

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

Location: CDOT Headquarters Auditorium
Date/Time: June 11, 2010 9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.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
March Meeting Minutes	<i>May minutes approved.</i>	<i>Minutes approved</i>
Federal and State Legislative Update- Mickey Ferrell	<p>Congress probably isn't going to be able to do anything with reauthorization until after the fall elections. The Senate is going to try to debate the climate change bill in July, but it is not certain that the bill has enough votes to move to the floor for debate. We have started the conversation with the Congressional delegation about what it would mean to have a transportation tax that is diverted away from transportation. If transportation fuel taxes are used for transportation purposes, it could be the revenue source that allows the reauthorization bill to move forward. If it becomes a revenue source for the reauthorization bill, this becomes an opportunity. Normally Congress starts the appropriation process in June or July. There are eleven appropriations bills. It doesn't look like this is going to happen except for defense, and maybe a few others. Transportation is part of the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development (T-HUD) bill. There is a billion dollar shortfall for HUD this year, and transportation is going to be caught up with this. T-HUD will likely be one of the last appropriation bills to be considered.</p> <p>Question- Bill Moore: Given that it is unlikely that a "lame duck" Congress will pass reauthorization and our current continuing resolution expires in December, can we expect another continuing resolution in January?</p>	No action taken

	<p>Mickey Ferrell: There is a slim possibility that a bill could come out of a “lame duck” Congress. There is some talk in D.C. right now that it might not be until after the next Presidential election before we see reauthorization.</p>	
<p>TIGER II Grant Applications- Mickey Ferrell</p>	<p>U.S. DOT issued its final guidance for the TIGER II application process. TIGER II is part of the FY10 appropriations bill. It is a \$600 million program. Award sizes are from \$10 to \$200 million. There is an 80/20 federal/local split in urbanized areas. Urbanized areas are based on the census definition. This includes most everywhere with a population of 50,000 or above. There is a \$140 million set aside for rural areas. Rural areas are not required to have a match. There is another set aside of \$150 million for TIFIA. TIFIA is a financing tool that provides a small amount of funding to allow for the leveraging of a larger loan. The guidance very clearly indicates that they are looking to complete funding packages- a financial plan must be submitted showing how the project will be financed. \$35 million is available for transportation planning grants, to be combined with \$40 million in HUD funds. Those requests will be looked at by a joint HUD-DOT review panel. There are five primary review categories- applications need to be really good in at least one category. Job creation is also very important.</p> <p>Pre-applications for CDOT requests are due to the Government Relations Office on July 6. Pre-applications are mandatory and will be given a pass-fail by U.S. DOT. Pre-applications must be submitted to U.S. DOT by July 16. We will brief the Commission on the submittals in July. On July 30, the draft formal applications are due to CDOT for an internal review process. Part of the application process includes a lengthy cost-benefit analysis.</p> <p>Final applications are due to the Government Relations Office on August 11, and need to be submitted via grants.gov by August 23. Announcements of awards are expected on September 15. Successful projects must be ready to obligate by September 30, 2012. Applications must demonstrate that this is possible.</p> <p>For non-CDOT local projects seeking letters of support, applications must be</p>	<p>No action taken</p>

	<p>received by CDOT by August 9. In addition to the application, we need to see the Project Financial Plan and a resolution of support or something similar with recognition of match requirements, ability to obligate, and an acknowledgment of understanding of requirements (TIFIA, etc.).</p> <p>Question- Commissioner Trent Bushner: Are all of these projects in the STIP?</p> <p>Mickey Ferrell: Projects may or may not be in the STIP because the source would be new money.</p> <p><i>Handout: TIGER II – National Infrastructure Grants, TIGER II Pre-Application Information, Potential TIGER II Applications</i></p>	
<p>Additional Transit Funding Programs- Jennifer Finch & Tom Mauser</p>	<p>There are a variety of federal funds available currently for transit. The TIGGER II grant program provides funding for projects that reduce energy consumption or greenhouse gas emissions. There is also a Clean Fuels Bus Program with a due date of June 14. A State of Good Repair program is a discretionary program for capital projects. This funding is normally earmarked by Congress. Since there will be no earmarking this year, the funds are in the hands of FTA. The urbanized MPO area transit systems can apply directly, all the rural systems apply through the State through a State Consolidated Application, which will be submitted next Friday. These are all capital funding programs, not operating.</p> <p>We presented the proposal for the FASTER Local Transit Grant program to the Commission last month and it was approved, with one exception. They added a criterion for financial capacity- "Is there an institutional commitment, funding, financial capacity, and capability to sustain the service and project over time, given that this program will provide capital assistance but no operating assistance."</p> <p>The program will include a regional allocation of the \$5 million available. The minimum request is for \$100,000, with an exception for rural projects and smaller vehicles with a minimum of \$25,000. Public agencies are eligible, as are public and private nonprofit agencies that offer either public transportation</p>	<p>No action taken</p>

