

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

**Location:** CDOT Headquarters Auditorium

**Date/Time:** August 10, 2012 9:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.

**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/July Minutes/Vince Rogalski/STAC Chair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minutes approved.</li> </ul>	<b>Action-</b> Approve minutes.
Transportation Commission (TC) Report/Vince Rogalski/STAC Chair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vince reported that, at its last meeting, the TC discussed MAP-21, the new Operations Division, and the advancement of Surface Treatment funds.</li> <li>• Jim Austin noted concern that funding would be taken away from rural Colorado roads. Vince responded that he'd been continually reminding Commissioners that some of these roads are the only way into and out of certain areas. He reminded STAC members of the importance of talking to your Regional Directors about what is important.</li> <li>• Pete Fraser noted the need to underscore the issue of safety- some of these roads have not been worked on for a very long time.</li> </ul>	No action taken.
Transit and Rail Advisory Committee (TRAC) Update/Mark Imhoff/Division of Transit and Rail (DTR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A resolution will be going to the TC next week for the disposal of 10 FREX buses. FREX operations will cease in August. Buses will be offered to Colorado transit providers first for 20% local match on the residual value (\$ 140,000 per bus). These are 40-foot buses with one passenger door, with no restrooms. Applications must be submitted, and a lottery will be held if interest exceeds the buses available. If all buses are not disposed of in-state, they will then be offered for bids out of state.</li> <li>• DTR worked over this past winter to update the process on grant contracts. In early May, there were 110 contracts still in backlog, which DTR has since worked hard to execute. As of a week ago, 42 contracts have been executed, 28 are with locals for signature, 12 are with the Contracts group, 10 are awaiting budget approval from FTA, 10 have been withdrawn, and 16 are still in the SOW development state with the applicants. DTR is pushing hard to get the remaining contracts executed and to ensure there is no backlog in the future.</li> </ul>	No action taken.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are 49 2012 FASTER Transit grants. Of these, one has been executed, eight are with locals for signature, one is ready to go out for signature, six have been withdrawn, and 33 are still in SOW development. Good progress is being made.</li> <li>• Development of a new Transit Grant Module is underway.</li> <li>• The 2014-2015 FASTER Transit Grants call for projects is out. Applications are due end of September.</li> <li>• Colorado did very well in the 2012 FTA 5309 Discretionary Grant program, with \$18 million in awards</li> <li>• The Interregional Connectivity Study, Advanced Guideway Study, Transit Capital Asset Inventory, and Interregional and Regional Bus Study are all underway, and will lead up to the Statewide Transit Plan.</li> <li>• Diane noted that articles in the newspapers concerning the AGS seemed to imply that route selection had been completed, and she advised DTR emphasize that this is an ongoing process.</li> </ul>	
Inactive Projects/John Cater/FHWA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FHWA was the subject of a national external audit that was extremely critical about the number and dollar value of inactive projects. Inactive projects are projects that have been obligated, but for which no expenditures have been incurred for over a year. An audit finding was issued in July, requiring FHWA to “get this cleaned up” by the end of August. In Colorado, 40 projects are considered inactive. This must be reduced to below five in the next few weeks. As of yesterday, 26 of these projects are still inactive, 57% of these are local projects. Nearly all of these projects will need to be de-obligated, unless some progress is made in the next few days. Sometimes the issue with an inactive project is that the work is underway, but bills have not been submitted. If this is the case, it’s important to send the bill in right away. We all have to make sure a project is really ready before the funding is awarded.</li> <li>• Whether to maintain project priority is within the discretion of the local planning entity</li> <li>• This concerns both projects that already have a contract, as well as those that are obligated, but for which a contract has not yet been executed.</li> </ul>	No action taken.
Federal Lands Access Program/John Cater/FHWA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One of the new programs in MAP-21 is the Federal Lands Access Program. There has always been a federal lands program that dealt with access to public lands, National Forests, BLM, National Parks, etc., but the basic premise of this new program is providing access to federal lands on</li> </ul>	No action taken.

