

DRAFT STAC
August 13, 2010 Meeting Minutes

Location: CDOT Headquarters Auditorium
Date/Time: August 13, 2010 9:00 a.m. – 12:00
Chairman: Vince Rogalski
Attendance: A sign-in sheet was distributed to note attendance at the meeting.

Agenda Items/Presenters/Affiliations	Presentation Highlights	Actions
Introductions	Everyone in the room gave self-introductions.	No action taken
July Meeting Minutes	<i>July minutes approved.</i>	<i>Minutes approved</i>
Transportation Commission Report- Vince Rogalski	Items discussed at last month's Transportation Commission meeting included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FASTER Transit State Funds- Discussed the distribution of the state share of FASTER Transit funds, but made no decision. Will likely take action at next week's meeting • NFR 34 Express Buses- NFR was awarded buses for the 34 Express route using SB-1 transit funds. The route is being discontinued for lack of ridership and buses are now available. • Bridge Enterprise (BE)- Efforts are proceeding quickly. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ BE negotiated a \$40 million short term loan at 1.19%. BE didn't want to explore longer-term financing until after November- if Amendments fail, BE will explore long-term bonding. ○ Rolled over \$37 million from FY 10-\$87 million in total funds available in FY 11. 	No action taken
State and Federal Legislative Update- Mickey Ferrell	Congress has been called back twice in the last two weeks. During this time they passed two bills- a border security bill, and an aid to the states bill. The state aid bill also included a \$2.2 billion rescission. We will not know the exact amount or requirements until we receive notification from FHWA. However, we think it will amount to roughly \$30 million for Colorado. Proportionality was	No action taken

	<p>waived, but some accounts were exempted. We will work with OFMB after notification to analyze. At this point we think the full amount of the rescission will come out of unobligated balances.</p> <p>We will probably not see an appropriations bill until after the elections. We have until the end of the year on the current extension of SAFETEA-LU. It is likely we will continue to operate on short-term extensions for some time.</p> <p>Question- Commissioner Wayne Williams: Has CDOT conducted an analysis of the impact of the November amendments to the Department's budget?</p> <p>Ben Stein: We've produced fact sheets for both amendments, and will also address the impact in the Budget Update later on the agenda.</p> <p>Question- Vince Rogalski: Are there any updates on the energy or climate bills?</p> <p>Mickey Ferrell: The Senate has been unable to come to agreement on a climate change bill. I think at least through the election cycle, it is going to be very difficult to get anything on climate change through the Senate.</p>	
<p>TIGER II- Mickey Ferrell</p>	<p>There are four official TIGER II requests from CDOT-3 where CDOT is the sole applicant, and one that is a joint application between CDOT and RTD. The CDOT applications include North Clear Creek Project (Region 1), I-70 Business Loop- Phase II (Region 3), I-25/Santa Fe Bridge (Region 6) and the I-225 Corridor (CDOT/RTD). There are also a number of non-CDOT TIGER II applications that CDOT will likely be providing letters of support for, including some that originated as CDOT applications.</p> <p>There were over 2,500 applications in the pre-application phase competing for \$600 million in funds. The official submittal date on grants.gov is August 23. Applications cannot be submitted if a pre-application was not submitted. Awards are expected in late September. The FY 11 appropriations include a continuation of the TIGER program, although it is currently called the National Corridor Investment Program, totaling \$400 million.</p>	<p>Motions approved- 1.) Recommend submittal of CDOT TIGER II applications; 2.) Support CDOT's provision of letters of support for appropriate local projects.</p>

