

**Statewide Transportation Advisory Committee  
February 13, 2009 Meeting Minutes**

**Location:** CDOT Headquarters Auditorium  
**Date/Time:** February 13, 2009, 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.  
**Chairman:** Vince Rogalski  
**Attendance:** A sign-in sheet was distributed to note attendance at the meeting.

<b>Agenda Items/Presenters/Affiliations</b>	<b>Presentation Highlights</b>	<b>Actions</b>
Introductions	Everyone in the room gave self-introductions.	
January Meeting Minutes	January minutes approved with no changes.	Approved
Pavement Management- Steve Olson	<p>Steve Olson presented on CDOT's Pavement Management program.</p> <p>Steve presented figures on the 2008 pavement condition % Good/Fair. At the network level, 53% good/fair, compared to a TC objective of 60%.</p> <p>Policy Directive 1400.00 provides for the annual collection of condition data, the setting of roadway condition objectives by the TC, the approval of STP funding and region allocation percentages and the use of the Pavement Management Program to manage the project recommendation and selection process. Chief Engineer Policy Memos provide guidance on the implementation of PD 1400.00.</p> <p>The Life Cycle of Pavement includes initial construction, preventative maintenance, rehabilitation and reconstruction.</p> <p>Good condition implies a surface life of greater than 10 years, fair implies 6-10 years, and poor 1-5 years. A road with zero remaining surface life is still a functioning road, but a road where it is no longer economical to do pavement preservation or preventative maintenance treatments.</p>	No Action Taken

	<p>Question- Vince Rogalski: Even with \$500 M per year, it will take 20 years for the network to reach the Commission Objective?</p> <p>Steve Olson: That is what we are projecting.</p> <p>Question- Wayne Williams: This does not include bridges?</p> <p>Steve Olson: No, some surface treatment dollars can be used for minor bridge work, bridge approaches, but in general this does not include bridge work.</p> <p>Question- Bill Moore: Are you aware of any instances where a road with zero remaining surface life requires the lowering of the speed limit, or weight restrictions.</p> <p>Steve Olson: Not that I am aware of.</p> <p>Pam Hutton: There have been isolated cases where the pavement condition became so serious that we had to lower the speed limit until an immediate fix was possible.</p>	
<p>Federal and State Legislative Update- Jennifer Finch</p>	<p><b>Colorado FASTER</b></p> <p>Colorado FASTER bill has made it out of the Senate. The bill is scheduled for House Transportation on Tuesday, followed by House Finance on Wednesday.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-System Funding component for roadway and bridge safety</li> <li>-Weight-based vehicle registration fee increase</li> <li>-Daily rental car fee</li> <li>-Estimated to result in about \$240M for bridge and road safety, and about \$2M for broader transportation investments, such as transit.</li> <li>-Funds will go into HUTF, and will be subject to those spending criterion</li> <li>-Local-share</li> <li>-Efficiency and Accountability component. Creates a committee to work with CDOT in looking at efficiencies.</li> <li>-High performance transportation enterprise to replace current CTE.</li> <li>-Requires up-front local agreement on any roads that are going to be considered for tolling.</li> <li>-Provides for the possibility of tolling existing capacity</li> </ul>	<p>No Action Taken</p>

-Tolling component very controversial.

Question- Wayne Williams: Which local governments would have to approve?

Jennifer Finch: "Significantly affected" local governments.

Diane Mitsch-Bush: I believe the significantly impacted language was added to account for localities such as those in Routt County, which is not on I-70 but depends on and is significantly impacted by it.

Heather Copp: The bill says all local jurisdictions- so that could include special districts.

-The VMT Study has been removed from the bill. There is some interest in adding some parts of this back in. Concerns over the VMT element included privacy, and urban-rural equity.

-Funds generated from tolling would need to at least stay in the general region of the area where tolls collected.

Steve Rudy: Metro Mayors Caucus supports the tolling component, but would not do so if that meant the state could move tolling revenue or funding to other areas of the state.

-There are also some planning policies in the bill. The bill refers to them as policy goals, but they are not worded as goals. I have sent comments suggesting that the bill only define topic areas, and then let the commission develop the policies.

-There was an inflationary clause in the bill that has since been removed.

-Hopefully CDOT can still move forward with its VMT Study. If the VMT element is removed by both the House and the Senate, we will probably have to hold off.

***Other Legislation***

-Bill on Division of Transit and Rail passed through its first committee this week.

-Existing Transit Unit would move into Division

-We need to be sensitive to cost to be able to move forward with a Division of Transit. At this time we will need to move forward within existing resources.

-It is important to note that we are not trying to usurp the authority of existing

	<p>transit agencies.          -SB 1154          Angie Drumm: SB-78 passed this week, and is ready to be introduced into the house. SB-78 concerns the Maintenance Incentive Pilot Program.</p> <p>Heather Copp: Continuing resolution expires on March 6. We have heard that there will be an Omnibus Continuing Resolution and an Omnibus Continuing Appropriations bill. If there is a Continuing Resolution we won't have a rescission, but we won't really know what the number is. If we have an Appropriations bill we'll have the number, but it will probably include rescissions.</p>	
<p>Budget Update-          Heather Copp</p>	<p>Memo to the TC concerning upcoming budget workshops. The 3<sup>rd</sup> budget workshop for the FY 10 budget will be held next Wednesday, with a following workshop to be held in March. Additional reductions to the budget include:          -SB 97-01 funds: \$13.9M          -FY 10 Gaming funds: \$10.2M          -Aviation SIB: \$3M          -Rail Bank: \$1.5M</p> <p>Salary survey increases have been eliminated from the budget.</p> <p>Other Administrative and Operations Changes:          -Reorganization of ITS Branch          -Withdrawal of rule-making position          -Funding of indirect costs</p> <p>We are proposing funding our indirect costs with state highway funds rather than by project. That would involve getting rid of the indirect cost allocation process.</p> <p>Stimulus bill should increase our FY 09 budget, not the FY 10 budget.</p> <p><b><i>Indirect Cost Allocation</i></b>          Indirect costs are those that are not directly attributable to a single project, or those that are too expensive to track to specific projects. Examples include environmental staff, business office staff at the regions, contracts, right-of-way and design staff at headquarters.</p>	<p>Motion-          Recommend          elimination          of indirect          cost          allocation</p>

Indirect costs funnel into organizational groups each month and are allocated out to projects.

