

**DRAFT STAC Meeting Minutes
Sept. 16, 2011**

Location: CDOT Headquarters Auditorium

Date/Time: September 16, 2011 9:00 a.m. – noon

Chairman: Vince Rogalski

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

Agenda Items/Presenters/ Affiliations	Presentation Highlights	Actions
Introductions/August Meeting Minutes/Vince Rogalski/STAC chair	<i>Everyone in the room gave self-introductions.</i> The August minutes were approved.	Minutes approved
Transportation Commission (TC) Report/Vince Rogalski	<p>In August, the TC approved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submittal of three CDOT TIGER III applications: I-25 Dillon/Eden Interchange in Pueblo; I-25 North Interim Managed Lanes (US 36 to 120th Avenue in Adams County); and I-70B in Grand Junction. (This varies slightly from the STAC’s recommendation, which was for the I-70 Eagle Airport Interchange instead of I-70B.) <p>The TC heard:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Bridge Enterprise website is being revamped so that the public can see the progress of various bridge improvement projects. • To promote efficiency, CDOT is improving its internal communications and considering how to streamline its business processes. <p>Vince also provided updates from other meetings he recently attended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CDOT Freight and Passenger Rail Plan is going pretty well. Also, those concerned with rail want existing rail lines to remain in service and agree that rail lines should have general shipper access. Communication with the rail industry and among the various parts of CDOT concerned with rail is being streamlined. • EnergySmart Transportation initiative is looking at ways to reduce energy consumption in transportation. 	No action taken.
Federal and State Legislative Update/ Herman Stockinger/ Office of Policy and Government Relations	<p>Herman said that Melissa Nelson, who has been CDOT’s legislative lobbyist with the Colorado General Assembly, is leaving CDOT at the end of September for another opportunity.</p> <p>Legislative news included:</p>	No action taken.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Office of Policy and Government Relations continues work on its legislative agenda for the coming state legislative session. • Congress passed a six-month authorization extension on Thursday, September 15, extending both the surface transportation and aviation programs at current funding levels. This includes a 6-month extension of the federal gas tax. • There is not yet an appropriations extension, although a three-week extension is likely near the end of the month. • The recently announced Jobs bill contains a transportation component but passage is unlikely. 	
<p>Phase 1 Resident Survey/Debra Perkins-Smith, DTD director, and Scott Richrath, Performance Measure and Policy Analysis</p>	<p>After being introduced by Debra Perkins-Smith, Scott Richrath reviewed the initial findings from a resident survey about public attitudes toward CDOT and transportation that Corona Insights conducted this summer, the first time CDOT has surveyed the public on transportation since 2006. Around 20,000-30,000 calls were made to get 2,136 complete interviews for a statistically valid sample of 384 completed interviews in each of four areas - the Eastern Plains, Western Slope, Colorado Springs/El Paso County, and Other Front Range - and 600 from the Denver metro area. When someone answered the phone, the first question asked was if the call recipient was a male 18-35 or if there were 18-35 year old males in the dwelling because of the underrepresentation of that group in the survey. The data had an approximate 2 percent error statewide.</p> <p>Some key highlights of the survey include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 78 percent of the respondents approve of the job CDOT is doing; • 79 percent trust CDOT to do what is best for the public; and • 71 percent believe CDOT efficiently uses tax dollars. <p>The survey indicated that government spending and economic issues are the most important problems for Coloradans, but only 6 percent believe economic development is CDOT's top priority. Survey respondents weren't asked if economic development should be a top priority for CDOT. The full survey that will be conducted for the next long-range plan update may that question. Mark Imhoff said he would make sure transit is represented in questions for the full survey.</p> <p>In 2006, the primary concerns of survey respondents were education/higher education, growth/urban sprawl/too many people, and water. According to this</p>	<p>No action taken.</p>

