

**DRAFT STAC Summary Meeting Minutes**  
**June 15, 2012**

**Location:** CDOT Headquarters Auditorium

**Date/Time:** June 15, 2012 9:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.

**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/May Minutes/Vince Rogalski/STAC Chair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May STAC Summary Meeting Minutes approved without additions or corrections.</li> </ul>	<b>Action-</b> Approve minutes.
Transportation Commission (TC) Report/Vince Rogalski/STAC Chair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approved HPTE budget for next year.</li> <li>• US 36 has been invited to apply for another TIFIA loan.</li> <li>• I-70 Viaduct – The current proposal is to lower below grade with coverage on certain sections to connect communities.</li> <li>• Bond spending close to goal in terms of timeline for expending bond funds.</li> <li>• Poor bridge list keeps growing.</li> <li>• Contingency Workshop- Voted in budget supplement to set aside \$40 million should certain projects (I-70 Co-Development, Twin Tunnels, and US 36 Phase II) go over budget.</li> <li>• Last month STAC recommended any additional funds go to RPP or Surface Treatment. No motion made.</li> <li>• Peter Runyon requested CDOT keep funding for RPP intact. The Eagle Interchange (different from Eagle Airport Interchange) must be improved. We're putting up a lot of money, and the TPR has allocated RPP funding. If RPP funds don't come through it will create a serious problem.</li> </ul>	No action taken.
Federal and State Legislative Update/Herman Stockinger & Kurt Morrison/CDOT Office of Policy & Government Relations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transportation authorization conference making little progress. There are another two weeks until extension expires. There will probably be another extension, likely through end of the fiscal year. The Speaker has talked about coming back for a lame duck session in December.</li> <li>• We thought we would have heard about our TIGER applications by now, but DOT is waiting to make sure funding is available before announcing. We'll probably hear about TIGER after the extension.</li> </ul>	No action taken.

<p>Discussion of Contingency Funds/Laurie Freedle/CDOT Office of Financial Management and Budget (OFMB)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$136 million from increased FY 13 revenue projections and additional FY 12.</li> <li>• Commission decided in May to set aside \$40 million as a reserve for projects (I-70 Co-Development, Twin Tunnels, and US 36 Phase II), plus \$5 million for road equipment.</li> <li>• Commission intends to make a decision on \$57 million of the funds at the July or August workshop.</li> <li>• Commission will act on some decision items at the June workshop.</li> <li>• Steve Rudy asked whether any of the Regions had identified other statewide strategic projects. Laurie Freedle said they have not been asked.</li> <li>• Wayne Williams reported PPACG identified I-25 Cimarron interchange as its highest priority, identified as a critical safety project for decades, with a number of issues. Specific phases have been identified that can be done. Total project is somewhere over \$100 million.</li> <li>• Pepper Whittlef recalled several months ago, this group vetted projects for TIGER grants. She suggested we consider funding those TIGER applications that aren't awarded. Herman Stockinger commented CDOT hopes to hear about TIGER in July.</li> <li>• Greg Schulte remarked SWTPR is on record noting RPP is not fully funded, and if there is extra money available, this money should go to all areas of the state through the RPP allocation formula already in place. The original RPP budget was \$51 million and went down to \$10. Allocating the funds to RPP is a fair and equitable way of addressing needs across the state.</li> <li>• Diane Mitsch Bush pointed out that RPP is an already-known, equitable process for getting money to the Regions.</li> <li>• Peter Runyon added he preferred spreading among the group through RPP to funding distinct projects.</li> <li>• Wayne noted there are remaining, already-identified strategic projects. While RPP is underfunded, strategic projects have not been funded at all. He suggested STAC consider how these projects might be funded.</li> <li>• Vince Rogalski remarked we are spending money on strategic projects, just not all of them. The I-70 Twin Tunnels being an example. We haven't discussed surface treatment.</li> <li>• Thad Noll suggested RPP is a good way to go because it can be used for surface treatment.</li> <li>• Diane moved STAC recommend the \$57 million in funds be put towards RPP, and Peter seconded.</li> <li>• Wayne asked whether the \$40 million already counts towards an RPP</li> </ul>	<p><b>Action-</b> Approve motion recommending the TC setaside \$17 million of the \$57 million available for strategic projects (7<sup>th</sup> Pot or TIGER IV), and allocate \$40 million through RPP. Of the \$40 million reserve previously approved, allocate the first \$5 million of any funds not spent to capital equipment and the remainder to RPP.</p>
---	---	--

