

**Bridge Enterprise Board  
Regular Meeting Minutes  
Thursday, December 18, 2014**

PRESENT WERE: Ed Peterson, Chairman, District 2  
Kathy Connell, Vice Chairman, District 6  
Shannon Gifford, District 1  
Gary Reiff, District 3  
Kathy Gilliland, District 5  
Doug Aden, Chairman, District 7  
Sidny Zink, District 8  
Les Gruen, District 9  
Bill Thiebaut, District 10  
Steven Hofmeister, District 11

EXCUSED: Heather Barry, District 4

ALSO PRESENT: Don Hunt, Executive Director  
Scot Cuthbertson, Deputy Executive Director  
Debra Perkins-Smith, Director of Division of Transportation  
Josh Laipply, Chief Engineer  
Heidi Humphreys, Director of Admin & Human Resources  
Amy Ford, Communications Director  
Scott McDaniel, Staff Services Director  
Scott Richrath, CFO  
Herman Stockinger, Government Relations Director  
Mike Cheroutes, Director of HPTE  
Mark Imhoff, Director of Division of Transit and Rail  
Ryan Rice, Director of the Operations Division  
Darrell Lingk, Transportation Safety Director  
Kyle Lester, Director of the Maintenance Division  
Tony DeVito, Region 1 Transportation Director  
Karen Rowe, Region 2 Transportation Director  
Dave Eller, Region 3 Transportation Director  
Johnny Olson, Region 4 Transportation Director  
Kerrie Neet, Region 5 Transportation Director  
Kathy Young, Chief Transportation Counsel  
John Cater, FHWA  
Vince Rogalski, Statewide Transportation Advisory Committee (STAC)

AND: Other staff members, organization representatives,  
the public and the news media

An electronic recording of the meeting was made and filed with supporting documents in the Transportation Commission office.

Chairman Peterson convened the meeting at 11:32am in the CDOT Headquarters building at 4201 E. Arkansas Avenue, Denver, CO.

### **Audience Participation**

Chairman Peterson stated that no members of the audience wished to address the Board of Directors.

### **Act on Consent Agenda**

Chairman Peterson entertained a motion to approve the Consent Agenda. Director Connell moved to approve the resolution, and Director Gilliland seconded the motion. Upon vote of the Board the resolution passed unanimously.

### **Resolution #BE-172**

Approval of Regular Meeting Minutes for November 20, 2014.

BE IT SO RESOLVED THAT, the Minutes for the November 2014, meeting of the Bridge Enterprise Board of Directors are hereby approved by the Bridge Enterprise Board as published in the Agenda for the December 17 & 18, 2014, meeting of the Bridge Enterprise Board of Directors.

### **Discuss and Act on the 5<sup>th</sup> Budget Supplement for FY'2015**

Scott Richrath stated that there was one request before the Board in the supplement. There was emergency work that had to be done on Dolores River State Highway 90. There was a previous request for contingency funds and forewarned the Board that because this is a Bridge Enterprise eligible project that they would make the request for Bridge Enterprise funds. This supplement asks for exactly that: \$590,000 for State Highway 90.

Chairman Peterson entertained a motion to approve the 5<sup>th</sup> Budget Supplement for FY'2015. Director Aden moved to approve the resolution, and Director Connell seconded the motion. Upon vote of the Board, the resolution passed unanimously.

### **Resolution #BE-171**

BE IT SO RESOLVED THAT, the 5<sup>th</sup> Budget Supplement for FY'2015 is hereby approved by the Bridge Enterprise Board.

### **Completion of 2014 Annual Report as Required by FASTER Legislation**

Scott McDaniel stated there was a draft of the 2014 Annual Report for the Colorado Bridge Enterprise. Each of the board members received a copy of that. He thanked the Bridge Enterprise program management team for making it a succinct 15 pages. It is packed full of good information. He asked that any comments be sent to Tromila Maile, who will forward them to the Bridge Enterprise to be incorporated into the report. By legislation, they are required to have it completed by January 15, 2015. Comments should be submitted by the first week in January.

Director Aden state that the very last sentence on page 15 talking about the I-70 Viaduct says, "At the conclusion of the process, FHWA is expected to issue a Record of Decision, which selects the preferred alternative allowing final design and construction to begin. The ROD is expected in 2015." Given the recent discussions,

that seems to suggest a foregone conclusion that construction will begin. He stated that he is not comfortable that the Board is there yet.

Chairman Peterson asked the Board to review the document and provide comments to appropriate parties at their earliest convenience.

Executive Director Hunt stated this may not relate to the Annual Report but that he was reviewing the information that had been provided the previous day regarding the scope of the I-70 Viaduct as it relates to all other bridge decks in the state. Page 3 of 6 on the I-70 Workshop from the previous day stated that the Viaduct represents 61% of the state's overall CBE eligible deck area. Josh Laipply calculated roughly that when the bridge falls back into deficiency, it will represent 30% of all deficient deck area. Clarification on those numbers for the next meeting would be helpful. As they look at how the sharing might have to occur during examination of how to stop gap the project, that is an important element.

### **Monthly Progress Report**

Scott McDaniel stated that he wanted to bring two points to the attention of the Board. The first is that the SPI in the report moved up to .92. Only one point of that was due to the advancement of the program. Two of those points were related to the way that SPI is calculated. They have gone from calculating the SPI for the project overall, including pre-construction and construction, to splitting it after the pre-construction phase and starting with a new SPI for the beginning of the construction phase. The reason for that is that it helps the staff track and better monitor the progress of the construction phase; whereas before, if they carried that SPI into the construction phase, they were not sure what the real progress of the construction phase of that project was. They split it there. But for the purposes of the Board, staff will continue to report the SPI overall so that they can gauge the health of the program holistically. They are calculating it differently so that they can also track the progress of construction better and more accurately.

The second point is not in the packet but he wanted to inform the Board that even though there was only one budget request in the supplement today, there will be more requests in the future funding the design phase of six projects. This was agreed upon during a previous Board meeting so that staff can start queuing up some design projects so that if permission is granted to advance construction on projects, there will be projects already designed. There will be no delay in the program. The staff has already selected those projects. If the Board would like to see those projects, staff can provide that information. However, the Board will see in future months budget requests to fund the design phase of these project. He wanted to ensure the Board understood that staff was doing that so there is no lost time if there is a green light for designing bridges. This plan does not affect the funding for the I-70 Viaduct. This was already included in that when the calculations were done for the funding there. It will not have any impact on I-70.

### **Adjournment**

Chairman Peterson asked if there were any more matters to come before the Bridge Enterprise Board. Hearing none, Chairman Peterson announced the adjournment of the meeting at 11:40am.