

DRAFT STAC Meeting Minutes
July 12, 2013

Location: CDOT Headquarters Auditorium

Date/Time: July 12, 9:00 a.m.-11:15 a.m.

Chairman: Vince Rogalski

Agenda Items/ Presenters/Affiliations	Presentation Highlights	Actions
Introductions/ June Minutes/ Wayne Williams/ STAC Vice-Chair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes were approved without changes 	Minutes approved.
Transportation Commission Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Debra Perkins-Smith provided a brief recap of the June Transportation Commission meeting. 	No action taken.
Federal and State Legislative Update/Kurt Morrison & Herman Stockinger/CDOT Office of Policy & Government Relations (OPGR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Transportation Legislation Review Committee (TLRC) has planned a series of field hearings to determine top transportation needs in Colorado. • In addition to the field hearings, the committee would like to hear public comments regarding the state of transportation infrastructure. The chair and vice-chair would like to hear specifically from those active in STAC, the TPRs, and MPOs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ STAC comments included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bobby Lieb Jr. (Southwest TPR) noticed a significant gap in area for the San Louis Valley region and expressed the importance of field hearings in the area. He also noted that the importance is compounded by the efforts of MPACT 64 and other funding strategies and the need for a greater understanding of those efforts. ▪ Peter Runyon (Intermountain TPR) expressed concern over the close proximity of field hearing venues and suggested more geographically diverse field hearing locations to better view infrastructure needs in the region. ○ CDOT comments included: 	No action taken.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Kurt Morrison (CDOT OPGR) said that, with regard to Southwest TPR, CDOT will attempt to get both TLRC chairs into the region with other area legislators.• MPACT 64 Update<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Current programs, such as RAMP, will allow CDOT to maintain the transportation system for the next five years. However, after that point there is a high degree of uncertainty.○ There have been two key MPACT 64 options discussed over the last year. The first option was a ten cent gas tax increase; however, polling demonstrated that is probably not an option supported by voters. The second option, a 7/10th cent sales tax increase statewide over 10-15 years, has become the focus.○ MPACT 64 has asked for a list of potential projects to do focus groups and public polling with.○ STAC comments included:<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Peter Runyon (Intermountain TPR) was curious about the methodology involved in creating the breakdown of funding.▪ Priscilla "Pete" Fraser (South Central TPR) had several questions regarding the role of MPACT 64 and noted there was a disconnect over the role of MPACT 64 resulting from a lack of discussion on the topic.▪ Pete also made remarks regarding the project selection and the statewide planning process. Speaking on behalf of South Central TPR, she expressed that meeting were geared more toward choosing from a list of predetermined projects as opposed to soliciting information from the TPR.▪ Thad Noll (Intermountain TPR) noted that every ballot measure needs a champion and in this case MPACT 64 was that group for transportation needs. He was encouraged that MPACT 64 is including the entire state in their thought process. George Wilkinson (San Luis Valley TPR) got the impression that the process, to this point, has been inclusionary with a mindset to include all parts of the state as recipients of transportation funding generated through a possible ballot measure.	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Terri Blackmore (North Front Range) felt that the MPACT 64 process is going too quickly, not enough planning is being done, and there is not enough time and information to make good decisions. Given that MPACT 64 is in the first few months of an 8-9 month process, it was added that the creation of schedule could help reduce anxiety about the process.○ CDOT comments included:<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ MPACT 64 (comprised of Metro Mayors, Metro Commissioners, Club 20, Action 22, and Progressive 15) decides the breakdown of funding. Currently, the tentative proposal calls for 1/3 for transit, 2/3 for roads with 60/40 (CDOT/local) share using the HUTF fund formula.▪ In developing “planning ranges” Herman decided to take three areas and roughly average them out- population, lane miles, and sales tax revenue. Those are the 3 areas people talk about most, so there was something for everyone. That percent for each TPR determined the "range" for planning discussion purposes. Not only have no decisions been made about ballot allocation around the state, those conversations have not even started yet at MPACT64.▪ CDOT is not a member of MPACT 64, but is allowed to attend MPACT 64 meetings and occasionally provide data when needed. CDOT’s greatest level of involvement has been offering possible projects that could be funded with a ballot measure.▪ MPACT 64 and the business community have asked CDOT if there was money available, what projects might get done? CDOT is in the position to ask TPRs and MPOs for a list of projects to meet this end.▪ MPACT 64 is a coalition interested in advancing transportation funding through a ballot measure. CDOT does not control this process because it cannot participate in sponsoring or advocating for a ballot measure. What CDOT can do is identify transportation needs, provide data, and offer input on what projects should be done.	
--	---	--

