

DRAFT STAC Meeting Minutes
July 15, 2011

Location: CDOT Headquarters Auditorium

Date/Time: July 15, 2011 9:00 a.m. – 11:15 a.m.

Chairman: Vince Rogalski

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

Agenda Items/Presenters/Affiliations	Presentation Highlights	Actions
Introductions	<i>Everyone in the room gave self-introductions.</i>	No action taken
June Meeting Minutes	<i>June minutes were approved.</i>	Minutes approved
Transportation Commission (TC) Report – Vince Rogalski	<p>Vince related the following about the June TC meetings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The parties involved seem to be leaning toward the southern alignment for the reconstructed I-70 viaduct. • The TC is preparing for the next transportation plan now that the 2035 amendment is mostly done. • The TC took under advisement letting the Front Range Express (FREX) bus service receive about \$220,000 of proceeds held in escrow from the sale of the nine SB 1-funded buses for FREX operational expenses. • Considered changing some of the Transportation Commission (TC) rules, which haven't changed since 1991. 	No action taken.
Federal and State Legislative Update – Melissa Nelson	<p>At the federal level, the U.S. House of Representatives is pushing a two-year transportation authorization bill and the U.S. Senate a six-year authorization bill. The two-year bill offers more funding per year than the six-year bill. At the state level, CDOT is developing its legislative agenda in concert with the Governor's Office for the next legislative session.</p> <p>For TIGER funding, CDOT will be selecting among several different proposals. CDOT can submit up to three applications to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA).</p>	No action taken.

<p>Federal Funding Update – Ben Stein/Laurie Freedle</p>	<p>Laurie Freedle said \$48.12M more is available in federal money for local projects than had been anticipated. That breaks down to this additional funding statewide for federal fiscal year (FFY) 2012: \$17.97M, Surface Transportation Program – Metropolitan (STP-M); \$2.35M, Bridge Off-System; \$22.22M, Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ); \$3.45M, Transportation Enhancement (TE); and \$2.14M, Metro Planning. She said the STAC eventually would be asked to decide among three possible options to recommend to the TC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 – Allocate 100 percent of the funding now. • 2 - Hold 100 percent of the funding in case 2012 funding levels are as short as has been predicted. • 3 - Allocate some portion now, with some money reserved in case of a FY 2012 funding shortfall. <p>The group discussed the pros and cons of the three different options, with some agreement that they needed more information before making a recommendation to the TC. Ben Stein said that recommendation can wait until August.</p> <p>Steve Rudy said he is not in favor of Option 2 because he wants the money to be used to “make whole” MPO allocations that were later reduced.</p> <p>In response to the discussion on the three options, Laurie Freedle said she will send to the STAC in the next week or so information about the resource allocation figures compared to the budgeted figures for FY 2011 and FY 2012, the FY 2012 budget with the additional funds, and the amounts that were reduced in the FY 2012 budget due to anticipated shortfalls. The STAC members are to receive the information on any federal program—such as Safe Routes to Schools, which received about \$1M more than anticipated—for which funding program figures changed.</p> <p>In addition to additional local agency funding, Laurie Freedle said the TC also anticipates receiving \$91M more money in flexible funding for FFY 2012. She said the TC could allocate this money:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Off the top for a strategically significant project, the I-70 Twin Tunnels. This money could be reserved for the years FY 2013-2105 or allocated and the spending authority advanced to other statewide projects –or- • Allocate the funds to a specific program, such as Surface Treatment 	<p>No action taken.</p>
--	---	-------------------------

