

**DRAFT STAC Summary Meeting Minutes
May 11, 2012**

Location: CDOT Headquarters Auditorium

Date/Time May 11, 2012 9:00 a.m. – 11:30 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/April Minutes/Vince Rogalski/STAC Chair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introductions and approval of meeting minutes. 	Action- Approve minutes.
Transportation Commission (TC) Report/Vince Rogalski/STAC Chair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bridge Priority List- There had been 160 poor bridges on the eligible list- 48 of those were removed because they were repaired or replaced. For 2012, there are 112 poor bridges which are eligible for FASTER Bridge Enterprise funding. The Bridge Enterprise has already bonded for \$300 M and developed a schedule for how to spend those funds down. The Bridge Enterprise Board is now considering future bonding, considering another \$ 200+ M. • Budget Workshop – The Commission passed the Budget, without discussion of the extra funding, leaving discussion of the additional funds for the May meeting. The Transit and Intermodal Committee focused on the Interregional Connectivity, and the Advanced Guideway System studies. 	No action taken.
Use of Additional FY 13 Funding and Contingency Balance Recommendations to TC/Laurie Freedle/CDOT Office of Financial Management & Budget (OFMB)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OFMB has increased its revenue projections for FY '12, and now for FY '13. The Commission passed the budget last month, adding the additional monies to its Contingency fund, and asking OFMB to evaluate the current Contingency Fund to determine needs. OFMB is starting the evaluation and allocation process this month. • For FY '13, staff has come forward with items that need attention, and OFMB is developing those into decision items for the Commission. If they approve, we are asking them to set aside funds for these needs. The first such need that is being requested now is the allocation of \$ 5 M for road equipment. This equipment averages about 172% of useful life, meaning downtime and repair costs are escalating. Further, such equipment involves extended delivery time, adding to downtime, ordering now means 	No action taken.

the purchases can be expedited.

- OFMB is asking the Commission to move forward with a decision for \$5 M right now, and to reserve \$15 M for certain additional needs that will be discussed soon, for a total of \$20M. Laurie presented a summary of project needs, which, with the \$ 20 M, totaled about \$ 105 M. OFMB recommends reserving about \$40 M, in case it's needed for US 36 – Phase 2, the I-70 Co-Development, and the Twin Tunnels. That leaves about \$45 M that is not assigned, and will be presented to the Commission for discussion and direction.
- Vince noted that a letter on this subject was sent out by Southwest TPR. Chris LeMay asked that the additional funds be put toward the RPP program, and that they be allocated based on the existing formula, noting that this is the best way to get money to all the Regions on an equitable basis. Adam Lancaster added that if the money doesn't go to the Regions, then it should go to Surface Treatment. Diane Mitsch Bush noted the importance of flexibility, and said we should put together a framework that looks at replacing RPP, which has lost a considerable amount of money over time.
- Vince commented that STAC also discussed additional monies about six months ago. He recalled that STAC had recommended that \$ 50 M go to RPP – he asked where that money had gone. Ben responded that, once the Twin Tunnels and Colorado Springs' I-25 North expansion were dealt with, the balance of the funds went to Surface Treatment. The money being discussed today is different, and it is additional.
- Vince asked how this proposal would affect the MOU. Ben responded that the Commission hasn't yet decided how it will approach the issue. No policy has been set regarding the off-the-top issue.
- Gary Beedy maintained that some of the funding should be put into Surface Treatment, adding that if roads are let go too long, addressing them only becomes more expensive. Steve Rudy added that, before making a decision, other areas of the state should be asked if they have projects of statewide significance that need to move forward. Thad Noll pointed out that money directed to RPP gives the RTDs flexibility. Adam said that if the funds don't go to RPP, then they should go to Surface Treatment, clearly supporting jobs and the economy. Diane asked for confirmation that the \$50 M that STAC had previously recommended go to RPP had not made it there. Diane noted the importance of flexibility – and RPP is flexible.
- OFMB will bring this agenda item back to the STAC in June for further

