

**DRAFT STAC Meeting Minutes**  
**March 15, 2013**

**Location:** CDOT Headquarters Auditorium

**Date/Time:** April 12, 2013 9:00 a.m. – 12:00

**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/February Minutes/Wayne Williams/STAC Vice- Chair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minutes were approved without changes.</li> </ul>	<b>Minutes approved.</b>
Recognition of Steve Rudy/Wayne Williams/STAC Vice- Chair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This was Steve Rudy's last STAC meeting, and Wayne Williams, Vice-Chair, led STAC in expressing its thanks for Steve's many years of service - members adding that they would miss his insights, and the continuity he provided. Herman added that every agency needs someone to challenge it, and Steve has done a great job. Steve responded that, in particular, he had sought to keep Transportation Commissioners aware that STAC members also travel from disparate parts of the state, as the Commissioners do, and work just as hard toward the collective good of the state, and he added that it had been his pleasure to work with STAC these many years.</li> </ul>	No action taken.
Transportation Commission (TC) Report/Debra Perkins- Smith/Division of Transportation Development (DTD)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Commission's Statewide Plan Subcommittee and its Transportation &amp; Intermodal Subcommittee held a joint meeting, discussing goals and objectives for Transit, as well as 20-year revenue projections. Although funding received for the new Transportation Alternatives (TAP) Program was less than the amount anticipated in Resource Allocation (RA), the SWP committee recommended funding the program to the RA level, with the exception of DRCOG, who offered to reduce their TAP funding but to be backfilled with CMAQ funds. The Commission approved these recommendations. It also discussed the Regional Commuter Bus (RCB) concept, and had a presentation from Bridge Enterprise on its proposal to allocate funds to bridge preservation.</li> </ul>	No action taken.

<p>Federal and State Legislative Update/ Kurt Morrison/ Office of Policy &amp; Government Relations (OPGR)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Today marks the 94th day of the 120-day legislative session. Currently, 637 bills and resolutions have been introduced. Of that amount, CDOT is tracking 90 bills, of which approximately 40 have already been postponed indefinitely or signed into law. Of key interest: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ House Bill 13-1110 (Special Fuel Tax &amp; Electric Vehicle Fee)</li> <li>○ House Bill 13-1299 (Changes to the SMART Government Act Of 2010)</li> <li>○ Senate Bill 13-203 (Limit Use of Government Land for Automotive Service Stations)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>
<p>Statewide Plan/Debra Perkins-Smith/DTD</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The schedule for development of the new Statewide Transportation Plan is being accelerated. CDOT will be working with the TPR's to hold a series of 2-3 meetings between mid-May and mid-October in order to examine transportation needs in their areas and to identify priorities if additional funds become available. Projects that might go with a ballot measure would come out of this planning process.</li> <li>• Working with OFMB, the STAC subcommittee developed revenue projections for the next 20 years for use in the Statewide Plan. The next focus for STAC is Program Distribution- which is somewhat different than the old Resource Allocation process. A subcommittee of the STAC will consider MAP-21 requirements and look at distribution formulas for RPP, FASTER Safety, TAP, and CMAQ for FY 15 and beyond. The subcommittee's recommendations will come back to the full STAC for discussion, and then STAC's recommendation will go before the Commission. Those interested in participating in the Program Distribution subcommittee should contact Jeff Sudmeier.</li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>
<p>RAMP Update/Tim Harris/Chief Engineer</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CDOT has already begun advancing projects. A list was distributed, showing that \$ 172 M has now been advanced into FY 13. Of that, \$ 144 M was FY 14 funding. The vast majority were surface treatment projects. These selections were driven by our Asset Management system. Several of the projects were larger than had been seen in the past. DRCOG asked if we can look at FY 16 and beyond now. However, Tim responded that doing anything with projects in FY '16 and FY '17 is very uncertain at this time.</li> <li>• A second handout provided a "snapshot" of projects proposed for acceleration, using RPP and FASTER safety funding, including some projects advanced from FY '15 to '14. He urged STAC members to review</li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>

	<p>information on the RAMP website. Partnership projects selected will come to STAC before they go to the Commission.</p>	
<p>MPACT 64 and Potential 2014 Ballot Question on Transportation/Herman Stockinger/OPGR</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A group of metro mayors and commissioners formed a task force to talk about potential methods for raising funds for transportation. . That group, together with Club 20, Action 22, Progressive 15, CCI and CML and others, comprise MPACT 64. Herman discussed some poll results that the group had conducted. He said gas tax did not fare too well but sales tax did better for public receptivity. Herman added that there had been a lot of discussion around vehicle-miles-traveled (VMT); however, if we think a gas tax didn't poll well, VMT polled even lower. From all appearances, and with the cost of fuel, VMT is probably not our solution right now. The thinking is that, for any funds raised, about a third would go to transit. He stated that road funds would be divided between CDOT and locals using the HUTF formula and that CDOT might get roughly \$250M per year.</li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>
<p>Advanced Guideway System (AGS) Study Update/David Krutsinger/Division of Transit &amp; Rail (DTR)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Currently, the study faces three main questions: Technical Feasibility, Land Use Feasibility, and Governance Feasibility. Three potential alignments had been anticipated; however, subsequent analysis pointed to four. Speeds over 150 mph are not feasible, as the mountain terrain would require too many tunnels, with MagLev requiring even more. The study is now examining a roughly 120 mile corridor from Golden.</li> <li>• Very generalized station locations are being evaluated. The Ridership Model tells how fast a rider could get from Point A to Point B, with the resulting timing helping us to determine attractiveness. It is important to go where we can get the ridership that will support farebox recovery. We're continuing to go out to the partnership people, using scenarios based on the best available information that we have, asking their opinions on funding financial feasibility.</li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>
<p>Other Business</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None.</li> </ul>	<p>No action taken.</p>