	<p>latest survey, the primary concerns are tax/government spending/budget, economy/unemployment/ and transportation issues/maintenance.</p> <p>Lack of public knowledge about CDOT's primary funding source also was evident, with only 28 percent saying they believe the fuel tax is the largest source of funding. Although government spending is a concern, 66 percent prefer CDOT spend more money to perform highway construction at night versus keeping construction costs lower by working during the day. Maintaining existing highways and bridges is a top priority of CDOT for 39 percent of the respondents, compared to reducing congestion (14 percent) and increasing access (13 percent).</p> <p>At least 75 percent think CDOT's performance is acceptable or more at roadway signage and striping, snow and ice removal, communicating traffic information, designing roads and bridges, and managing road construction. At least 30 percent say CDOT needs improvement with pavement repair, including filling potholes; bicycle and pedestrian facilities or highways; traffic light synchronization, and bridge repair and replacement.</p> <p>At least 70 percent erroneously believe CDOT is responsible for issuing state drivers licenses and providing regional transit services.</p> <p>Vince Rogalski said he received a complaint about calls being made late at night. Scott responded that some calls had to be made later at night to include all the demographic groups but that that comment would be passed onto whatever entity does the next survey.</p> <p><i>Handout: Summer 2011 CDOT Resident Survey PowerPoint (made available after the meeting on the STAC website)</i></p>	
--	--	--

<p>North Front Range Metropolitan Planning Organization (NFRMPO) 2035 Plan Update/Cliff Davidson/NFRMPO director</p>	<p>Cliff Davidson provided an overview of the NFRMPO 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update. This corridor-based plan lists highway and transit projects only if they are on one of the three tier corridors: Tier One (I-25, US 287, US 34); Tier Two (SH 14, US 85, and Prospect); and Tier Three (SH 392, SH 1, Two Rivers Parkway, SH 60/SH 56, and SH 257). Highway projects must involve at least one lane mile of roadway and transit projects must be considered regionally significant.</p> <p>At the direction of the Planning Council, the plan does not address livability. It includes data on greenhouse gases (a 42.4 percent growth in greenhouse gas emissions is forecast by 2035) and updates data on the travel demand model, land use allocation model, forecast report, and other information. It incorporates data from three plans: Transportation Demand Management, Regional Transit Element, and Congestion Management Process.</p> <p>The greatest challenge is finding resources to pay for implementing the RTP, with a current \$3.6 billion funding shortfall forecast by 2035. Strategies for addressing the funding gap include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit the call for projects to regional projects; • Focus available funding on the most critical projects, such as completing the current Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) projects and helping CDOT Region 4 implement Phase I of the North I-25 Environmental Impact Statement; • Focus on projects that have the most benefit for the least expenditure (i.e., Travel Demand Management, Transportation System Management, and emphasizing “thin roads, thick nodes” to guide improvements, particularly intersections); • New funding mechanisms, such as special improvement districts, regional transportation authorities, provision of regional services by the MPO to local governments for a fee, cost sharing, and indexing of gas tax; and • Right of way preservation for all modes, including rail. <p><i>Handout: North Front Range Regional Transportation Plan 2035 Update PowerPoint</i></p>	
--	---	--

<p>Transit and Rail Advisory Committee (TRAC)/Division of Transit and Rail (DTR) Update/Mark Imhoff/DTR director</p>	<p>The CDOT-Colorado Association of Transit Agencies fall conference was last week. On Sept. 16, DTR issued a call for FY 2013 FASTER transit grant projects. DTR hasn't heard if a decision has been made yet on funding for the State of Good Repair and Bus Livability Section 5309 projects. Last month CDOT submitted projects for Clean Fuels and Greenhouse Gas/Energy Reduction funding. The required annual report on possible state rail line acquisitions has been submitted (there weren't any proposed in 2010). DTR will be back to the STAC in November or December 2011 with recommendations from the State Freight and Passenger Rail Plan. A consultant has been selected for the Rail Connectivity Study and kick-off meeting took place Sept. 15. Consultants for the Advanced Guideway System plan will be interviewed in late September.</p> <p>In answer to a question from Cliff Davidson, Mark said the FASTER transit contract template has finally passed the State Controller's Office. Of the 86 submitted and approved FASTER projects, one has been completed, four have had their contracts executed, 19 have had their contracts sent to local entities for approval, 11 are in Procurement after the scopes of work were reviewed and approved, and 42 are having their scopes of work reviewed. One project was withdrawn and there has been no action on two projects. For the next group of FASTER transit projects, intergovernmental agreements will be initiated in July 2012 for projects awarded in December 2011-January 2012.</p> <p>Progress on transit contracts eventually will be posted on the DTR website.</p>	<p>No action taken.</p>
--	--	-------------------------