	discussion and action.	
Federal and State Legislative Update/ Kurt Morrison/CDOT Office of Policy & Government Relations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both the House and Senate have named conferees for transportation authorization. No one from Colorado was named. The first formal meeting of the conferees was held yesterday. • On Tuesday night, there were about 30 bills (none of them CDOT's) the legislature had yet to act on that were tied up with the civil unions bill. All of them died on the calendar on Wednesday. The Governor has summoned the Legislature back for a special session next week. CDOT is watching two bills - one of them is special movement machinery registrations – mostly to the extent that it would impact the HUTF, and the other is the DUI per se law, which would create a new standard for driving under the influence. 	No action taken.
Key Elements of the next Statewide Long-Range Transportation Plan/Michelle Scheuerman/CDOT Division of Transportation Development (DTD)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The RFP has been released, with a submittal date of May 29th and a consultant should be on board by August 1st. In the meantime, DTD has been moving forward with work that can be done in-house. • DTD intends this next plan be more meaningful and flexible, allowing MPOs and TPRs to tailor to their needs. The corridor-based structure will be maintained, with a 20 year timeframe. We've found that people relate better to a shorter timeframe. We'll be taking a more rigorous look at the ten-year timeframe, using the new data to help set the needs and context for those corridors. • We'll also look at whether there are any specific plans for geometric changes, or, if the current plans are preservation-only, to help guide the conversation. • This will be a performance-based plan that can be reported on past - adoption, connecting the dots between plan development, and, ultimately, project selection. Performance-based planning is identifying desired outcomes, and reporting on whether those outcomes have been met. • Other new plans are being developed as well, including a Transit Plan, the Freight and Passenger Rail Plan, a Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, an Asset Management Plan, and the Operations Plan. These will all be integrated into the Statewide Plan. We would like to do more than just reference these plans- we'd like to make them all work intrinsically. We're looking at doing early engagement of the public using more web based methods, getting people on board earlier. • STAC packets contained a graphic, illustrating all of the elements that need to come together for the next plan. Wayne Williams questioned why 	No action taken.

	<p>Congestion Mitigation and Mobility were not listed. Michelle responded that these are addressed in the "Fix-it-First," Preservation piece, Safety, in the future Operations Plan and in the concept of multimodalism, although that is not identified in the diagram. Wayne wondered why these were not called out individually, while topics such as Greenhouse Gases (GHG) were. Michelle responded that GHG is one of the factors in the FASTER bill, which CDOT is required, by statute, to address. Wayne replied that two of the most critical factors that drive transportation planning, and are most important for Pikes Peak were omitted, adding that Congestion Mitigation is statutory as well, thus the CMAQ funds. He added that Congestion is not just a tiny little strategy embedded in one of these other topics- it's a critical planning factor, and he strongly believed it needs to be added to the list in its own right.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Michelle noted that she will revise the graphic to include Mobility and Congestion Relief. • Herman Stockinger stated that these were great points, and he would think Economic Vitality – more than anything - is about these issues, enabling our workers and others to get to where they need to go when they need to get there. But planning factors and what they fund don't necessarily match up. Dennis McCloskey noted that listing congestion that way might be interpreted as having equal stature, and some might even interpret as equal spending. • John Cater, of FHWA, explained that planning factors should be considered in the planning process, but are not criteria used for programming money. The reason these are highlighted as specific factors is because there was concern that these were not being considered in planning processes. Not that these are the only things that you should be considering. Gary Beedy noted that "if you don't have that as a focus for a planning document, then I think you're missing why we're doing a plan. If you're going to list them out like this, then Mobility is what the public looks for first." Vince asked whether technology is being considered. How will it impact infrastructure and the way we travel? Some of that needs to be a beginning basis for what we're going to do in the future. 	
<p>Highway Capacity Update/Mehdi Baziar/DTD</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DTD is using the new Highway Capacity Manual procedures to update its highway capacity numbers. One of the main parameters that the old procedure used was terrain type. Colorado has a lot of terrain that is mountainous or rolling, so, using the old procedure showed reduced 	<p>No action taken.</p>