Indirect cost allocation is a large administrative cost. It made sense to do when we received larger portions of federal money, but no longer does now that so much of our funding comes from the state.

Anything after July 1 would be funded "off the top."

If the Commission decides not to pay for the indirect costs off the top, there will need to be another increase in the indirect rate this year.

Indirect staff cost about \$86M- that is the amount that we will have to cover from state highway funds.

Motion to recommend elimination of indirect cost allocation. Motion approved.

***Rescissions***

- With a \$3B rescission, we would have real money rescissions from Interstate Maintenance and Metro Planning.
- With an \$8.7B rescission, we would have real money rescissions from Interstate Maintenance, NHS, STP Flexible, Metro Planning, and Recreation Trails.
- With an \$11.7B rescission, we would have real money rescissions from Interstate Maintenance, NHS, STP Flexible, Bridge, Metro Planning and Recreation Trails.
- There are high positive numbers in Safety, and STP-Metro. We are prohibited from taking money from these categories for rescissions. We have been meeting with Congressional Staff to discuss.
- A FY 09 rescission of \$3B would mean \$40.8M for Colorado
- A second rescission built into the SAFETEA-LU authorization act is estimated to be \$8.7B nationally, or \$118.4M for Colorado.
- "Proportionality Rule:" each federal account must be drawn down proportionally to fund rescissions (some programs such as STP-Metro cannot be cut at all).
- Proportionality rule means that rather than rescinding up to \$159.2M in unobligated balances, CDOT may potentially have to cut about \$81.5M in real project dollars, while leaving the STP-Metro account with over \$98.5M in

	<p>unobligated balances.</p> <p>-CDOT is engaging the MPOS, our congressional delegation, and key congressional committee staffers in an effort to fix this problem and prevent \$81.5M in cuts this year.</p> <p>-This would involve allowing the state to rescind money proportionally in each account until we reach a zero balance of unobligated funds, and then regain the flexibility to reduce funds in accounts that still have unobligated balances that we are currently not allowed to spend.</p>	
<p>2035 Plan Amendment- Sandi Kohrs</p>	<p>The next STIP will include years 2012-2015, so we still have the required 20 years past the last year of the STIP with the 2035 Plan. As such, the TPRs do not need an update. The MPOs, however, are on a four year cycle and will need an update.</p> <p>The new STIP will be 2012-2017. Resource Allocation will be developed for the first four years of the STIP. MPO Updates will be "amended" into the 2035 Plan.</p> <p>Next month we will come back with a more formal presentation and we will also be going to the Commission for approval of this approach.</p> <p>Craig Casper: We discovered during the 2035 Plan process that not all of our urban area was included in our MPO boundaries, and we will have to adjust the boundaries before updating the plan.</p>	
<p>Economic Stimulus Discussion- Jennifer Finch</p>	<p>Estimated \$425M on highway side. The majority of transit dollars for urban areas will go directly to those agencies. We think the state will get somewhere in the vicinity of \$10-\$11M for rural transit.</p> <p>50% of funds need to be obligated within 120 days.</p> <p>Allocation to TMAs. It is our understanding that they have a year to obligate those funds.</p> <p>We are presenting you with a resolution to support the addition of projects to the stimulus lists for Regions 1, 3 and 5.</p> <p>Question- Wayne Williams: Can this money be used for design or engineering to</p>	<p>Resolution Approved- Addition of projects to stimulus list in Regions 1, 3 and 5</p>

	<p>get projects ready to go?</p> <p>Heather Copp: Yes it can, under the law, although CDOT will be discouraging this.</p> <p>Jennifer Finch: We would hope that such uses would represent only a small portion of the funds.</p> <p>Diane Mitsch-Bush: The C list in our region does contain some projects that require some design work, or right-of-way.</p> <p>Jennifer Finch: We do have a little more time with the second half of the funds. However, it is the position of CDOT that we should really try to get funds out the door for construction this year. That's the intent that is being read into the legislation. The majority of the dollars should be going into construction. That said, we realize that there may be some projects on the C list that may require some right-of-way, or some design work.</p> <p>Heather Copp: Transit money is available until September 2010, 50% must be obligated within 180 days.</p> <p>Heather Copp: Starting with the \$425.8M, we allocated funds to each of the six regions. Starting with region 1 we deducted the proportion that would normally go to DRCOG, then we deducted the TMA totals, and then enhancement dollars. STP Metro TMA Allocation totals \$79.8M, with \$333.3M flexible to CDOT.</p> <p>Tony DeVito: The additional project in Region 1 is the Colorado Blvd. project in Idaho Springs. It can be ready in about 10 weeks based on our latest information. It's a great project- about a million dollar project.</p> <p>Motion to approve resolution supporting the addition of projects to the stimulus lists in Regions 1, 3 and 5. Resolution approved.</p>	
Other Business	None.	