on budget. We are looking at this as we go forward in developing a plan to get more projects out sooner. 	<p>No action taken.</p>
<p>Transportation Ambassador Program/Herman Stockinger/Office of Policy and Government Relations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At the TBD Colorado meetings, they asked, "Why do we love Colorado?" But no one mentioned transportation or the role it plays. CDOT's new external communication plan includes a presentation called, "Transportation Matters". 2.5 million Coloradans drive 76 million miles every day in Colorado. Both our VMT and our population have gone up over 50 percent in the last 20 years, but our lane miles to accommodate this growth have only gone up by about 2 percent. How do we pay for transportation? FASTER funding comes from license fees and car registrations. The federal gas tax is 18.4 cents, last increased in 1993. Our state gas tax has been 22 cents per gallon since 1991. Eleven percent comes off the top to pay for State Patrol, Ports of Entry, Division of Motor Vehicles – all necessary functions of government. The remainder is split: 60% for CDOT, and 40 % for our cities and counties. Here in Colorado, our 	<p>No action taken.</p>

40.4 cents (state and federal) means we're below the U.S. average - lower than Nebraska or Kansas - although we deal with rockfall locations and mountain passes. Contrast that to Utah, where they have a sales tax dedicated to transportation, primarily for capacity improvements.

- How much does transportation cost? Some sample costs are \$60 M/year in snowfall removal (about 5% of the CDOT budget), while an average rural interchange costs about \$ 1.5 M, and an urban interchange requiring bridge replacement can cost \$ 25 M. Even a 2-inch pavement overlay – to protect it from further deterioration – can cost about \$275 K per lane mile. Most of CDOT's revenue is spent to maintain the 23,000 lane mile system. Colorado spends less than the national average per mile for maintenance, in spite of our high mountain passes, rockfall locations, etc. Projects over \$ 150 K – the vast majority of our construction work – are contracted out to the private sector, creating private sector jobs, which means a lot in this economy.
- What do we as individuals spend on transportation? Herman spends 31 hours a month in a car or 1,011 miles a month, or about \$27 per month in transportation taxes and fees. \$27 doesn't seem like a lot to him for state and local roads and all the reasons he uses the system. But he wanted to know how this compares to what he spends on other things, like his 24-hour Fitness membership for \$30 a month. Since Herman lives just a few miles from SuperCuts, he spends only 7 ½ cents to get there, and \$ 18 for his haircut. He spends about 2 ½ cents per mile to get to work safely and pick up his children afterward. He spends fewer than 31 hours on his cellphone, and yet, he spends much more money to use it.
- Many rural Coloradans commute longer distances, perhaps 50 hours or 2500 miles, and might pay as much as \$73 a month, but they are using the transportation system much more than Herman does. TBD identified Rural Safety and Reliability as a key issue: 40 % of fatalities in Colorado are rural run off the road accidents, another 6 % are rural head-on collisions. Although rural highways don't have the VMT that urban highways do, they do have about 50% of the fatalities, just in those two categories. Spending a little more on safety will reduce accidents in rural areas. Rural Reliability is also important: too many accidents happen when we're trying to get past a slow-moving vehicle. For a few dollars for rural safety and reliability we can improve travel in our rural areas.
- Congestion is another key issue: studies have shown that delays on I-70 cost about \$800 K/hour in lost economic activity. Herman now has a 25

minute commute, but, in five years, his 25 minute commute will grow to 30 minutes, meaning that he will be spending 40 hours – an entire work week – in the car each year. Right now, an average commute in an urban area is about 30 minutes. In 20 years, it will go up to an hour.