	<p>Commissioner Peter Runyon: We would like to see Greenport TIGER application before we or CDOT extend any support.</p> <p>Question- Commissioner Wayne Williams: Where is the CDOT match coming from on these projects?</p> <p>Mickey Ferrell: Match is coming from the acceleration of future year funding out of the regional budgets. The CDOT/RTD project match from CDOT is primarily coming from right of way and design and engineering services.</p> <p>Commissioner Diane Mitsch Bush: I move that the STAC recommends to the Transportation Commission the submittal of the CDOT TIGER II applications as identified here.</p> <p><i>Motion approved.</i></p> <p>Commissioner Wayne Williams: I'm not sure how much CDOT ought to be involved in applications for off-system roads.</p> <p>Herman Stockinger: We want to get dollars into Colorado. If we can get a transportation project, we want to support it. I would hate to say because it's a local project we don't want to write a letter of support. I think as long as it seems like a valid project we ought to support it.</p> <p>Commissioner Wayne Williams: I move STAC supports CDOT's provision of letters of support for appropriate local projects.</p> <p><i>Motion approved*.</i></p> <p>*There was significant discussion of the issue of letters of support for non-CDOT applications. Concerns were raised about whether the provision of support from CDOT should be contingent upon MPO or TPR approval of the application. Commissioner Peter Runyon noted that Intermountain TPR would like to see the Greenport application prior to any extension of support from the TPR or from CDOT. Steve Rudy noted that DRCOG would not have time to</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>review and approve applications in advance of the deadline, and did not want support from CDOT withheld on that basis. There was also discussion of the status of non-CDOT applications versus CDOT applications. Cliff Davidson raised concerns about the NFR ITS project's status as a non-CDOT application.</p> <p><i>Handout: CDOT TIGER II Applications; Potential Non-CDOT Tiger II Applications</i></p>	
FY 12 Budget Update- Ben Stein	<p>We are now beginning the FY 12 budget process, beginning with revenues. The draft budget provided includes the figures from the FY 10 final budget and the FY 11 final budget, as well as the FY 12 budget from Resource Allocation (RA). Three additional scenarios for FY 12 are provided, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revenue based on continuing at current level of authorization- \$51.7 million above FY 12 RA • Revenue based on current actual HTF collections- \$34.3 million below FY 12 RA • Revenue based on assumption that Amendment 101 passes- \$314.6 million below FY 12 RA <p>This month we are only looking at revenues. In September we'll return to the Commission and look at alternatives with spending. The "Final Draft" Budget is set for adoption in November.</p> <p>Question- Commissioner Wayne Williams: Do Amendments 60 or 61 have any effect on CDOT's budget?</p> <p>Ben Stein: Amendment 61 would eliminate the ability of the Enterprises to bond. We would also lose the ability to use TIFIA loans, as we are doing on US 36. There is some question as to the possibility of the Amendment resulting in requiring us to reduce revenues at the time of the expiration of debt payments commensurate to the amount of those debt payments.</p> <p><i>Handout: Draft FY2012 Budget</i></p>	No action taken
Strategic Project Discussion- Jennifer	<p>The Commission has been interested in having a broader discussion of strategic projects and about what to do going forward given the elimination of Senate</p>	No action taken

Finch & RTDs	<p>Bill 1 and reduced overall funding. The question is one of how to best allocate scarce resources. If additional dollars are available, do we put them towards 7th Pot projects? Do we prioritize 7th Pot projects at the state or regional level? This is the discussion that the Commission has asked STAC to explore. The STAC requested that we start the discussion by reviewing what of the 7th Pot has been completed, and what remains to be completed. Today we will look at incomplete projects. Next month we will look at completed projects.</p> <p><i>Region 2- Tim Harris</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I-25 South Corridor <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Widen I-25 between SH105 (MP 161) and South Academy Boulevard (MP 135). ○ For the 11 mile central portion from North Academy (MP 150) to the US 24 Bypass (MP 139) an additional through lane in each direction would be added. For the section between Briargate Parkway and Woodmen Road an eight- lane cross section (four lanes in each direction) would be built. ○ Interchange reconstruction projects include: Exit 156 – North Gate/Powers Boulevard, Exit 145 – Fillmore Street, Exit 141 – Cimarron Street (US 24). ○ All NEPA complete. Estimated cost of remaining improvements is roughly \$500 million. • Powers Boulevard (SH 21) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Construction of missing bridges between Woodmen Rd. and SH 83; construction of new freeway from SH 83 to I-25; reconstruction of Powers from a 6-lane expressway with at-grade intersection to a 6 to 8-lane freeway with interchanges from SH 16 to Woodmen Road. ○ Completion of the I-25 and SH 85/87 interchanges at SH 16. ○ Estimated cost of \$730 million. • US 287- Ports to Plains <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Corridor is 90% complete in Region2 ○ Remaining work involves reconstruction of US 287 through Lamar or the construction of a reliever route on the east side of Lamar. ○ Estimated cost of \$30 million for reconstruction, or \$200 million 	
--------------	---	--

