

**DRAFT STAC
February 11, 2010 Meeting Minutes**

Location: CDOT Headquarters Auditorium
Date/Time: February 11, 2010 1:00 p.m. – 3:45 p.m.
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
January Meeting Minutes	<i>January minutes approved.</i>	<i>Minutes approved</i>
Federal & State Legislative Update- Herman Stockinger & Mickey Ferrell	<p><i>State Legislative Update</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SB 110- The primary seat belt bill introduced this session is not going to move out of its primary committee and appears to be dead this session. • HB 1184- A multiple DUI bill that would have made third DUIs a felony was also defeated on concerns of additional prison costs. • HB 1162- Concerning Payments of Amounts Due Under a Construction Contract- Also known as the escrow bill, has been laid over and will probably be heard sometime in the next couple of weeks. We suggest you take a look at this bill if you haven't already. • HB 1238- Wildlife Crossing Zones- Would allow the department, in consultation with DOW, to establish wildlife crossing zones on state highways and to lower speed limits accordingly on up to 100 miles of highway. • Other bills we are monitoring include SB 95 concerning the Air Program, HB 1088 which would devolve state highway routes that serve as commuter routes to local governments, and a bill from Senator Romer proposing the use of FASTER funds for a Colfax trolley line. • There are six to eight FASTER related bills. HB 1211 and HB 1212 address late vehicle registration fees and are supported by the Governor. 	No Action Taken

- Government Relations, DTD and the Regions have been working on FASTER Fact Sheets for each of the roughly 150 FASTER projects planned for FY 11-13. These should be finished shortly. We will take these to the legislature to show the actual projects that will be lost if FASTER funding disappears.

Question- Bill Moore: Is there some sort of penalty for not having a primary seat belt law?

Herman Stockinger: There is no penalty, but under SAFETEA-LU there is a \$12 million incentive to states that do have a primary seat belt law.

Federal Legislative Update

- The Senate broke the "Jobs for America Act" into five separate bills. The first and fourth bills contain transportation components. The bills are being heard in order of priority.
- The first bill focuses on small businesses and tax credits for hiring, but also includes an extension of transportation authorization through the end of the calendar year. It includes the transfer of \$19.5 billion from the general fund into the highway and transit trust funds. This level of funding represents a "step-up" from SAFETEA-LU and backfunds the SAFETEA-LU rescission.
- The fourth bill is similar to what the House did with its Rebuild America proposal, although it will likely be a smaller package.
- The first bill was jointly introduced by Senators Baucus and Grassley and has good potential for passing. The success or failure of the first bill should provide some indication of the likelihood of success for the subsequent bills.
- Current transportation extension expires on February 28. The first of the Jobs for America bills will not pass by the 28th, and so we will probably see a 15-30 day extension before the end of the month.

ARRA

- As of Tuesday, \$2 billion nationwide remains to be obligated. As such there is the possibility that Colorado could see some redistribution funds.

	<p>CDOT has submitted a dollar figure based on the Jobs II project list to illustrate how CDOT could use redistribution funds. Redistribution, if there are funds available, will occur in mid-March and we will have until September 30 to obligate. There is no sub-allocation of redistributed funds.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TIGER grant recipients should be announced next week. 	
<p>FASTER Safety Projects- Bob Garcia</p>	<p>There have been a few minor changes to the FASTER safety list for FY 11-13. We will be taking this list to the Commission for approval next week, and would like to first discuss these changes with you.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Region 1- No changes • Region 2- One change involving Bridges on Powers Blvd. Since there are some issues still being worked out, we removed the specificity of exactly where the bridges would cross. • Region 3- No changes • Region 4- No changes • Region 5- No changes • Region 6- Extensive outreach with local agencies resulted in a number of changes. The majority involved changes in cost estimates as our RTD asked the locals to revisit and double check their cost estimates. Two local governments removed projects, and a bike underpass project was removed. Funds were also moved from a guardrail project into region-wide design. <p><i>Motion approved unanimously- recommend list, with amendments from Regions 2 and 6 added, to the Transportation Commission.</i></p>	<p><i>Motion approved- recommend list, with amendments added, to the Transportation Commission.</i></p>
<p>FASTER Transit Funding- Jennifer Finch</p>	<p>FASTER provides funding for transit in two ways: a \$5 million local share of the fees to go to a local transit grant program, and \$10 million from the state share of the fees to fund multimodal transit related projects. We would like to identify projects to show the legislature what we can do with the funds, especially if they are considering changes to the legislation. Options for the use of these funds were discussed at the Intermodal Committee last month. Next week we will have a workshop with the full Commission. We are currently</p>	<p>No Action Taken</p>

