

**DRAFT STAC Meeting Minutes
August 9, 2013**

Location: CDOT Headquarters Auditorium
Date/Time: August 9, 2013, 9:00 a.m.-11:15 a.m.
Chairman: Vince Rogalski

Agenda Items/ Presenters/Affiliations	Presentation Highlights	Actions
Introductions/ July Minutes/ Vince Rogalski	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes were approved without changes 	Minutes approved.
Transportation Commission Report/Vince Rogalski	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The July Transportation Commission (TC) meeting included continued discussion on Asset Management, Bridge Enterprise, the new Transportation Systems Management and Operations Division, RAMP, and a Bicycle/Pedestrian update. • The TC was provided with an update on Bridge Enterprise bonding, and discussed the I-70 viaduct, and starting a project there by 2017. This would take all the money from Bridge Enterprise (about \$750 million) to do and the bond would go to 2046. • The Division of Operations gave a presentation to the TC on the Transportation Systems Management and Operations Reorganization Plan. The goal of this program is to improve the accuracy and timeliness of traveler information, reduce delays at critical bottlenecks by at least 5% in the most congested corridors, reduce incident clearance times by 5%, reduce period delays on East bound I-70 on Sundays and holidays from Frisco to C-470 by 5%, and reduce delays from lanes closures. • The TC was provided with an update on RAMP. RAMP discussion will continue at workshops in August and September. • The TC received a presentation on Bike/PED. The presentation reviewed the goals set by the Governor and the CDOT Bike/Ped Policy. 	No action taken.
Federal and State	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Federal Update: Last week the Congress looked at the transportation 	No action taken.

<p>Legislative Update/Kurt Morrison & Herman Stockinger</p>	<p>spending bill for next year the fiscal year, which is currently set to run out at the end of the federal year. Both transportation bills in the house and senate failed and Congress went on a four week break. There is a narrow window in September for Congress to act, but it is very unlikely that a whole transportation spending bill pass, more likely is a continuing resolution.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CDOT is still waiting on USDOT to release a timetable for TIGER grants. OPRG spoke with the Secretary's office and they said they will have more guidance by early October. • State Update: TLRC had the first field hearings (Greeley Fort Collins and Fort Morgan) covering many topics including: energy, agriculture, and importance of the trucking industry. There was significant discussion on I-76 and the importance of that corridor. Legislators thought that the attendance was good by cities and counties, but would to see more general public at these events. Legislators asked for more constructive feedback, such as specific projects in need of funding. • STAC members received, by email, a copy of the OPRG memo outlining the timetable for future TLRC meetings. The next meetings are set for August 19, in La Junta at Otera Junior College, followed by Pueblo and Colorado Springs on August 20. • John Cater, FHWA Colorado Division Administrator, briefed STAC on a recent memo from the Department of Justice that relates to the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). The memo outlines that ADA requires that any alternation to a roadway surface bring up to standards curb ramps for pedestrians. In the past, there was been some variation in how this has been interpreted, so DOJ provided clarification. Any modification to a pavement surface, with the exception of sub-maintenance such as chip seals or crack seals, must include these improvements. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Scott McDaniel noted his concern over the move, citing that there are certain unintended consequences which may have been overlooked by the DOJ's decision. ○ Sandi Kohrs inquired as to what point in the development process does the DOJ's ruling on ADA's ruling apply? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John responded that changes to the ADA implementation guidance do apply to projects underway and apply to all facilities open to the public, regardless of funding source. The only "exemption" for a project underway is that 	
---	---	--

	<p>the pedestrian improvements (curb ramps) can be done under a separate contract, so that the ongoing contract which is underway does not have to be modified. Mr. Cater wanted to stress that this applies to every improvement to a roadway surface regardless of the method of funding that improvement.</p>	
<p>MPACT 64/ Herman Stockinger</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MPACT 64 met once since the last STAC meetings. Although Herman didn't attend the meeting, he was able to report that MPACT 64 is moving forward and beginning to gain some momentum around the state. MPACT 64 has focused on refining the level of sales tax increase and is beginning to lean more towards a .7 cent over fifteen years as opposed to ten years. The TPR meetings that developed the project lists for a potential ballot measure are completed and those lists should be disseminated to MPACT 64. There is another MPACT 64 meeting scheduled for August. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Steve Ivancie noted that he attended the Club 20 meeting in Craig where questions were raised about bonding and sun-setting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Herman indicated the need for public polling with regard to bonding. There are some who believe that there is a tradeoff of losing a few percentage points when bonding is included in the ballot measure. With regard to sun-setting, Herman outlined that there is a greater possibility of passage with a sun-set than without. The logic is that you complete the established project list outlined in the ballot and then go back to voters if the need remains. Also, the 10-15 year window of the measure coincides with gas tax revenue. Gas tax revenue remains somewhat stable during that timeframe, but after that the bottom falls out and there is a need for a more permanent solution. 	<p>No action taken.</p>
<p>RAMP Update/ Herman Stockinger</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Herman provided a brief update on the status of RAMP. STAC members were supplied with hard copies of the RAMP information. These materials are the same materials which will be provided to the TC in their August meeting. • The TC made clear at their July meeting that they need a month to review the recommended RAMP list before taking any action. Initially, the goal was to have the TC adopt the RAMP list in September. While CDOT has 	<p>No action taken.</p>

