

**DRAFT STAC
January 14, 2010 Meeting Minutes**

Location: CDOT Headquarters Auditorium
Date/Time: January 14, 2010 1:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
Chairman: Vince Rogalski
Attendance: A sign-in sheet was distributed to note attendance at the meeting.

Agenda Items/Presenters/Affiliations	Presentation Highlights	Actions
Introductions	Everyone in the room gave self-introductions.	No Action taken
December Meeting Minutes	<i>December minutes approved.</i>	<i>Minutes approved</i>
Federal & State Legislative Update-Herman Stockinger	<p>A discussion on a new jobs bill has started at the congressional level. There is no news as of yet on the TIGER grants. Also, the last appropriations bill had a \$600 million grant program similar to the TIGER grant program. This same \$600 million will be used to create a new grant program with match requirements. States should be hearing from the USDOT on this new grant program shortly.</p> <p>The new FY11 congressional appropriations notebook has been prepared. This list includes all the projects currently identified in the STIP and aviation projects. We have the opportunity to pull projects from the notebook if those projects get funded by the new jobs bill. Staff is looking for the TC to take action on the notebook in January.</p> <p>The legislative session has begun. The focus this year will be on balancing the budget. We anticipate a few bills related to FASTER; some would try to repeal FASTER and others would change the late fee structure. As bills related to transportation policy get introduced in session, Government Relations staff will bring them to the STAC for discussion.</p>	Approved - FY 11 Congressional Appropriations Notebook

	<p>H. Copp passed out a summary sheet on the U.S. House version of the 'Jobs for Main Street America' bill. The current bill passed by the House will certainly get changed once introduced in the Senate. What we know is that CDOT will be on a very tight timeframe so we need to start the STIP amendment process now. Because of the tight timeframe we would potentially need to go to ad with projects within weeks of the bill being signed to make the proposed 90 day deadline identified in the current legislation. Priorities will be given to projects that can be completed in a three-year timeframe and that are located in economically distressed areas (EDAs). States shall ensure that there is an equitable distribution of funding and an appropriate balance between urban and rural projects. For Colorado, the geographic equity provision is in direct conflict with giving priority to projects in EDAs.</p> <p>The funding is 100% federal, 50% of the funds must be under contract after 90 days after apportionment. FHWA is helping to define 'under contract' and is trying to get that language changed. FHWA/FTA has 21 days after enactment to apportion the funds. The current version of the bill includes maintenance of effort and extensive reporting requirements. Current estimates have Colorado receiving \$409 million in highway dollars. The bill states that 3% off the top would go to enhancement projects and 30% would get sub allocated to metro areas with populations greater than 200,000. A proposed \$60 million will be a discretionary grant program available nationwide.</p> <p>CDOT will distribute the new jobs bill funding using the 'new funding formula.' The new formula applies to new funding sources created through any new legislation and is distributed using a 70% congestion and 30% system quality calculation.</p> <p>We hope to see significant policy related changes in the Senate version of the bill, but it is unknown when the Senate will take up the bill. The current House version extends SATETEA-LU until the end of the current fiscal year and backfills the HUTF trust fund with \$20 billion in highway and \$4 billion in transit funding.</p> <p>FHWA is working with us to streamline the STIP amendment process and we</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>will be asking the MPOs to modify their processes to meet these short deadlines.</p> <p>M. Ireland – Question: Is it possible for us to identify projects from previous lists that could be ready in 90 days and are located in economically distressed areas?</p> <p>P. Hutton – Response: RTDs have already been directed to look at projects that could be ready in 90 days that are in EDA areas. These are really difficult timelines that simply don't work.</p> <p>B. Garcia – Comment: The tight timelines will be especially difficult in the DRCOG area.</p> <p>H. Copp – Response: We are looking for FHWA to adjust the guidance to possibly reduce the public involvement period. FHWA is looking into various options to provide flexibility with the short timeframe and should provide guidance soon.</p> <p>R. George – Comment: This is really like a fire drill. We will do everything we can to make this meaningful. The way the house bill is written, it sets us up for failure. Failure is defined as not having the opportunity to take full advantage to improve our infrastructure. We need to short cut our normal process and short cut our process in a fair and open way in order to take full advantage of the funding. We need to think about the House bill as the worst case scenario and the most likely case. When we have to hurry we all have to be flexible.</p> <p>W. Williams – Question: Sen. Bennett and Sec. Ray LaHood are having a panel discussion tomorrow; what are the key messages that we need to be sending?</p> <p>R. George- Response: There are two messages we want to send. First, thank you for this opportunity. We can do this. We are up for the challenge. Secondly, explain the difficulties in the details of the bill.</p> <p>H. Stockinger – Response: We need to tell Sen. Bennett and Sec. LaHood that</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>we can do it again. To have the type of urban and rural equity the bill requires will be difficult to do in 90 days. Specific things are 'more time is required' and change the bill language from 'contract' to 'obligation.' The EDA areas are a concern for Colorado.</p> <p>H. Copp/ H. Stockinger – Response: The focus of the bill is still capital investment. The transit section is more restrictive on timing requirements, but the project eligibility is the same as ARRA.</p> <p>C. Davidson – Question: In the NFR area it was difficult coming up with shovel ready projects – what do we do?</p> <p>B. Garcia- Response: Shovel ready projects mean eight weeks – that is a problem. The real issue is the EDA requirement.</p> <p>P. Hutton – Comment: I would encourage the TPRs to get with the RTDs to develop an approach as quickly as possible.</p> <p>W. Williams – Question: What was the average time from obligation to contracting; what is the range?</p> <p>P. Hutton – Response: In a perfect world it takes 60 days to get us to project award. Additional time is required to get to a signed contract.</p>	
<p>Federal Livability Initiative Program Grants- Eric Ellis & Jennifer Finch</p>	<p>This is a capital grant program through FTA's 5309 Bus and Bus Facility Program. This grant is under the livability initiative with HUD and EPA and each project must include a 'livability' component. CDOT is responsible for submitting a consolidated application on behalf of the rural transit providers in cooperation with CASTA.</p> <p>T. Bushner - Question: Why are the match rate numbers different for some of the applications?</p> <p>Response: Some of the providers are overmatching projects.</p>	<p>STAC approved the list as presented</p>