	<p>infrastructure owned by state and local governments. This new program requires a local match. The money comes to Colorado through a formula based on recreational visits, federal land area, public facilities on federal land, and bridges on federal land.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The program is administered by a three-member committee charged with selecting projects that represent all interests in the state. One member will be from the Federal Lands Division of FHWA, one from the state DOT, and one, a representative of local government. This may be the STAC, providing another opportunity to weigh in on transportation programming in Colorado. Details will be released over the next several months. bike/ped paths would be eligible, as well, although it's not yet clear whether military bases are eligible, as there are other programs for access to defense facilities.</li> </ul>	
<p>Federal and State Legislative Update/Herman Stockinger &amp; Kurt Morrison/CDOT Office of Policy &amp; Government Relations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Both Herman and Kurt were unavailable, and no federal/state update was provided.</li> <li>Sandi Kohrs noted that FHWA discretionary grant awards were recently announced and that Colorado did particularly well, and was the 6th highest state in terms of funds awarded with a total of \$9.9 million. This will likely be the final major grant award announcement from FHWA for the next several years. MAP-21 either eliminated or converted to formula grants all 12 discretionary grant programs issuing awards this week.</li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>
<p>MAP-21/Sandi Kohrs/Division of Transportation Development (DTD)/Laurie Freedle/Office of Financial Management and Budget (OFMB)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MAP-21 offers increased flexibility. OFMB is often being asked, "What is happening with the FY '13 budget?" OFMB is verifying that funding will be available as programmed in the adopted budget, and doesn't anticipate any significant changes will be necessary. In the coming months, the TC will be looking at how this increased flexibility will play out in the FY '14 budget.</li> <li>MAP-21 includes some performance measures and some penalty triggers for tailing to meet those measures.</li> <li>Set-asides for some programs have been eliminated. The Transportation Enhancement (TE) program has been eliminated, and Safe Routes to School no longer has dedicated funding, although it remains eligible under the new Transportation Alternatives (TA) program. The TA program has an off-the-top portion (\$ 1.5 million) that goes to the Department of Natural Resources for recreational trails. The state may choose to opt out of the program.</li> <li>Up to 50% of funds in any program can be transferred to another program.</li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>

	<p>The only exceptions are Metropolitan Planning and TA. Funds may not be transferred into or out of either of these programs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many of the other programs, STP and NHPP, for example, are now eligible for different kinds of projects, such as bike paths, although it is not known if the TC will choose to find those kinds of projects with these funds.</li> <li>• Beginning with FY '13, Safe Routes to School will no longer provide 100% funding for a project – it will now require an 80/20 match.</li> <li>• A memo from Laurie Freedle and Kurt Morrison was distributed, which included a spreadsheet illustrating types of projects now eligible under the new funding programs.</li> <li>• There are several AASHTO committees taking a “deep dive” into the new legislation to identify issues and answer questions, and then provide findings to FHWA. Sandi and others from CDOT are involved in some committees.</li> <li>• Tim Harris added that there are now penalty triggers for not dealing adequately with High Risk Rural Roads.</li> <li>• Laurie Freedle noted that when one federal transportation bill expires, and is replaced by a new bill, apportionments under the old bill expire within four years of the time the apportionments were made available. OFMB is currently examining this and will be contacting the MPOs about getting these funds obligated. OFMB will be coming up with a process, and talking with the Regions and the TMAs.</li> <li>• Pete Fraser asked whether the Transportation Alternatives funding will be distributed to the Regions. Laurie responded that OFMB had not yet come to a determination on this.</li> </ul>	
<p>Allocation of Additional Funds/Laurie Freedle/OFMB/Tim Harris/Chief Engineer</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussions regarding the allocation of additional federal funds have been underway for a few months now. Earlier this year, we realized that federal revenues for FY '14 were probably going to come in a little higher than forecasted, and that we would have more contingency than needed. \$ 67 million is now available for the TC to allocate. We will know more about redistribution in late August or early September.</li> <li>• Staff developed a list of potential projects for consideration by STAC and the TC. The Chief Engineer requested the RTDs provide a list of projects that could quickly be “ready to go”. The list totals \$ 243 million dollars, is not prioritized, and includes construction, design, and PEL studies.</li> <li>• Several options for funding projects from this list were considered, and two options will be presented to the TC for discussion. Action will not occur</li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>