<p>List of Ready-to-Go Strategic Corridor Projects/ Tim Harris/ CDOT Chief Engineer</p>	<p>Tim Harris discussed a handout and Strategic Corridor projects totaling \$335 million in today's dollars that would be ready to go to ad by May 2012 at the latest if money were available. Most of the projects would be ready to go to ad by February or March, however. The list has five projects from Region 2, three from Region 3, and one each from Regions 4 and 6. Since he compiled the list, the Region 4 \$11M I-25 Crossroads to Harmony Rubblization and Overlay project was removed because surface treatment money is likely to be used to fund the project.</p> <p>Jim Austin asked why Region 2 had more incomplete Strategic Corridors than any other region. Wayne Williams said Region 2 had the most projects now, due to incomplete environmental clearances at the time when transportation bond money was available.</p> <p><i>Handout: "Ready to Go" 7th Pot Projects (To Ad by May 2012) chart</i></p>	<p>No action taken.</p>
<p>FY 2012 Budget Update/Laurie Freedle/Budget Director</p>	<p>Laurie Freedle noted that a handout had been distributed during the meeting about a new policy on making amendments to the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) pool projects. She said she wanted to give the STAC a heads-up that the TC will consider the new policy at its September meeting the following week. She said it will make things easier.</p> <p>In August, the STAC discussed possible options for spending \$91.8 million in additional federal funding. Now, as a result of a thorough review of all sources of revenue, the amount of additional federal and state funding has increased to a total of \$229.1 million. The sources are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$91.8 million from FY 2011 final apportionment; • \$10.6 million from FY 2011 federal distribution; • \$13.1 million in FY 2011 roll forward dollars (dollars that went unspent); • \$13.1 million from reconciliation of SB-1 revenues legislatively dedicated to Strategic Corridor projects; • \$3.3 million from unused match for ARRA projects; • \$37.8 million from reconciliation of SB 1310 revenues; and • \$59.4 million from reconciliation of state Highway Users Tax Fund (state highway fund revenues and FASTER safety revenue) <p>None of the budget proposals for FY 2012 include the additional money. Laurie presented three alternatives for the use of the funds that will go to the TC for</p>	<p>No action taken.</p>

	<p>discussion and later action:</p> <p>Alternative #1 – Regional Balance Surface Treatment: \$90.0M Miscellaneous Items: \$13.8M Twin Tunnels: \$60.0M <u>RPP: \$65.3M</u> Total: \$229.1M</p> <p>Alternative #2 – Surface Treatment as a Priority Surface Treatment: \$125.0M Miscellaneous Items: \$13.8M Twin Tunnels: \$60.0M <u>RPP: \$30.3M</u> Total: \$229.1M</p> <p>Alternative #3 – Strategic Projects Surface Treatment: \$90.0M Miscellaneous Items: \$13.8M Twin Tunnels: \$60.0M <u>Strategic Projects: \$30.3M -TC selects specific 7th pot project(s)</u> Total: \$229.1M</p> <p>The \$13.8 million Miscellaneous Items includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal of beetle kill trees from the public right of way: \$2 million; • Transit Loan to local operators: \$4.8 million; • Rock fall mitigation: \$2 million (additional); and • Road equipment: \$5 million (additional). <p>Will Toor of DRCOG asked if the Twin Tunnels project estimates include revenues that could be raised from managed lanes or congestion pricing. Ben Stein responded that he does not know how much could be raised in that manner.</p> <p>Diane Mitsch Bush reminded the group that the Twin Tunnels impact the Western Slope as well as the Front Range.</p> <p>Of the alternatives, Will Toor said he preferred Alternative #1 because it</p>	
--	--	--

doesn't place Strategic Corridor projects above others. Thad Noll of Intermountain TPR agreed, saying the money would have been allocated by formula in about the same way. Steve Rudy said Twin Tunnels would be counted toward Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG) allocation outlined in the Memorandum of Understanding with CDOT.