<p>Asset Management/Debra Perkins-Smith/Division of Transportation Development (DTD)/Bill Schiebel/Staff Services</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Debra Smith Perkins delivered a presentation on how asset management and PD 14. Her presentation included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Transportation Commission Statewide Plan subcommittee has started discussions around PD 14. The subcommittee is developing individual goals for PD 14. Once those goals are developed they will be brought to STAC and then they will be presented to the full Transportation Commission. ○ PD 14 provides a framework for the statewide planning process. It affects the distribution of resources and supports performance objectives. The Transportation Commission sets goals in PD 14 which translate into metrics that CDOT attempts to meet. Those metrics affect the allocation of funding through the annual budget process, STIP, and/ or the statewide plan. ○ There are new elements in the draft PD14 as a result of new MAP-21 requirements. MAP-21 introduces seven national goals areas with corresponding performance measures. The goal is to take PD 14 and incorporate MAP-21 requirements and use it to guide the statewide plan. ○ Of the seven national goals areas MAP-21 outlines, the presentation focused on two: safety and infrastructure condition. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Safety: The four performance measures related to safety, included in MAP-21, are: the number of fatalities, fatalities per VMT, number of serious injuries, and the number of serious injuries per VMT. ▪ PD 14 Safety Goals: The primary goal of safety is to reduce traffic fatalities and serious injuries and work toward zero deaths for all users; Achieve a five year annual average reduction of 12 (number of fatalities); Achieve a five year annual average fatality rate of 1 per 100 million VMT (fatalities per VMT); Achieve a five year annual average reduction of 100 serious injuries (number of serious injuries); five year annual average serious injury rate of 25 per 100 million VMT (number of serious injuries per VMT). An additional performance measure, not mandated through MAP-21, but included by 	<p>No action taken.</p>
---	--	-------------------------

	<p>CDOT is reduce the economic impact of crashes by one percent annually.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Infrastructure condition (Asset Management): The four performance measures related to Infrastructure condition are: pavement condition of the Interstate system, pavement condition of NHS (excluding Interstates), bridge condition on the NHS, and transit state of good repair. Asset Management will be housed under this category. MAP-21 requires that CDOT develop an asset management plan by October 1, 2015. CDOT's plan is expected to be completed by the end of the year.▪ PD 14 Infrastructure condition goals:<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The primary maintenance goal is to annually maintain CDOT's roadways and facilities to minimize the need for replacement or rehabilitation. There is no MAP-21 requirement, but this been a part of PD 14 in the past and a large amount of the budget goes to maintenance. There are two objectives that govern the achievement of this goal: maintain an LOS B grade for snow and ice removal and maintain an overall MLOS B- grade for the state highway system.• The primary infrastructure condition goal is to preserve the transportation infrastructure condition at a least lifetime cost. To meet this goal, the proposed objective is maintain the percent of NHS bridge total deck area that is not structurally deficient at or above 90%. This objective is consistent with the requirements of MAP-21.• Debra noted that Transit is new to PD 14. Also, MAP-21 emphasizes state of good repair and the development of Transit Asset Management Plans. Transit goals are based around the new FTA 1-5 rating scale. There are two proposed objectives developed by the Transportation Intermodal Committee of the	
--	---	--

	<p>Transportation Commission. First, maintain the percentage of vehicles in the rural Colorado transit fleet to no less than 65% operating in Fair, Good, or Excellent condition, per Federal Transit Administration (FTA) definitions. Second, by 2017, ensure that all CDOT transit grantees have Asset Management Plans in place for state or federally funded vehicles, buildings & equipment. These objectives are consistent with the requirements of MAP-21.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• CDOT is currently in the process of transitioning to a new pavement asset management method known as Drivability Life (DL). Bill Schiebel, CDOT Materials & Geotechnical Branch Manager, delivered a presentation on the new approach.<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Several issues with the current Remaining Service Life (RSL)-based pavement asset management system prompted CDOT to make significant changes in the approach to pavement asset management. Among the concerns over the RSL-based pavement asset management system was the lack of fiscal constraint, pavement condition reporting metrics inconsistent with public perception of roadway condition, unlimited project pavement treatment types allowed on all highways and infrequent surface treatment work across major segments of our pavement network.○ DL is a measure, in years, of how long a highway will have acceptable driving conditions. DL is based upon the level of driving conditions on pavements across the network.○ The key objectives of the new DL analysis method include: recognize anticipated \$240M annual fiscal constraint to optimize pavement condition across the entire state system, improved condition metrics that will better reflect driver experience, new pavement condition goals, new treatment practices for traffic-based highway pavement categories, DL method will result in statewide highway network with the most drivable roads due to more routine periodic surface treatments across the entire pavement network.○ Traffic-based pavement categories are an aspect that is built into how	
--	--	--