	<p>She said the money could be allocated in two different ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 1a – Allocate and hold funding: This would ensure money would be available when it is needed, even if revenues go down. At the same time, setting aside money would prevent it from being used while the funds lose value due to inflation.• 1b – Allocate and advance projects: The state would benefit by getting projects advanced, primarily for surface treatment. However, a severe downturn in revenues could leave the CDOT Regions with no funding in the year of payback, or leave a project unfinished if payback is impossible. <p>Ben Stein said he doesn't know when the TC will make its final decision on possible approaches.</p> <p>Tony DeVito, Region 1 regional transportation director, said the Twin Tunnels project costs are projected to be \$55M for the eastbound lanes and \$105M for the westbound lanes. The TC has asked for more information on the costs and benefits of the westbound Twin Tunnels work. Region 1 will be placing in the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) \$5M of the funds, but environmental work won't be done for another year or so, and funds will need to be staggered over a three-year period.</p> <p>Pete Runyon said he's surprised the Twin Tunnels has been put forward in light of financial constraints, particularly the more expensive westbound lanes, but he totally supports the entire project.</p> <p>Tony DeVito and Diane Mitsch Bush both noted the Twin Tunnels project has garnered broad local support. Tony DeVito said the county has offered rights of way and permission to use a county road for the project, which can't be disregarded. Diane Mitsch Bush said the Twin Tunnels is a model for local-state partnerships and for putting projects on a fast track toward completion, and that CDOT shouldn't lose that kind of momentum. Although it's a Region 1 project, the Twin Tunnels affects the entire Western Slope and the tourism and energy sectors of the state's economy, she added.</p> <p>Steve Rudy said the Twin Tunnels are in DRCOG's planning area, and will be a factor in the financial Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that DRCOG has with CDOT.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>After more discussion, Vince Rogalski asked if the STAC is ready to move forward with using the additional federal funding for the Twin Tunnels. Rob MacDonald of Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments (PPACG) responded that he is not in favor of that action because the Twin Tunnels project isn't ready to go while some U.S. Department of Defense-oriented projects of about \$46M-\$70M within the Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments (PPACG) are. He added that PPACG also has a financial MOU with CDOT, but hasn't ever seen the level of funding provided. All the PPACG projects he mentioned have gone through environmental processes. The voters in 1999 approved a 28-item list of strategic projects with the expectation that they would be finished. Yet the incomplete projects are mostly in the Colorado Springs areas. For all those reasons, he said he wouldn't support spending all the \$91M in additional flexible funding for the Twin Tunnels.</p> <p>Ben Stein said the issue before the STAC is if it favors 1a or 1b.</p> <p>Responding to comments on the economic impact of I-70 Twin Tunnels improvements, Rob MacDonald said one Colorado Springs project on I-25 added 2,700 direct jobs to the area and 4,000 indirect jobs. Craig Casper added that the congestion on I-70 through the mountains is sporadic, occurring during the ski season less than 20 Sundays a year, while congestion problems on I-25 through Colorado Springs are frequent and year around. One traffic incident in Colorado Springs stopped all I-25 traffic for eight miles, for example. Tony DeVito said not all congestion problems on I-70 are confined to the winter skiing season. Traffic on I-70 on the July 4 weekend through the mountains was extremely heavy.</p> <p>CDOT could quantify the actual economic impacts of various projects and make its investment decisions accordingly, Craig Casper said. The TREDIS considers business impacts of different project decisions.</p> <p><i>Two Handouts: Local Additional Local Project Timing, Additional Federal Funding Workshop (PowerPoint Slides)</i></p>	
--	---	--

<p>Long Range Plans Research – Sandi Kohrs</p>	<p><u>Sandi Kohrs discussed a report compiled of various transportation planning approaches of state Departments of Transportation (DOTs)</u>noted that the full 21-page report was distributed just before the STAC meeting. Staff compiled the report when the<u>for the at the request of the- TC, at its annual retreat, who asked for information on what other DOTs were doing for planning.</u>The TC later asked for information on finances of other DOTs, which staff has been compiling and the STAC will review next month.</p> <p>Many of the states operate under very different powers than what is permitted under Colorado law. For example, Oregon and Pennsylvania have much different land use legislation than Colorado.</p> <p>Diane Mitsch Bush asked if the Utah governor’s veto against raising sales and use tax for transportation was overridden this session. Sandi Kohrs said staff will look into the matter, and staff from the Utah DOT will be visiting Colorado DOT office soon.</p> <p>A few state DOTs are facing changed laws about how they operate. In Washington State, transportation funding issues simply needed a vote in favor in the state legislature; now the legislature is saying any future transportation funding initiatives will have to go to the ballot.</p> <p>In response to a question from Cliff Davidson about whether staff discovered any planning initiatives that Colorado can use, Sandi Kohrs said that the next transportation plan probably will be much more performance based. That means that the plan will have more goals and outcomes. CDOT and the Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) will have to discuss how performance based plans can be done. Craig Casper said PPACG can’t use performance based planning because of the different funding and planning boundaries for PPACG.</p> <p>Starting in fall 2014, CDOT will go through a resource allocation process. The heavy lifting for the next transportation plan will take place in 2013 and into 2014. CDOT has met with some of the MPOs on some of the timing issues.</p> <p>The FASTER legislation added some planning factors to what CDOT already had, including reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Vince Rogalski said transit will have to do its part to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.</p>	<p>No action taken.</p>
--	---	-------------------------