- We need to try to maximize what we have. CDOT’s successful TIGER grant application for North I-25 will help to fund the restriping of shoulders, creating new capacity for about \$ 44 M dollars. The original plan called for expending about \$ 400 M dollars on this by 2035, so this new approach brings capacity improvements 20 years sooner, with a 90% cost reduction. We’re creating a new Division of Operations to try to get more out of the system. We don’t have any planned-for dollars for capacity improvements. We need to look at other options, such as Interregional Transit to connect communities. The best example of that was FREX, but FREX has shut down and the state doesn’t have a means to keep it going, so we need to look harder at this.
- CDOT has undertaken several process improvement programs. Herman’s favorite example is the improvements made to the Access Permit program – one result being, if someone needs a permit, they can log in to CDOT’s website and find out where that permit is in the process. And CDOT is being more accountable with its funds. The Bridge Program is now online. All bridges are mapped, enabling viewers to locate any bridge and see its status, including funding and completion timing. Also, all CDOT financials are now online. We hope to have all of our projects online, ideally by the end of the year.
- We’re facing hard choices. We’d like the public to understand this, and we hope to enlist STAC’s help to carry this message. We can invest today, or we can have our kids pay more in the future. We think there are three steps to this stool: We’d like to do a statewide effort first, a regional effort second, and, third, address congested corridors in urban areas. We recognize that there is no reasonable statewide increase that is going to be able to handle the capacity issues that we have in urban areas.
- Gone are the days that we can just build generous lanes on every corridor. We need to examine the use of managed lanes. We’re considering taking a policy to the Commission in the next month or two and asking them if they feel we should have managed lanes for any congested corridor. We think if we can accomplish the three legs of that stool, we can keep our transportation system as awesome as Colorado is.
- STAC members added that the “Transportation Matters” presentation

	<p>should also address transit, rail, and airports, in addition to highways, and that more emphasis should be placed on Safety. But another thought was that focusing on infrastructure vs. mode is key: transportation infrastructure costs should be compared to other infrastructure costs: what do people pay for water, sewer, trash removal, water, etc.? And what price do we pay for air quality?</p>	
<p>FY '14 Budget/Laurie Freedle/Office of Financial Management and Budget (OFMB)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The draft FY '14 budget was distributed for review. The Commission has asked that the new Asset Management Program be accelerated, so they might use it in further developing the FY '14 Budget. The Commission hasn't really had a chance to start making decisions based on the new Asset Management Program, so this budget is more draft than we'd like and there'll probably be some re alignments when the Asset Management Program is taken into account. Also, FASTER funding has consistently come in lower than expected, and the revenue model took this into account. Therefore, the total for FASTER funding is reduced. Funding was added to Surface Treatment but may be moved to other programs later. The Highway Safety Investment Program is increased, by \$ 7 M, so our safety people will be planning a larger program. With MAP-21, Transportation Enhancement, Safe Routes to School, and Recreational Trails were incorporated into the new Transportation Alternatives Program. 	<p>No action taken.</p>
<p>LRP Resource Allocation/Laurie Freedle</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To begin the next Long Range Transportation Plan, OFMB will run revenue scenarios and determine the best revenues to use for the plan. As part of this process, CDOT prefers to form Special Committees of the STAC – one for Revenue Projections and one for Resource Allocation - and is looking for volunteer members for the Committee. This would be a dedicated group, meaning that members would commit to make all of the meetings, so that concepts would not need continual re-explanation. CDOT hopes this might be comprised of representatives from around the state. Meetings will begin in November, ending in April, and, to avoid extra travel, be scheduled directly after the STAC meeting. Some may be interested in participating in only one part of the discussion (i.e. Revenue Projections, but not Resource Allocation, or vice-versa). Please let us know if you are interested. 	<p>No action taken.</p>

