

**DRAFT STAC Meeting Minutes  
December 14, 2012**

**Location:** CDOT Headquarters Auditorium  
**Date/Time:** December 14, 2012 9:00 a.m. – 11:30  
**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/November/Vince Rogalski/STAC Chair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introductions were made and minutes approved.</li> </ul>	<b>Action-</b> Approve minutes.
Transportation Commission (TC) Report/Debra Perkins-Smith/Division of Transportation Development (DTD)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Transportation Commission's Statewide Plan Subcommittee will meet and review the draft Policy Directive 14 (PD 14) Goals and Performance Measures for the next Statewide Plan. In January, there will then be a joint meeting of both the Statewide Plan Subcommittee and the Asset Management Subcommittees, to review Statewide Plan policies and Revenue Projections.</li> <li>• Revenue Scenarios are currently under development, through the Revenue Projection Subcommittee of the STAC. The Commission wants to see multiple planning scenarios.</li> <li>• The Commission also reviewed the proposed Managed Lanes Policy. They want consistency throughout the state, in so far as managed lanes being strongly considered for every capacity project. The consideration effort must be documented.</li> <li>• Right now, the Asset Management Committee is focusing on equipment – the percentage of average life of our fleet is 92%, and those being replaced are at 118%.</li> <li>• Bridge Enterprise shared their 10 Year Plan. Now we have a guidance manual, a candidate bridge list, and a master calendar for bridge projects.</li> <li>• The Twin Tunnels project is estimated to provide approximately \$ 11.5 M in travel time savings in the first year. Geotechnical analysis for the tunnel project is currently underway.</li> <li>• The Commission approved the Draft FY '14 Budget, and approved a NEPA policy directive.</li> </ul>	No action taken.

<p>Regional-Commuter Bus Plan/Mark Imhoff/Division of Transit and Rail (DTR)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mark announced that Don Hunt appointed Vince Rogalski to represent STAC at TRAC. Vince will attend his first TRAC meeting in January.</li> <li>• While no decisions have been made, next week, the Intermodal Committee and DTR will discuss a concept to develop and fund Regional-Commuter Bus (RCB) service. The goal is to focus RCB service in congested, high-volume corridors, linking population and employment centers along the I-25 corridor, between Fort Collins, Denver and Colorado Springs at peak commuting times; and on the I-70 mountain corridor between Grand Junction, Glenwood Springs, Vail, Frisco, and Denver, during peak travel periods.</li> <li>• An Inter City Bus (ICB) Study is just getting underway to evaluate connections to other parts of the state.</li> <li>• The most efficient transit services are well-integrated into a cohesive network, where connections can be made between local and regional transit service. The RCB system will not only provide interregional transit service in the most congested corridors; it will also serve to connect many of the largest transit agencies in the state, where service gaps currently exist.</li> <li>• This will be the first time CDOT is considering operating buses. DTR is working with the Attorney General's office, looking into the legal aspects of the concept. The statutory language creating the Division of Transit &amp; Rail and the FASTER Statewide Transit funds gives CDOT the authority to develop and fund transit services, including the use of FASTER Statewide Transit funds for operations and maintenance.</li> <li>• FASTER funds would provide a sustained annual funding source. Needs are estimated to be approximately \$2.5 M/year for interregional bus operations. A fleet is anticipated to cost \$ 7.5 M. There is still a little over \$2 M remaining from SB-1 dedicated to transit and \$ 500,000 in the FREX account. DTR is also looking to see if some CMAQ funding could be applied for.</li> <li>• While CDOT would be the owner/operator of the RCB service, the system is predicated on strong local partnerships. We'll need partnership agreements for in-kind services, access to the other systems, park-n-rides, and service to come out to bus breakdowns. If we receive Commission approval to move forward, we will begin by setting up a subcommittee of TRAC to examine issues. The proposed funding and operating plan has CDOT purchasing and owning the rolling stock (bus fleet), and contracting out the operations and maintenance. In this way, if there is ever a contractual</li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>
--	---	-------------------------