	<p>looking only one to two years ahead, with the intention of putting a more formal process into place for subsequent years.</p> <p>In developing options, we assumed that the funds would be used for capital costs only, and would include a 20% local match. This is not in statute, so the match is open to discussion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 1- Use funds to match FTA Discretionary Capital Funding • Option 2- Use funds to match FTA Formula Capital Funding • Option 3- Award funds based on a new call for capital projects • Option 4- Fund projects using the list developed for awarding SB-1 funds • Option 5- Distribute funds statewide by formula • Option 6- Regional distribution by formula, project selection using existing planning processes • Option 7- Development of a rolling stock funding list <p>Options 6 and 7 are the most feasible and are the staff recommendations.</p> <p>Question- Craig Casper: Is the reason this can't be used as operating because of the HUTF distribution?</p> <p>Jennifer Finch: Yes. This is an issue we do not want to open up right now with all of the existing challenges to FASTER.</p> <p>Heather Copp: The HUTF specifies that fees have to be spent on highway-related projects. There is some concern that rolling stock could violate this.</p> <p>Jennifer Finch: There is also concern that we couldn't get through the processes required of option 6 by March, which is when we would need to have projects selected if they are to be of any benefit to Herman in the legislature.</p> <p><i>Handout: FASTER Transit Funding Options Workshop</i></p>	
--	--	--

<p>Resource Allocation for FY 12-FY 17 STIP Cycle- Heather Copp</p>	<p>Last month the Commission approved revenue projection "Scenario 1." We have prepared allocations based on this revenue scenario. Some of you have participated in our revenue subcommittee meetings. We have two additional meetings scheduled- one on February 22 and one on March 1. We will review the regional allocations on our meeting on the 1st, and then present these to executive management the first week in March, the STAC would see them on March 12, the Commission on March 17, with approval on March 18.</p> <p>FY 08 through 11 is shown as a lump sum. For FY 08 and FY 09 we used actual revenues and allocations, and in FY 10 and FY 11 we used budgeted allocations. ARRA and HB 1310 dollars have been allocated across surface treatment, bridge on-system, Regional Priority Program (RPP) and 7th Pot.</p> <p>The final line on the spreadsheet is labeled remaining to allocate. The executive management team has prepared a recommended allocation for these funds for FY 12-FY 17. We would like STAC to review, and provide us with feedback.</p> <p>In all years, the Maintenance Incentive Pilot Program (MIPP) has been eliminated based on direction from the Commission. In each of the years between FY 12 and 17 funds are allocated to ITS, Surface Treatment, RPP and Strategic Projects, although the recommended levels of allocations change between categories for each year.</p> <p>Next month we will address how to balance the years FY 18 through FY 35 so that the 2035 total remains unchanged. Our recommendation is that, to the extent possible, we balance by program line first. If we need to add money to a program we hope to do so in the FY 18 - FY 22 year time frame, as close to FY 18 as possible. If we have to subtract money we hope to do it in the out years, as close to 2035 as possible. We are hoping that by doing so we might mitigate some of the air quality conformity issues.</p> <p>Question- Bill Moore: In the event that Congress passed a new authorization without earmarks, the earmark contingency allocation would be rolled back up into RPP?</p>	<p>No Action Taken</p>
---	---	------------------------

	<p>Heather Copp: Correct. The hope is that if there are earmarks they are for projects that we already have planned and are in our Congressional Notebook so that contingency funds are not needed. In either case, if not used these funds would then be available for RPP.</p> <p>Question- Diane Mitsch Bush: What inflation factors were used?</p> <p>Heather Copp: On the expenditure side, those categories that were not roadway intensive expenditures used the CPI, the other more roadway intensive expenditures were inflated with the Colorado Construction Cost Index (CCI).</p> <p>Heather Copp: It is my impression that this group is ok with going forward with this and doesn't need to see another scenario.</p> <p><i>Handout: Allocation of Revenues for the FY 2012-2017 STIP</i></p>	
<p>CMAQ Distribution- Jennifer Finch</p>	<p>Marissa Robinson delivered a presentation on the 2007-2008 CMAQ Report. In FY 2007-2008 \$52,654,114 was obligated to new CMAQ projects, resulting in an estimated statewide annual vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reduction of 518,681,749 miles. Decreases in emissions are shown in the executive summary to the report.</p> <p>In order to maintain the resource allocation and STIP development timelines, staff is requesting a decision on the allocation of CMAQ funds at this month's Commission meeting. During the last CMAQ recipient meeting on February 4, there was general acceptance of two scenarios. Both scenarios feature:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A reserve set aside for the purpose of accommodating new non-attainment areas that are anticipated with new EPA non-attainment standards • A 50% population, 50% VMT formula allocation, except for in PM-10 areas <p>Scenario A- assumes a \$1 million total allocation for the five eligible rural PM-</p>	<p><i>Motion approved - recommend Scenario E for adoption by the Transportation Commission</i></p>

	<p>10 areas and weights ozone no-attainment areas at a higher level than attainment/maintenance areas in the funding formula. A minimum threshold of \$200,000 is established for any eligible CMAQ recipient.</p> <p>Scenario E- allocates CMAQ funds based on specific pollutants (ozone, carbon monoxide, and PM-10). 75% of the total federal CMAQ funds are directed to ozone, 15% to CO, and 10% to PM-10. Of the 10% PM-10 allocation, half would be distributed to eligible rural PM-10 areas, and half would be distributed to eligible urban areas. A minimum threshold of \$200,000 is established for any eligible CMAQ recipient.</p> <p><i>Motion approved with six for, and five against- recommend Scenario E for adoption by the Transportation Commission.</i></p> <p>Handout: CMAQ Funding Distribution for FY 2012-2017</p>	
Other Business	None	No Action Taken