<p>Enhanced NHS/William Johnson/Division of Transportation Development (DTD)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MAP-21 eliminated the mileage limitation for the National Highway System (NHS). Last month, FHWA sent a letter to CDOT, asking it to review highways currently on the NHS, to determine whether they should remain there, and to review other principal arterials, as well, for potential addition. • CDOT expects to work with the TPRs and MPOs on this effort, and STAC will be key in coordination. William is the project manager for this effort. DTD can provide both GIS data and/or mapping to assist in evaluation. The CDOT Regions (the Region Planning and Environmental Managers) will coordinate all the information coming in from their respective TPRs and MPOs, and will forward to DTD, who will compile and send to FHWA. William distributed a handout that included links to FHWA guidance documents, and the original FHWA request. He displayed a map illustrating the NHS system, which he will send to STAC members. He further explained the eligibility criteria for the NHS, described in the handout. Sandi Kohrs added that the definition of NHS does consider the NHS connectors – which serve airports and public transportation facilities. • John Cater pointed out that MAP-21 performance measures and targets could mean stricter requirements for projects and maintenance on NHS highways. But there is no new money to pay for these. There may be issues regarding flexibility of design standards, and with new performance measures, there will likely be more pressure on FHWA to have more control. There may also be more pressure on local governments to put their own resources on this. He noted that he really did not see much upside in this for local governments. William added that no changes are required. We are simply asking that every TPR and MPO do this evaluation. Some of you may not have staffs available for this effort. If you need assistance, let us know and we will help. 	<p>No action taken.</p>
<p>Transit and Rail Advisory Committee (TRAC) Update/David Averill/Division of Transit and Rail (DTR)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After the discontinuation of FREX, CDOT found itself in possession of 10 FREX buses, so DTR tried to find homes for the vehicles and posted a Request for Proposals, with 20% local match required. We received only two proposals, one from Summit County and one from Eagle County. Summit County will take eight buses and Eagle County will take two. CDOT will bill them for the match, and they will take possession in the coming weeks. • DTR recently closed its 2-year Call for Projects. It received a total of \$ 40 M in requests for the \$ 30 M available. Half of the applications were for 	<p>No action taken.</p>

	<p>vehicle replacements. DTR staff and the regions will now begin the review process, anticipating completion next year.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Advanced Guideway Study (AGS) continues, evaluating high speed transit options between DIA and Eagle County Airport. This effort is being coordinated with the Interregional Connectivity Study (ICS). We're currently asking people to identify the best options. Technology proposals have been received and will be screened against engineering guidelines. • The 2013 Statewide Intercity and Regional Bus Study is a nine month study to identify needs and priorities throughout the state and opportunities for connectivity. The SOW has been finalized, and consultant selection will begin shortly. • Proposals for the Statewide Transit Plan – Colorado's first – are due Oct 29th. The Plan is required by state statute. With a 15 month schedule, it will identify passenger needs and priorities, will include a Survey of the Elderly and Disabled, and will be coordinated with all Human Services Transportation Plans. • MAP-21 brought changes to programs: JARC (5316) and New Freedom (5317) were eliminated as stand-alone programs. Those activities are now eligible under the Formula Grants for Other than Urbanized Areas Program (5311) in rural areas and through the revamped 5310 program for urbanized areas. Overall funding levels for the 5311 program have been increased due to Colorado's high rural transit ridership. The discretionary grants programs under section 5309 (Bus and Bus Facilities, Livability, etc.) have undergone some significant changes. Rural agencies will now apply directly to CDOT for funding under the revamped Bus and Bus Facilities Formula Program (5339), where a total of \$1.25m has been authorized on an annual basis. Small urbanized area providers will now receive these funds directly from FTA. 	
<p>Central Federal Lands Access Program/John Cater/FHWA</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This program provides support for those roads that provide access to federal lands, although they are owned or maintained by the DOT or local entities. A Committee will be formed, and projects will be selected by representatives from the state DOT and local government. The appropriate entity in Colorado is the STAC. Do you feel STAC should take on this responsibility? As FY '13 funding is available now, this needs to get up and running as soon as possible. Federal lands will be meeting with CDOT a week from today. Eligible projects must be designed and ready to go, and a match requirement must be finalized. Military bases 	<p>Motion approved-STAC to participate in Central Federal Lands Access Program.</p>

	are not excluded, but they do have other streams of federal funding. Wayne moved that STAC participate. Diane seconded. Motion approved.	
Other Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• None.	No action taken.