	<p>issue with the private operator, CDOT can bring in a new operator and utilize the same bus fleet.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Next week, DTR will bring this to the Intermodal Committee. If they recommend consideration by the full Commission, and the Commission recommends staff continue to move forward, staff proposes to develop a formal Regional-Commuter Bus Plan over the winter for action by the Commission in Spring, 2013.</li> <li>• Wayne Williams remarked that, after the years of pushing by STAC to obtain operating funds for transit, it's good to see CDOT moving forward making operating transit a statewide effort.</li> </ul>	
<p>State Demography Presentation/Elizabeth Garner/State Demography Office (SDO)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The 2010 Census showed us that, in the ten years prior, Colorado increased by 700,000 people. While the US, as a whole, grew by 9%, Colorado grew by 17%. Our 2040 forecast is about 120,000 less than we projected last year, due to the recession. A lot will depend on how well we attract and retain business. The North Front Range is the fastest-growing region, followed by the western slope, with a lot of growth along the I-70 corridor. Population growth forecasts for the western slope and northwest areas are now revised down, due to a slowdown in oil and gas development, but remain greater than the state average.</li> <li>• Persons 65+ comprise only about 10 percent of the population, but by 2030, they will increase to 25 percent, meaning we'll transition from a relatively young population to relatively average. Services for the 65+ will be in great demand, and the 75+ group will become the fastest-growing group. We'll also see a decline in household size, along with huge growth in single person households. Living alone increased by 26 percent, while persons age 65+ living alone increased by 32 percent.</li> <li>• Do people drive differently by age? Do they consume services differently by age? Today, a 45-65 year old may be a commuter, and spends the largest percentage of their income on fuel. But the number of persons in this highest-earning, largest-spending, highest-taxed group is now declining. The highest earners will become non-earners. And they become a growing share of our population over time. 65+ spends less on retail goods, property tax, and fuel for vehicles. With increasing numbers of older persons commuting and interactions on roadway system will be different-commuters may become day travelers, and disabilities may be more prevalent.</li> <li>• The number of Hispanics grew 40 percent over the decade. Very generally</li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>

	<p>speaking, Hispanic households tend to earn about \$ 30,000 less in income. As the number of Hispanic households in Colorado grows, how will that affect transportation? Youth unemployment has been greater than in any other group – about 50 percent. Will they ever be able to achieve what their parents achieved? Smaller household sizes and lower incomes could mean people need to live further away from cities to find affordable housing.</p>	
<p>Statewide Plan Update/Michelle Scheuerman/DTD</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It's important that Colorado's Statewide Plan have its own "brand." DTD is looking at early branding of other state transportation plans to identify useful approaches. We plan early public engagement through early messaging.</li> <li>• MAP-21 requires that this plan be performance-based. Performance measures start with goals, and goals need to be structured to align with the performance reporting required in MAP-21. DTD will prepare early-draft performance measures, and bring to STAC, just to get the discussion started.</li> <li>• In June or July, we will begin early public involvement with the TPRs.</li> <li>• We've begun data collecting efforts. In previous plans, data was mapped, but we hope to develop ways to use the data – possibly still with mapping – in such a way as to tell a story. We'll start by bringing it to STAC and asking what it means to you. And we'll get your thoughts on ways to engage persons who are totally unfamiliar with transportation issues.</li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>
<p>Federal and State Legislative Update/Kurt Morrison/Office of Policy and Government Relations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Fiscal Cliff" negotiations continue - it's likely that one of three measures will be punted to be dealt with in 2013. Many rumors are floating around, but few solid facts are out there at this point.</li> <li>• CDOT will be requesting two bills in the state legislature this year: one to make a technical correction to oversize overweight permit law, and one to establish improvements to the Motorcycle Operator Safety Training program.</li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>
<p>Proposed Changes to FASTER Transit Program/Tom Mauser/DTR</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DTR's intent is to use all available FASTER funds within the current fiscal year, and it is therefore proposing the following changes to the FASTER Transit Program:</li> <li>• <i>Process for reprogramming current unspent FASTER funds:</i> When a Region cannot use its entire FASTER transit funding allocation, DTR believes these</li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>