for reliever route.

Region 1- Tony DeVito

- I-70 Mountain Corridor (with Region 3)
 - Revised Draft PEIS is set to be released on September 10, 2010. A Final PEIS is anticipated to be complete in Winter 2010, with a Record of Decision (ROD) in Spring 2011
 - Some of the high priority projects could be implemented as soon as funding becomes available. Region 1 examples include: Empire Junction/US 40 Interchange, Silverthorne Interchange. Region 3 examples include: Dowd Canyon, Eagle Interchange, Fiber Optic projects. Plus a corridor-wide Advanced Guideway Feasibility Study.
 - CDOT has determined that \$20.2 billion of strategic funding is needed for the corridor (in 2025 Year of Expenditure dollars)
- I-25 South Corridor
 - Remaining work in Region 1 includes widening of I-25 to 8 lanes between the north end of RidgeGate and C-470. Also includes the replacement of the Happy Canyon bridge over I-25 with a wider structure and updated ramps. Both projects are currently in the preliminary design stage and should be completed and “on the shelf” by summer 2011. Project costs estimated at \$25 million, and \$6.25 million, respectively, and are currently unfunded.
- US 287- Ports to Plains
 - Remaining work on the corridor in Region 1 consists of concrete reconstruction, drainage extensions and shoulder embankments for approximately 32 miles in Cheyenne and Lincoln Counties, and concrete reconstruction, drainage improvements, street lighting, curb & gutter, sidewalks and shoulder embankments for approximately 2 miles through the town of Kit Carson. Project is fully funded, with remaining work estimated to cost \$34.7 million.

Region 6- Reza Akhavan

- East Corridor MIS
 - I-70 East from I-25 to Tower Road

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Draft EIS complete- once preferred alternative is identified, FEIS will begin. ○ Two alignments (existing and due north) and two operating scenarios (general purpose lanes, tolled express lanes) being considered ○ No-build scenario would cost \$500 – 700 million to rebuild the viaduct in its current configuration. ● West Corridor MIS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ US 6 from I-25 to Colfax ○ Cost of roadway improvements included in the MIS were estimated at \$390 million (2002 dollars); \$31 million in 7th Pot funds allocated to date. ○ Denver and Lakewood reached agreement on first two priorities for 7th pot funding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ US 6 / Wadsworth Interchange reconstruction and widening of Wadsworth from 3rd to 14th Avenue, connecting to a new RTD FasTracks park-n-ride at Wadsworth and 13th Avenue. ▪ US 6 / Federal-Bryant bridge reconstruction, consistent with Phase I Valley Highway priorities <p><i>Region 4- Myron Hora</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● I-25 North MIS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Initial 14 miles (SH 7 to SH 66) documented by EA/FONSI in 1995 ○ Recommended Proposed Action is to increase I-25 from four to six mainline lanes, frontage road improvements and major interchange improvements. ○ Construction as identified in 1995 EA/FONSI is almost complete, with the last phase of construction at Prebble Creek expected to be finished in October. ○ EIS and ROD scheduled for signature in summer 2011. ○ \$2.2B multi-modal package with highway, rail and transit 	
FASTER State Transit Funds- Jennifer Finch	There is a \$10 million set aside from FASTER funds for transit related projects. These funds can be used for the “planning, designing, engineering, acquisition, installation, construction, repair, reconstruction, maintenance, operation, or	No action taken