	<p>From the 2035 plan debrief that took place after the last plan update, Sandi Kohrs said it seemed clear that CDOT needs to do a better job involving the public in transportation decisions using social media tools and other techniques beyond public meetings. She added that Policy Directive 14 requires certain goals to be met, which is a step in the right direction. However, she asked if it makes sense to have goals on record that can't be met under current funding. Also from the 2035 plan debrief, Sandi Kohrs said there were some procedural issues and concerns about the time invested in the planning process compared to the estimated dollars available.</p> <p>The results of the Smart Transportation initiative about reducing energy consumption in transportation that the Division of Transportation development is doing now also will need to be incorporated in the planning process. The Smart Transportation initiative was undertaken to help CDOT decide how to address the new planning factors contained in the FASTER legislation about energy savings and greenhouse gas emission reduction. Vince Rogalski said he thought more emphasis on transit might be one approach to reducing greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>During its planning process for the 2035 plan update, PPACG has been using scenario planning. Craig Casper suggested CDOT is well positioned to try scenario planning using its revenue planning model.</p> <p>Based on what she heard at a recent Transportation Research Board (TRB) meeting, state DOTs should deal with financial uncertainty by planning around different sets of numbers. They need to ask what would happen if more or less money became available than what they anticipate. Diane Mitsch Bush said future plans also need to place more emphasis on interconnectivity issues among different travel modes, so that people can move easily from vehicles to bikes and walking and to transit. Land use is an important element in interconnectivity issues, she said.</p>	
--	--	--

Cliff Davidson asked how MPOs and the state can plan for fiscal constraint in the face of so much financial uncertainty. Sandi Kohrs said fiscal constraint was discussed at the TRB meeting, with some indication by FHWA officials that state plans, not just those of MPOs, should be fiscally constrained. Colorado already requires that.

John Cater of the Denver office of FHWA said he hasn't heard that state transportation plans should be fiscally constrained, but noted that FWHA sees the value of having more fully defined plans for shorter time periods than the statutorily required 20 years.

Handouts: Research on State Departments of Transportation Long-Range Plans and Processes (Introduction only and full 21-page report)

<p>CDOT Railroad Crossing Initiatives – Mark Imhoff</p>	<p>In response to a concern brought to the STAC last month by Upper Front Range (UFR) TPR, Mark said a meeting probably will be organized with UFRTPR to discuss a statewide railroad crossing initiative and condition report.</p> <p>The UFRTPR concern prompted an investigation on the part of the Division of Transit and Rail (DTR) on the various sections of CDOT involved in freight and railroads and how to best coordinate those activities. FHWA provides Section 130 funding to assist with railroad upgrades. The Division of Transportation Development (DTD) inventories freight. CDOT participates in a monthly freight coordination meeting with the Public Utilities Commission and FHWA. The Freight Advisory Committee that included representatives of the railroads, truckers and shippers has not met in a very long time, and Mark said he hopes the group can be reactivated. A white paper on the state’s regulatory authority over the railroads has been completed and reviewed by the railroads. The Colorado Municipal League and Colorado Counties Inc. are reviewing that white paper.</p> <p>At the DTR, one staff person deals with railroads. The Transit and Rail Advisory Committee (TRAC) is considering adding a rail representative.</p> <p>CDOT is regrouping internally on how to address concerns about railroads. The STAC next month will have a fuller discussion about railroad crossings in general, as well as a communication plan about keeping people informed about railroads.</p>	<p>No action taken.</p>
<p>I-70 Advanced Guideway System (AGS) Feasibility Approach - Mark Imhoff</p>	<p>The PowerPoint presentation that the STAC received with its agenda last week had been given to the I-70 Leadership Team in June about how the AGS study will follow and embrace the Tier 1 I-70 Preliminary Environmental Impact Study. Tier II is the AGS feasibility study itself.</p> <p>The AGS and interconnectivity studies are being coordinated. That will allow CDOT to focus on technologies available and AGS alignment. The first step in the AGS study will be the selection of a public support consultant. In order to take that step, the program definition will be refined with the industry in mind. A public service consultant should be selected by the end of August or early September.</p>	<p>No action taken.</p>