	<p>allocation. Diane explained the \$57 million would be allocated by the RPP formula to all Regions and the \$40 million would not be counted towards this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wayne asserted that, given the \$40 million taken off the top for strategic projects, there are other strategic projects that should be considered. He proposed including consideration of strategic projects alongside RPP.</li> <li>• Steve remarked that the portion of the \$40 million for the Twin Tunnels is truly a contingency project. Out of the \$40 million the Twin Tunnels was \$10 million or less.</li> <li>• Diane could not accept Wayne's amendment, saying it was not entirely clear, and needed further discussion.</li> <li>• Wayne put forth an amended motion with \$40 million going to RPP, and \$17 million for strategic projects.</li> <li>• Greg Schulte suggested STAC recommend any funds coming back from the \$40 million reserve go to RPP.</li> <li>• Diane and Peter agreed they would accept this.</li> <li>• Wayne added that, included in strategic projects would be anything on the 7th Pot list, as well as the TIGER IV projects, should they not be successful.</li> <li>• Thad said he would like to see up to \$5 million of any leftover contingency go to capital equipment, with anything beyond that going to RPP. Diane and Peter agreed they could accept this.</li> <li>• Vince summed up: Of the \$57 million, \$17 would be set aside for statewide significant projects (and TIGER IV projects), \$40 million to RPP, and of the \$40 million in reserve, the first \$5 million of any funds not used would go to capital equipment and the remainder to RPP</li> <li>• Motion passes with one 'No' from Commissioner Donnelly.</li> </ul>	
<p>I-70 Co-Development-Herman Stockinger/Office of Policy &amp; Government Relations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CDOT received an unsolicited proposal to do some work on I-70 as a public-private partnership.</li> <li>• HPTE reviewed and then put out an RFP for proposals on a public private partnership on I-70.</li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>
<p>Tiering/Debra Perkins-Smith/Division of Transportation Development (DTD)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Debra Perkins-Smith provided STAC with a preview of the tiering workshop that will be presented to Commission next week.</li> <li>• This is a slightly streamlined version that is a little bit different than next weeks' presentation.</li> <li>• We'll hopefully wrap up the tiering discussions this month. We came to</li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>

	<p>the conclusion that CDOT already tiers, but doesn't call it that. Any decisions regarding what, if anything, should be done with tiering should be part of the statewide plan discussion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some overall conclusions from these presentations over the last couple of months:</li> <li>• Traffic volumes correlate closely to socioeconomic factors and serve as a good surrogate for activity. We looked at where population is, where jobs are, and high-priority corridors. We then overlaid that with traffic volumes, and the locations with higher volumes corresponded with population and activity centers, so traffic works as a surrogate for the other factors;</li> <li>• Current practices result in some level of tiering;</li> <li>• Tiers I and II account for half of the lane miles, and 90% of the VMT and 80% of the Construction and Maintenance dollars;</li> <li>• Tiers III and IV account for the other half of the lane miles, 10% of the VMT, and 20% of Construction and Maintenance dollars;</li> <li>• Tiering is not applicable to safety.</li> <li>• Diane pointed out that in rural areas; there are extreme seasonal variations in volume, but averaging masks this. It's important that the Commission understand that in certain areas of the state there are significant seasonal variations in traffic related to tourism, that are not captured in annual AADT figures, and yet, the safety concerns from these traffic increases are real.</li> <li>• Pete Fraser asserted that the conclusions would be flawed, if based on VMT, as there are serious issues relating to safety and hazardous materials that are not considered. Hwy 350 in southeast Colorado is dangerous, although volumes are light. You can't ignore parts of the state just because of volume.</li> <li>• Debra acknowledged that one of the recommendations is that we do not tier for safety.</li> <li>• Jim Austin declared it's important to recognize that in rural areas, if a road is in poor condition or not open, there often aren't any nearby alternatives. It is not like in the metro areas where, for instance, if you don't drive Sheridan, you can drive some other route.</li> <li>• Craig Casper observed that the way it is right now, the roads become the customers, but roads are not going to increase funding - drivers do that.</li> </ul>	
--	---	--