	<p>completed the Region review, and SME review, the final staff recommendations are incomplete and it is unlikely the TC will adopt the RAMP list in September. Herman emphasized the importance of taking the extra time to ensure the best outcome for the program. Therefore, the most likely scenario is an October adoption by the TC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Vince asked for comment on whether RAMP funding will be spread out over five years. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Herman said that it is a TC decision, but if he was to speculate that the funds would be spread out over the term. ○ Craig Casper asked at what point STAC will be able to see the SME recommendations on project ratings. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Herman indicated that most likely that will take place at the September STAC meeting. ○ Steve Cook asked what amount was expected to be available. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Herman said the one thing that is still being evaluated is the “color of money” and identifying the kinds of projects. Those two factors will certainly affect the final number. ▪ Ben Stein also commented that CDOT has a cash management consultant to help address the question. ○ Barbara Kirkmeyer asked if there was any consideration of going back to local governments and asking if they are willing to contribute more funding to a particular project. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Herman indicated that there aren’t those types of conversations happening at this point. However, those discussions did take place between the pre-application and detailed application phases. 	
<p>TPR Outreach Meetings/ Sandi Kohrs and Michelle Scheuerman</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sandi began the update by thanking STAC members who were involved in setting up meetings and helping identify projects for a possible ballot list. She also noted that as the partnership continues in the planning process there will be discussions on how the project lists can be used in plan development. There will be meetings in late September and early October to determine how we get from where we are now with RTPs to RTP completion/adoption by spring and early summer of next year. • Michelle Scheuerman noted that information on the Regional Transportation Plan, and public involvement will be provided in advance of the TPR meetings in September and October. 	<p>No action taken.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sandi commented on differences between the TPRs on the desired level of involvement, and the amount of change since the 2035 Plan. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Vince commented that STAC members have experience with corridor visions. It would be helpful, in preparation for the upcoming meetings, if STAC members reviewed previous corridor visions to see how things have changed prior to the next round RTP meetings. ○ Barbara Kirkmeyer commented that Upper Front Range will be meeting with their Executive Committee and have a discussion about how they are to put their plan together. UFR would like to move away from the corridor vision approach because they feel it hasn't been beneficial or of value, especially in identifying what their strategic projects are. She also indicated the need for a set of statewide strategic projects, which Vince agreed was a good idea. 	
<p>Bridge Asset Management/Josh Laipply</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Josh Laipply gave a presentation to STAC on Bridge Asset Management. Josh began his presentation by providing an overview of CDOT's historic approach to bridge and culvert investment. Making up 15% of the overall budget for bridge and culvert, on-system bridge and culvert repairs divert the majority funds for replacement major rehabilitation (\$11.6 million) and essential repairs (\$9.5 million). Only a fraction of funds go toward preventative maintenance (\$500k). Josh demonstrated how CDOT can extend the life of its bridges and save a significant amount of money through funding preventative maintenance. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Barbara Kirkmeyer inquired as to how much funding CDOT is putting toward eliminating the back log of bridges which need upgrades. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Josh replied in two parts. First, before Bridge Enterprise, the program was drastically underfunded. Historically CDOT has taken the worst first approach and now RAMP provides a unique opportunity to utilize funding to have the biggest impact. 	<p>No action taken.</p>
<p>FY 15 Budget/ Pat Saffo</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pat Saffo gave a brief update on the FY 15 budget. In March 2013, the TC approved the baseline revenue projections for the 2040 Statewide Plan. The STAC subcommittee on Revenue Projections met several times before TC approval and presented them with a recommendation before action was taken. The preliminary FY2015 Budget Revenue Forecasts 	<p>No action taken.</p>

	<p>were also projected at that time and approved as a subset of that forecast. Since March, no significant changes have occurred either at the state or the national level that appear to justify a change in the basic assumptions used for the development of the 2040 revenue projections. Staff recommends proceeding with the FY15 annual budget's development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pat and Ben Stein pointed out that RAMP is not a budget item. RAMP funding represents existing funds, not additional funding. 	
Program Distribution Sub-committee Report/Sandi Kohrs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sandi reported back to STAC on the last meeting of the STAC subcommittee on Program Distribution. The subcommittee has been developing allocation formulas for a number of programs over the course of the spring and summer months. The committee began with TAP, and last month focused on CMAQ. There is still a question about how much CMAQ funding to put into CNG, so Sandi has asked the Colorado Energy Office (CEO) to present their CNG plan to the subcommittee at the September meeting. Funding used to be determined using population and VMT; however, Sandi asked AASHTO to conduct a survey on what other states are doing. The subcommittee tentatively agreed to use population because on-system VMT off-system NHS VMT doesn't provide a complete picture because pollution is also created on roads outside of the state system or NHS. The tentative formula is 5% PM-10, 15% CO, 80% Ozone. 	No action taken.
Other Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No other business 	No action taken.