Ben Stein said that the minimum of \$90 million suggested in each of the scenarios for surface treatment was arrived at because every year the amount allocated for surface treatment has declined from a years-past amount of approximately \$100 million annually.

Ken Simms of Grand Valley MPO asked why Twin Tunnels isn't treated like other Strategic Corridor projects. Vince Rogalski said that point has been raised for several months about why Twin Tunnels has been jumped ahead of other Strategic Corridor projects that are truly ready to go.

After more discussion, the following additional alternatives were proposed by the persons whose names are in parentheses:

Alternative #4 (Thad Noll)
Surface Treatment: \$75 million
Miscellaneous: \$13.8 million
Twin Tunnels: \$60 million
RPP: \$65.3 million
Strategic: \$15 million
Total: \$229.1

Alternative #5 (Wayne Williams)
Surface Treatment: \$52 million
Miscellaneous: \$13.8 million
Twin Tunnels: \$60 million
RPP: \$52 million
Strategic: \$51.3 million
Total: \$229.1

Alternative #6 (Craig Casper)
Surface Treatment: \$0
Miscellaneous: \$13.8 million

	<p>RPP: <u>\$215.3 million</u> Total: \$229.1</p> <p>Wayne Williams said that if no money is taken off the top for large-ticket items, nothing will get done. Gary Beedy of Eastern TPR noted that the alternatives are weighted toward the west side of I-25, and said I-70 east is an important project for the eastern part of the state. Cliff Davidson said the NFRMPO still needs money to get the North I-25 EIS implemented.</p> <p>The TC will discuss the various alternatives for spending the additional money this month, and will take action in October. The STAC still has time to consider the options, and can make a recommendation to the TC in October, said Ben Stein.</p> <p>Following the discussion, Laurie Freedle said she would arrange to have the three additional alternatives posted on the STAC website by the middle of next week. Sandi Kohrs said an email would go out to STAC alerting them when the new information is posted on the STAC website.</p> <p><i>Handouts: Additional FY12 Funding Availability and Scenarios for its Use memo; Fiscal Year 2012 (Final Budget) – Allocation by Category</i></p>	
FY 2013 Budget Update/Laurie Freedle	<p>The FY 2013 budget that starts July 1, 2012, was developed under two different revenue assumptions: a staff recommendation of a revenue estimate based on a model run (\$1.105 billion) and a more pessimistic projection for federal revenues (\$1.023 billion).</p> <p>Laurie Freedle pointed out that the FY 2012 and FY 2013 budgets have different investment categories than before because of the belief on the part of CDOT staff that the current investment categories (safety, mobility, system quality, and program delivery) aren't well understood by the public. The proposed new categories are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain – maintaining what we have; • Maximize – maximizing the current system; • Expand – increasing capacity; • Deliver – program delivery/administration; • Pass-through Funds/Multimodal Grants; and • Transportation Commission Contingency/Debt Service 	No action taken.

	<p>Wayne Williams said he likes the new budget format, but asked why High-Performance Transportation Enterprise was placed in “administration” in the “expand” category rather than the “program delivery/administration.”</p> <p>Steve Rudy said he doesn’t think “maximize” is a word that resonates with the public. He also said he doesn’t have a problem with “pass-through”, but he isn’t sure the public will readily understand it.</p> <p>Laurie Freedle said that most programs could be placed in more than one budget category and that suggested revisions would be taken into consideration along with the TC input. She said the new investment categories and the current ones will be shown in the budgets until the next Statewide Transportation Plan is approved.</p> <p><i>Handouts: FY 2013 Budget Revenue Information; Fiscal Year 2013 (Draft Budget Scenarios 1 and 2) Allocation by Category</i></p>	
Other Business	No additional items were brought to the STAC.	No action taken.