	<p>administration of transit-related projects. Including, but not limited to, designated bicycle or pedestrian lanes of highway and infrastructure needed to integrate different transportation modes within a multimodal transportation system that enhance the safety of state highways for transit users.”</p> <p>We are still in the process of establishing the Division of Transit and Rail, but want to proceed with getting at least some of these funds out the door as the Division develops. It is definitely implied that these funds have a more inter-regional focus. We probably don't have enough projects today to do only inter-regional projects. We have passed on the STAC's recommendation that these funds be made eligible for operating. The Commission understands the need for operating and shows a desire to move in that direction but thinks it is too risky to do today. The issue is the constitutional interpretation of what HUTF funds can be used for.</p> <p>These funds were not specifically directed to the Division of Transit and Rail, although we would expect high participation by the Division in the project selection process. We will be using some of the funds to actually operate the new Division of Transit & Rail, and will be using some as match for FRA grants. This leaves about \$7 to \$7.5 million a year. If we allocate these funds for just three years- FY 10, 11 and 12- this would allow time to get the new Division up and running and to look at some inter-regional projects, yet still get some projects completed in the short-term. We have discussed a mix of CDOT and local projects, but would not expect 100% local projects.</p> <p>We are recommending that the criteria outlined for the local share of the FASTER Transit funds also be used here, with an additional criterion relating to inter-regional or multi-regional connectivity. We are recommending a distribution to the Regions, with some funds withheld for inter-regional projects. If none are identified, then these funds would be distributed to the Regions. Rather than developing a new formula for a short time period, we thought it would make sense to use the existing local distribution formula. We would then reevaluate the distribution after three years. The Commission will be discussing this next week, but will not be making a decision until September.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>Thad Noll: I'm okay with distributing at the local level for now, but I think ultimately we need to move towards prioritizing at a higher level to address larger, inter-regional, strategic transit projects.</p> <p>Steve Rudy: Even in the short-term I think it is important to give priority to multi-regional projects, or even projects that address lengthier travel within a Region.</p> <p><i>Handout: Options for Awarding 2010 FASTER Multimodal Transit Funding</i></p>	
SB 37 Rail Abandonment Report- Jennifer Finch	<p>Every year CDOT prepares a report on rail abandonment that identifies what we think might be abandoned, or is in jeopardy of being abandoned, and then establishes some priority. The report provides recommendations to the Commission on what we should be doing in terms of monitoring the abandonment of railroads.</p> <p><i>Electronic Handout: SB37 Report</i></p>	
Transfer of SB-1 Buses- Eric Ellis	<p>In 2008 CDOT entered a contract with NFR to purchase three buses with SB-1 funds. Unfortunately, due to poor ridership the service was eliminated this spring. We are looking at different options to dispose of the buses. One option is to put the buses back into service in some other fashion in the NFR, another option is to make these vehicles available for some other strategic purpose elsewhere in the State, or to make these vehicles available for some other non-strategic purpose. Per the direction of the Commission, we sent out a solicitation for interested parties on August 4. We are asking for responses by August 16. These vehicles were designed for commuter service, so it would be more difficult to use these vehicles for local service.</p> <p><i>Handout: Options for Disposal of SB1 North Front Range MPO Buses</i></p>	
Other Business	<p>Due to time constraints, the TPR Update from Gunnison Valley TPR has been delayed until next month's meeting.</p>	No action taken

	<p>We need two reps from the TPRs and two from the MPOs to be on the Safe Routes to School application review committee. These positions are for two-year terms. We have already had participation from Southwest, Southeast, and Intermountain TPRs, and DRCOG, Pikes Peak, Pueblo and NFR MPOs. Please contact Lenore Bates if someone from your MPO or TPR is interested.</p> <p><i>Meeting adjourned.</i></p>	
--	--	--