	<p>The operating characteristics outlined in the Environmental Impact Statement will be shared worldwide with manufacturers and delivery experts. Then, potentially interested firms and entities will be invited to tour the I-70 corridor and share their concepts and concerns. CDOT and the consultant will review the validity of the data gathered and criteria so that a valid comparison can be made among technologies. CDOT next will issue a Request for Proposals (RFP) to send out to the industry for technologies that will work on the corridor. The information in the RFP will include information on tunnel sections, curvatures of I-70 rights of way, and identify areas where an AGS alignment may have to go outside of the I-70 rights of way. CDOT will select up to three of the best proposals submitted and ask them to move forward to the next phase of the effort. The up to three firms will be given a “stipend” for their work of proposing different technologies, assessing what can be delivered, and identifying any “fatal flaws” and the next steps.</p> <p>Despite the lack of identified funds, CDOT has already received inquiries and visits from magnetic levitation firms and Japanese high-speed train representatives. Peter Runyon and Diane Mitsch Bush said that the AGS needs to be considered in concert with rail along I-25. Mark Imhoff said the Rocky Mountain Rail Authority study indicated that while a train along I-70 is viable, it would be more economically feasible with connections to rail along I-25. The connectivity study should also help with those issues.</p> <p><i>Handout: Proposed Scope of Services for Advanced Guideway System Study (PowerPoint Slides)</i></p>	
<p>Transit and Rail Advisory Committee (TRAC)/Division of Transit and Rail (DTR) Update – Mark Imhoff</p>	<p>Activities of the DTR in the past month include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compilation of project lists from Grand Valley MPO and rural transit applicants for State of Good Repair Federal Transit Administration funds in cooperation with the Colorado Association of Transit Agencies; • Formation of an evaluation team to review the applications and prioritize them for the Federal Transit Administration; • Development of a DTR work plan for the coming federal fiscal year which will include public open meetings on possible programs and projects; • Issuance of an RFP for emerging small business involvement for the Towner Line, a short-line railroad that CDOT owns. The lease is about up with the current operator, and CDOT has decided to try to sell the line. 	<p>No action taken.</p>

	<p>Activities of the TRAC in the past month include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Start of discussion about performance measures for transit, such as mobility and access; • Planning for a joint retreat/workshop of the TRAC and the TC Intermodal Committee in November 2011; • Planning for a presentation to the TRAC about railroad freight in the state; • Discussions about size and weight limitations for freight trucks; • Investigating public private partnership investments for intercity and commuter service; and • Continued discussions on operational costs for transit agencies <p>Elena Wilken of CASTA thanked the STAC for its work on project selection criteria that will be used in selecting the State of Good Repair projects for FTA funding. TRAC and STAC work on project selection criteria earlier made it possible for CDOT to act quickly when the Federal Notice of Funding Availability for the State of Good Repair projects was issued.</p> <p><i>Revised Handout: State of Good Repair – Draft list of requested projects – July 15, 2011</i></p>	
Other Business	<p>Region 5 Regional Transportation Director Richard Reynolds has retired. Dewayne Findley of Southwest TPR expressed his appreciation for all that Richard has done for the Region.</p> <p>Some STAC members said they would like to see a new organization chart for CDOT, as many of the key players have changed.</p>	No action taken.