	<p>until September.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAC previously recommended putting some of this money into Surface Treatment. Part of the discussion with the TC involves advancing \$ 84 million in Surface Treatment funding, so there is less need to use some of the \$ 67 million for this purpose.</li> <li>• Steve Rudy asked which options attend to the MOUs? Laurie assured him that the TC will be reminded of the MOUs. Steve recommended an “MOU check” be done prior, with the results presented to the TC.</li> <li>• Diane asked how the projects were chosen and how was input obtained. Tim responded that the selections came about as a result of discussions with the RTDs. Diane stated that, typically, Region 3 provides an opportunity for TPR and MPO input. Tim responded that this is only for TC discussion and there will be no decision until September.</li> <li>• Wayne asked why, for Option 2, Powers Boulevard and US 50 were selected, as opposed to the Fillmore and Eden interchanges, which were TIGER applications. Tom Wrona put forward that Powers is an active construction project. The Fillmore project has the potential to be funded with other means, possibly with federal Bridge funds.</li> <li>• Peter Runyon requested that each individual RTD write a memo to the various TPRs within their regions to explain the thought process for the projects identified on the list for their regions. He noted that his TPR meets only quarterly and he would like to be able to send this out to his members for input. Laurie reiterated that, if the TC approves the action, there will be an additional \$ 84 million going out to surface treatment. Tim added that CDOT would support the options provided, and look to the Regions to make the best recommendations.</li> </ul>	
<p>Accelerated Program Delivery/Tim Harris/Chief Engineer</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff is recommending that the TC advance \$ 84 million from FY '14 surface treatment funds to be expended on the NHS and Interstate, which ties into the “tiering” discussion of prior months. By advancing this \$ 84 million, along with what is already planned for FY '13, Surface Treatment will increase to roughly \$ 200 million this year, and then \$ 180 million the following year.</li> <li>• The TC has been discussing low volume reads and a “least cost” approach. There is currently \$ 50 million – out of \$ 134 million – programmed for non-NHS roads, but many of these programming decisions were made several years ago, and plans are ready. The staff recommendation is to “leave FY '13 alone,” and move on with FY '14, with the advancement of</li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>

	<p>dollars focused on the Interstate and NHS, while the TC considers a Tiering policy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Craig Casper inquired whether USDOT performance measures for the NHS had been determined. John said he'd heard rumors it could be having a percentage of the NHS meet a certain condition level.</li> </ul>	
<p>Online Transportation Information System (OTIS)/Gary Aucott/DTD</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gary Aucott of DTD's Information Management Branch provided a demonstration of OTIS, which will be available externally at the end of the month. The objective of OTIS is to achieve a greater level of data integration by bringing together multiple data sources into a single, more accessible user interface. It does not contain crash data. There will be a second phase that will include a construction map view. See: <a href="http://dtdapps.coloradodot.info/otis">http://dtdapps.coloradodot.info/otis</a>.</li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>
<p>Other Business</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peter Runyon asked for an update on the I-70 Co-Development project. Tony DeVito responded that the RFP is out, and the response period closes this week. CDOT will begin an internal review of proposals received, and interviews will follow. Tony predicted he'd be able to provide another update in a month or two.</li> <li>• The I-70 Viaduct is still in the NEPA process. The collaborative team came to a decision to keep the current alignment. Conversation continues. The first phase is expected to cost at least a billion dollars. One conceptual idea that has come forward is to take out the viaduct, trench its footprint, and, over that, build a section that connects the two sides together. CDOT is working with FHWA to have the preferred alternative identified by the end of this year.</li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>