	<p>the system operates. There are five of these categories: Interstate, NHS high volume, other high volume, medium volume, and low volume. These categories have not yet been finalized. The DL method will use category-specific treatment options based on the traffic-based pavement categories.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A goal of DL analysis method is to maximize acceptable driving conditions for the motoring public across the entire network. ○ Under this method, regional planning partners will remain key players in developing the treatments that are needed and determining the best projects. ○ STAC comments included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Craig Casper (Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments) inquired about acquiring the formulas used to develop the DL so regions can replicate the process. ▪ Steve Ivancie (Northwest TPR) asked about special consideration being given to those roads that are being used with a vastly different purpose than what they were designed for (i.e. roads used for oil and gas production). Bill indicated that those roads will be given special consideration. ▪ Thad Noll (Intermountain TPR) inquired about the software used in the new DL method. Bill indicated that it is the same software, but has been significantly revamped. Additionally, the enhanced NHS database is being worked into the system. 	
<p>Statewide Plan/Michelle Scheuerman/DTD</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Michelle Scheuerman provided an update on Statewide and Regional Plan Development efforts. Her presentation included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There was clarification that the development of RTPs will continue over the course of the next several months. ○ Feedback generated from the 2035 debrief and 2013 TPR survey indicated that the plan should be meaningful, and informative to future decision making, Corridor visions should inform planning, short-range strategies need more attention, the 20 year timeframe is too long- it's best to focus on critical needs now, and the need to create a plan that is implementable. ○ Regional Transportation Plan Initiation and Development schedule is 	<p>No action taken.</p>

	<p>set for August-March 2013. Items which will be addressed include financial scenarios for funding shortfalls, development of a public outreach plan, addressing state and federal planning factors, the 20 year vision with an emphasis on the first 10 years, and additional needs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In September, CDOT DTD will be reaching out to the Regions to identify possible public involvement techniques for each TPR. Possible techniques include: telephone town hall conferences, open houses, development of a website, webinars, and mailings or postcards. ○ CDOT is asking regional planning partners to schedule five meetings for continuing RTP development and concurrent public involvement between September 2013 and May 2014. These meetings will be used to confirm TPR level priorities, needs and possible solutions. ○ CDOT plans to have a dedicated website for the Statewide Plan which will be launched in July 2013. ○ Starting in January 2014 through the spring, CDOT will continue public involvement at the local and statewide level. In May of 2014 STAC will review and comment on the final plan product. By July 2014, the final product will be brought before the Transportation Commission for adoption. 	
<p>Program Distribution Sub-committee Report/Wayne Williams/STAC Vice-Chair</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Wayne Williams (STAC Vice-Chair) provided STAC members with a written update of the STAC Sub-committee on Program Distribution from June's meeting. 	<p>No action taken.</p>
<p>RAMP Update/Tim Harris/Chief Engineer</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Tim Harris, CDOT Chief Engineer, provided STAC with an update on the RAMP program. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The RAMP detailed applications were due on July 1 and the total number of applications was reduced from 210 to 165. ○ Despite the reduction in the overall number of detailed applications, the total dollar amount of the remaining applications is 2 ½ times the total amount of funding available. ○ Regions and subject matter experts have begun reviewing the detailed applications. Once both groups have completed their analysis of the projects, senior management will review the remaining detailed applications. In September, senior management will come before 	<p>No action taken.</p>

	<p>STAC and Transportation Commission for final approval.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Tim made a point to remind STAC members that even if your project(s) isn't selected, that doesn't mean work isn't going to be done in your area. Tim also expressed his appreciation for all the energy the regions put into filling out the applications. 	
Transit Update/Mark Imhoff/Division of Transit and Rail (DTR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Mark provided a brief update on transit activities and directed STAC members to review the June DTR Update memo for additional information. ● Mark elaborated on Debra's PD 14 presentation in reference to mobility measures for system performance for Transit. A TRAC sub-committee is proposing two performance measures. The first is a transit utilization measure that gauges statewide transit ridership by sub-category. The second is transit connectivity which measured through transit service provided in miles. ● Mark outlined that phase one of the Regional Commuter Bus program is set to launch in 2015 with service along the I-25 corridor Colorado Springs to Denver. A second phase is planned to service the I-70 corridor. ● Mark also indicated that CDOT has received a significant amount of input from local operators requesting operating assistance for other regional services they currently provide. Due to funding constraints Transit has been resistant to those requests; however, Transit is creating a sub-committee to examine if current funding streams that might allow for this type of assistance. ● FASTER transit sub-committee working on the distribution formula for local funds. 	No action taken.
Other Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● None 	No action taken