	<p>capacity. The new procedure also uses the grade of the highway, and, although more representative of the highway, this change caused the highway capacity numbers to go up. The old procedure assumed 15% trucks. The new procedure uses the actual percentage of trucks that the highway carries. We're now seeing that each highway lane is carrying more traffic than previously thought. National research proves that vehicles are now following more closely.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The definition of "congested lane miles" is a volume-to-capacity ratio equal to .85 or above. In the recreational areas, highest traffic hour is used. In urban areas, it's likely the evening peak on a Friday afternoon. On SH 40, near Steamboat Springs, volumes might be greater on Saturday or Sunday, so those numbers are used. Diane Mitsch Bush stated that this is encouraging, as there are many areas with seasonal traffic peaks, and this is not captured by looking at annual averages. And for design purposes, site-specific analysis is always necessary. • Wayne Williams commented that, although the definition of a congested highway has been re-defined, to the average Coloradan traveling in that location, it will still seem congested. Wayne had concerns with re-defining a standard so it doesn't seem like there's a problem, noting this didn't seem like a rational approach, if the goal is to address some of the long-term deficits in the state. He requested a map, illustrating which highway sections are still congested. Steve Rudy added that, while we should not stray too far from procedures in the Highway Capacity Manual, Colorado might change its own approach, perhaps re-defining its own metric: instead of reporting centerline miles, it could report more lane miles. So, by changing how congestion is calculated, you are changing how it's reported. 	
<p>Active Traffic Management/John Cater/Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active Traffic Management (ATM) means trying to use existing facilities better, how to get more vehicles through the same pavement. ATM involves technology, transit, express lanes, telework, and other options for commuters to deal with congestion. One approach is Dynamic Pricing – instead of fixing the price at one point, under times of congestion, the price may increase to ensure that more traffic isn't coming into the facility than it can handle. There is dynamic feedback, and, as the volumes go down, the price is reduced. Pricing is based on number of vehicles in the lane, speeds, and the rate of change of traffic conditions. Using this as a tool can maximize traffic volumes. 	<p>No action taken.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The fundamental core of ATM is a regional transportation management center – a place where data and information come in, and decisions can be made based on that information. A key move is to have the state DOT and state patrol in the same place. “Dynamic shoulder lanes” refers to the use of shoulders at certain times of day. Bus use of shoulder, hard shoulder running – these are all part of the toolbox to improve congestion. Technology can really reduce backups and assist incident management, having a dramatic effect on congestion. Similar techniques are included in the proposal for the Twin Tunnels. 	
<p>Division of Transit and Rail (DTR)/Transit and Rail Advisory Committee (TRAC) Update/David Krutsinger/Division of Transit and Rail (DTR)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The next FASTER transit funding applications will be due in September. DTR is looking to upgrade its stakeholder process for the Interregional Connectivity Study which will examine high-speed rail options between Fort Collins and Pueblo. Those interested in being involved in the study should contact David. DTR is developing an RFP for an Inter-City Bus Study, focusing on near-term bus connections throughout the state. We’ll be doing a Local and Coordinated Human Services Transportation Plan, which will feed into the Statewide Transportation Plan. We will also be doing a Transit and Capital Asset Management Plan, to better-anticipate capital maintenance and replacements requests. Finally, there’s the Statewide Transit Plan, which will be an effort to pull all of these studies together into one package that feeds into the Statewide Transportation Plan. 	<p>No action taken.</p>
<p>Other Business</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thad Noll inquired what might be done to speed up the process for contract execution. His organization is 18 months from order date to bus delivery date. It can be 10 months from when a grant is awarded until a contract is executed. Thad noted “We can’t order a bus until we have a signed contract. If we could have pre-award authority – something that would allow a bus to be ordered before the price increases. This problem is statewide, and we’ve got to figure something out.” David Krutsinger said he’d take the suggestion to Tom Mauser. Herman Stockinger stated that Executive Director Hunt has recently asked for weekly updates until all of the transit grants are up-to-date, and we’ll 	<p>No action taken.</p>

	be giving this special emphasis over the next couple of months, so you have our commitment that this will be done soon.	
--	---	--