	<p>funds should be distributed to the other Regions, using the existing allocation formula. If the Regions have not ranked their projects, the funds will be placed in the FY 14 pool. Projects will be selected using the current review process;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>Process for reprogramming future unspent FASTER funds:</i> Starting in FY 2014, if a project has not shown significant progress toward scope development by October 31 of that fiscal year, DTR or a Region may determine that the project should be withdrawn, and funded instead from a future year's allocation, or withdrawn indefinitely;</li><li>• <i>Improved eligibility screening:</i> DTR has been increasing and improving its use of metrics to rank vehicle replacement requests. However, the metrics should be used across the board and enforced. DTR is proposing the use of metrics (vehicle miles, hours of service, condition) as threshold eligibility criteria. A vehicle request that doesn't meet the criteria could be considered for funding in a later year.</li><li>• To make this process work, the Regions must develop a ranked list of projects that continues past anticipated funding availability, and includes other projects that would be eligible for additional funding if it becomes available. This would be a list of projects that received a passing score and are ready to implement. The Region could transfer the funds from a withdrawn project to a project on this list, provided the chosen local agency could actually proceed with its project with that amount of funding, not merely "bank" the funds for a future date.</li><li>• Should no ready projects be available, DTR would determine if there are any other unfunded capital project requests in that Region, and seek to fund those capital requests with the withdrawn FASTER funds. If there are no unfunded capital projects in that Region, DTR could then make that Region's FASTER funds available to another Region.</li><li>• Rob MacDonald expressed concern over the reallocation of funds without the recipient's input. Pete Fraser put forward that that project concerns should be brought to the Regions before action is taken, adding that not all of the Regions have equal opportunity: there are large areas that have no transit at all. Steve Rudy advised that the proposed approach to projects with insufficient scope development be brought to the TRAC for further analysis.</li></ul>	
--	--	--

<p>Revenue Projections Update/Laurie Freedle/Office of Financial Management and Budget (OFMB)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most revenues are forecast using CDOT’s revenue model. For the next Statewide Plan, the model estimates the revenues from the State Highway Users Tax Fund (HUTF), and other sources, including federal funds, that are used for programs administered by CDOT. The model depends on macroeconomic and demographic forecasts as inputs, from which it estimates transportation activities and the revenues that may be derived from them.</li> <li>• The Revenue Projection Subcommittee has been meeting, and is now working on developing several revenue scenarios. OFMB is recommending that for long range plan fiscal constraint purposes, no new revenue sources are assumed, and only those in current law are used. We also recommend that for those existing sources, the assumptions are limited to only what the model indicates they will generate under current law and economic conditions.</li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>
<p>Region Boundaries/Tim Harris/Chief Engineer</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Since the last STAC meeting, CDOT met with Progressive 15, Action 22, Club 20, Summit County, North Front Range, to receive input on proposed changes, and we continue to look at options. This is not a resource allocation issue – it’s a customer service/operations issue. We continue to look at TPRs, MPOs, counties, engineering districts, commission districts, and, from each of those perspectives, how to best operate and provide the best customer service. One question is: How big should any one region get? The good news is that we should get a recommendation to the Executive Director next Monday. The first decision is: should we change anything at all?</li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>
<p>Accelerated Program Delivery/Tim Harris/Chief Engineer</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Governor will be holding a press conference this afternoon to talk about the Responsible Acceleration of Maintenance and Partnerships (RAMP) program. This allows us to use \$ 300,000 a year more of our already-programmed funds for projects. This is not new money, or a permanent fix, and doesn’t solve all our issues; it’s just a different way of managing money that we already have programmed, for the five years of the program.</li> <li>• The program has two focus areas: Acceleration of Maintenance and Partnerships. Acceleration of Maintenance means more ability to take care</li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>

	<p>of what you already have, for example, surface treatment, bridge replacement, tunnels, road equipment and facilities. Partnerships can be either public/public or public/private. CDOT has already ventured into these on I-25 and the Twin Tunnels projects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Commission will begin discussing project selection criteria, and later, projects will be selected. We shouldn't let concern about the details overwhelm this great opportunity available to us. And, in 2017, TransBonds payments end, so we'll then have another \$ 167 M to work with.</li> <li>• Steve Rudy added that CDOT will have an entirely expenditure-based budget in place by that time, which should facilitate this. Gary Beedy expressed concern that this approach misleads the public, as this is not really not additional funding – just an acceleration of expenditures. Vince echoed this concern, noting that, as soon as people hear funding is available, they begin to put forward new projects. But we're not looking at new projects – this is not a call for projects. That needs to be part of the message. Rob MacDonald questioned whether making the announcement of availability of these funds wouldn't later make it difficult for CDOT to tell the legislature that it needs more money?</li> <li>• Proposed project selection criteria will be brought to STAC in January.</li> </ul>	
Other Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>	No action taken.