	<p>Using VMT is a better measure of how CDOT is serving its customers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suzette Mallette asked how this information will be used.</li> <li>• Debra responded that the intent was to look at the low-volume roads as a group, and not to single out specific locations. This is just information to show to the Commission how they are spending funds, to help as they go forward in making policy decisions. The next step is to launch into the Statewide Plan, and develop a framework of principles for Resource Allocation. For instance, is the policy going to be “Fix-it-First” or “Balance Capacity Improvements with Maintaining the System”?</li> </ul>	
<p>Transportation Planning Rules/Michelle Scheuerman/DTD</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To date no comments of a substantial nature have been received.</li> <li>• Next week, DTD will be going to the Commission and asking to open the rule making process.</li> <li>• In July we’ll notify interested parties and stakeholders of a 30-day review and comment period.</li> <li>• In September, the administrative hearing officer will hold a public meeting, asking for additional comments. We’d like to come back to the STAC with a summary of comments.</li> <li>• In October we will go over with you the final version and will ask that you recommend the Commission adopt the rules, and, if the Commission agrees, the rules will be adopted in October.</li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>
<p>Advanced Guideway System (AGS) Feasibility Study and Interregional Connectivity Study/David Krutsinger/Division of Transit and Rail (DTR)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• David Krutsinger provided an overview and update on the two studies currently underway. These studies are a continuation of work that’s been ongoing for over a decade: the I-70 Mountain Corridor EIS, and the North I-25 EIS. These documents set expectations, with lots of community input. People said we need to keep high-speed intercity passenger rail, and continue planning and developing projects in that direction. The AGS Feasibility Study is the I-70 project, with a focus on Eagle County Airport to Jefferson County. Jefferson County to DIA is being addressed by the ICS. David noted the need to understand what technology can be obtained from industry, and what funding might be obtained from our federal partners. He presented a list of goals for the project, with the overarching goal of gaining consensus. Assuming feasibility is confirmed, we’d proceed to a Tier II environmental process, with the public fully engaged.</li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The prior Consensus recommendation had identified 28 different criteria, which will help define what the AGS should do. It expects to go to RFQ in August, and will shortlist three teams to provide us with professional opinions in response to these performance criteria.</li><li>• Craig asked if the core values had been fully developed, and for a description of what success would look like. David responded that this work has been done, and relates to the performance criteria. He will ensure all related items are placed on the website.</li><li>• The Interregional Connectivity Study is running on a schedule parallel with the AGS study: April, 2012 to August, 2013. DTR is using the State Freight and Passenger Rail Plan to provide the vision for this study. We're looking at technologies, alignments, and funding packages, that would help keep high-speed intercity passenger rail in Colorado's future. We are using a modified Context Sensitive Solution method for both studies, enabling us to keep them together as they go along, allowing us to keep to a statewide vision. Beginning with prior work from other studies, and the alignments identified, we're trying to narrow the set of alignments to go forward in July, learning from past work to really take the next step forward.</li><li>• Diane recounted that prior studies have shown that seamless connections between the two sets of systems are critical, and it is important that this study ensure that those connections exist.</li><li>• Steve Rudy wondered how the flavors of high speed rail will be defined in this study. David replied that, from previous work, we've found there are about four different flavors. One flavor, that may be supported by FRA, is that you may not need fantastic speeds, but, if you're as fast as or somewhat faster than automobiles, that may be sufficient. One question is, even if you're going high speed in the open areas, but you must slow down in the urban areas, is your average speed still going to be fast enough to appeal to riders?</li><li>• Steve warned that, in dealing with the metro areas, penetrating the area with something that goes really fast and makes a lot of noise ultimately leads to political issues.</li><li>• Diane emphasized that feasibility is directly related to speed and interconnectivity.</li></ul>	
--	---	--