	Look for more transit and livability type of funding with more involvement from EPA and HUD in the future.	
CMAQ Update- Jennifer Finch	<p>We have not reached an agreed upon new CMAQ formula yet. We will continue funding our non-attainment areas, maintenance areas and our rural PM10 areas. We will continue funding our five rural areas off the top at the \$200,000 dollar per year level, as well as focus on ozone non-attainment areas as we continue to look at the various funding scenarios. We will also look at both on-system and off-system VMT for the major facilities on the NHS. All of our previous formulas have been based on on-system VMT. We will also look at scenarios that would provide funding for 'potential' non-attainment areas designated by 2012 based on new EPA guidelines. We are looking to get TC action on a funding scenario in February.</p> <p>More detailed scenarios will be provided in the next few weeks and we are looking to get a formula adopted by the TC in February so that CMAQ funding can be included in the new resource allocation.</p>	No Action Taken
FASTER Safety Project – Bob Garcia	<p>Staff is close to finalizing a FY 11 FASTER safety projects constrained list. DTD and Gov. Relations are working on FASTER fact sheets for legislators. STAC requested that the fact sheets be distributed to STAC members to help create a common message.</p> <p>Each of the RTDs reviewed their process and the projects on each region list by category.</p> <p>W. Williams – Question: Can we get these projects mapped?</p> <p>H. Stockinger – Response: The fact sheets should help with project location information. We are looking for approval on the project lists in February by both STAC and the TC.</p> <p>W. Williams – Question: Can we look at the bridge projects? Also, as a part of the presentation next month include some discussion on geographic equity.</p> <p>H. Copp – Response: There are no bridge enterprise projects identified past</p>	No Action Taken

	<p>FY10. Additionally, the bridge enterprise does not want to identify any projects beyond FY10.</p> <p>H. Stockinger – Comment: By the end of the day the bridge enterprise annual report will be available on the CDOT website. That has 10 candidate projects and a list of 100 poorly rated bridges statewide.</p> <p>B. Garcia – Overarching Comment: We are looking to get an agreement with how the process is unfolding.</p> <p>Result: STAC was in agreement that the project list process was moving forward in a positive way.</p>	
<p>Revenue Projections for FY 12 – FY17 STIP Cycle</p>	<p>Pat Saffo gave the revenue projection presentation which covered four scenarios and the revenue assumptions. Pat’s presentation covered the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RA update is to facilitate development of FY2012-FY2017 STIP • Only FY2012-FY2017 revenues will be forecasted • Constant dollar LRP total will remain the same through 2035 <p>The three revenue scenarios are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scenario #1– Highway Trust Fund (HTF) generates revenue from estimated deposits into the HTF only – no rescissions or general fund transfers • Scenario #2 – Assumes a five cent federal gas tax increase to be deposited into the HTF • Scenario #3 – Uses current Oberstar proposal - \$450B general fund transfer to HTF <p>S. Rudy – Question: Does scenario 1 give you any cause for pause knowing what we will have to deal with in the upcoming legislative session (e.g. proposed bills that would repeal FASTER?)</p> <p>H. Stockinger – Response: An honest scenario is the best scenario we could come up with. Without general fund revenue our revenues do begin to bottom out.</p>	<p><i>STAC recommended Resource Allocation Scenario 1</i></p>

	<p>S. Rudy – Question: How does 90% obligation limit compare with actual obligation limit during SAFETEA-LU?</p> <p>H. Copp – Response: We have been averaging about 90% obligation limit under SAFETEA-LU. There are no rescissions built into any of the scenarios because there is no legislative foundation to place a rescission in any of the forecasts.</p> <p>T. Bushner – Question: On the second scenario, what is the source for the \$.05 tax increase?</p> <p>H. Copp – Response: A national blue ribbon panel on transportation proposed a gas tax increase of \$.05. We additionally ran an analysis increasing the price of gas to \$5.00 per gallon, at that level there is more diversion of revenue because of decreased gas consumption. We can provide that scenario to those who are interested.</p>	
Other Business	<p>Southwest TPR has developed a resolution of transportation principles to pass along to the legislature. SWTPR is looking for the STAC to support this resolution and will develop something more appropriate from the statewide perspective at the next STAC meeting. The resolution would need to further explain and define the term 'restructuring funding so it is more sustainable' in order to obtain agreement by the STAC.</p>	