<p>Division of Transit and Rail (DTR)/Transit and Rail Advisory Committee (TRAC) Update/Mark Imhoff/DTR</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DTR has taken the better part of a year taking a hard look at the transit grant processes. DTR is testing the processes we set out last year with the current round of FASTER grants</li> <li>• DTR is putting a lot of effort into old contracts that haven't yet been executed, with the expectation that the backlog will be virtually eliminated by the end of summer.</li> <li>• Tom Mauser noted that they are working on the FY 13, and FY 14 and FY 15 application process. We've taken suggestions from Region planners, and moved up the timeline to allow more time for applications. We're now separating applications, based on vehicles, planning studies and other, and suggesting those who have a construction project contact their Region and set up a meeting to make sure that we have better applications that are ready-to-go.</li> <li>• DTR will now make funds available for design, and is encouraging a multiyear funding process for FY 14 and FY 15. We hope to move toward better use of cash, so if you are going to use money over two years, please ask for the money in those two years, as opposed to one.</li> <li>• Wayne stated that he is pleased that CDOT has been willing to be more aggressive in using road funds; however, he noted that if DTR is using these funds to do planning for transit, surely it ought to be appropriate to use it for operating systems that take people off the highways.</li> <li>• Mark Imhoff responded that DTR is starting to look at this. The one area that we have no funding stream for today is regional commuter service. I believe CDOT is now starting to understand that the FASTER program does allow for operations, and is starting to explore how we might be able to fill that void for regional commuter service. There is no direction or conclusion from Commission at this point but hope to have discussions over the coming months with the Commission. For statewide dollars (\$10 M/year), how can we fulfill capital program needs as well as having some funds dedicated to operations? That analysis has begun.</li> <li>• Wayne put forward that, while putting people into a multi-occupant vehicle could potentially take them off the roads, running that vehicle is what actually gets cars off the highway system, so funding operation is key.</li> <li>• Mark replied that Colorado Springs and PPRTA have been funding FREX in the past, but that has now come into question, and there is possibility that</li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>
---	--	-------------------------

	<p>FREX might not be running in the future. We will not likely be able to provide them any guarantee on when we might be able to provide service. If that service comes to an end, CDOT will end up owning the buses. We will be presenting the Commission with some options next week should that come to pass, including offering those buses to other providers in the state.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tracey MacDonald stated that DTR is working on a SOW for the Statewide Transit Plan. The SOW will include Local Transit and Human Services Plans for the rural TPRs. The TRAC has been working on performance measures that will help guide us. We will also be conducting a survey of the transportation needs of elderly and disabled, which will help inform the Human Services Coordination Plan. We are looking at about a 15 month schedule to develop this plan. It will incorporate the Local Transit and Human Services Plan, the passenger rail portion of the State Rail Plan, the AGS, the ICS, and also a bus study. All this will feed into the Statewide Long Range Transportation Plan. The Local Transit and Human Services Plans will be incorporated into the Regional Plans. We're looking for much coordination with transit providers around the state, coordination councils, and state and federal agencies, looking at needs and gaps, intending to share information.</li> <li>• Steve mentioned that any regionally-significant, large capital projects planned by 2040 will need to be included in DRCOG's 2040 Plan.</li> <li>• Vince remarked he'd like to see the Statewide Transit Plan fully integrated into the Statewide Plan. Transit has been lost over the last several years, but some sort of service still needs to be provided.</li> <li>• Tracey explained that this will be a team effort, utilizing corridors already in the plans, and looking at existing systems and future needs, including transit. A major effort will be evaluating state and federal funding sources.</li> <li>• Sandi Kohrs affirmed this is certainly the intent in setting up the framework for the long range plan. CDOT wants to ensure the strategies reflect all appropriate modes. We'll be examining in the STIP how funding expenditures are matching the strategies identified for the corridor.</li> </ul>	
Other Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None.</li> </ul>	No action taken.