	<p>or “open door” specialized transportation. There is a 20% local match requirement.</p> <p>We are asking that requests be submitted to County Commissioners, and TPR and MPO representatives in advance of 4P meetings. Once presented at the meeting, unless there is objection, the CDOT Region office will provide a brief application form. TPRs and MPOs will prioritize projects and then the Regions will go through that transit list with you and select the projects for your Region. We have not identified weighting for project criteria. That is up to you to do at the Region level.</p> <p>We will most likely not know the results of the federal grant applications before we need to select projects for this program.</p> <p>Jennifer Finch: The Commission approved the budget for the new Division at the May meeting. It includes funding for 8 new FTEs, including the Director. This represents a doubling of staff from the existing staff of 7. The budget includes the FTA funds, and State FASTER funds. We currently have 23 applicants for the Division Director position and the posting closes this week. At this time we are not doing a national search. Under state law an exemption is required in order to search outside the State, which we are not pursuing at this time.</p> <p>Question- Steve Rudy: Do you have a general timeline for the dealing with state funds?</p> <p>Jennifer Finch: We will probably begin discussions in July. Now that we know how the Division will be funded, we can begin to look at the state funds that will be available.</p> <p><i>Handout: Implementation Guidance for FASTER Local Transit Grants</i></p>	
STAC Roles & Responsibilities- Jennifer Finch	This has come up several times over the life of STAC. The STAC was created when the Department of Highways became the Department of Transportation and came into existence in part to address the planning requirements that	No action taken

became part of state and federal law under ISTEA. The purpose of the STAC is to provide advice to the department on the needs of the transportation system in Colorado, to review and comment on regional transportation plans, and other activities that relate to transportation planning. One important aspect of this was that the STAC was not designed to constrain or replace the county hearing (or 4P) process for the actual programming of projects. The fact that we have a fiscally constrained Statewide Transportation Plan makes the STACs role much more critical in addressing transportation needs at the state level. The bylaws of the STAC were developed to outline the election of a Chair and Vice-Chair.

We have tried to include the STAC in planning related decisions and in how we choose to make investments. The only time that we have had difficulties in the past has been around the STAC wanting to make recommendations to the legislature. It has been a few years since this last came up. The STAC's role is to advise the Department through the Transportation Commission. STAC should also serve to communicate information back to constituents and to transportation planning regions.

Question- Rob MacDonald: What have we heard from the Transportation Commission about what they would like to hear from the STAC?

Jennifer Finch: In the early stages there was some tension between the STAC and the Commission about the STAC usurping the Commission's authority. That was worked through, and I think that the Commission is very interested in hearing what the STAC thinks. Vince gives a monthly report to the Commission Often in workshops, the Commission will turn to Vince and ask him what the STAC has had to say about a particular issue. I think this is very reflective of the fact that the Commission values the input of the STAC, both as a body and as input from individual members.

Vince Rogalski: I try to give both sides of the story if we have a controversy so that they understand while we may have made a certain recommendation, there was this discussion and these other viewpoints.

	<p>Steve Rudy: I am wondering if we might take 15 minutes of a TC workshop sometime and review with the TC what is in legislation about the STAC, and then pose Rob's question directly to them.</p> <p>Jennifer Finch: I think that might be very advantageous. One of the concerns we have is how the STAC will relate to the new Advisory Committee for the Division of Transit and Rail. That might provide some good context for having that discussion.</p> <p>Question- Steve Rudy: Vince and I both regularly attend the TC meetings and tend to know the outcomes of those meetings. Would it be of any interest if Vince or I reported back to the STAC on the Commission meetings? My other question is should we set aside time for the STAC to provide a few updates from TPRs?</p> <p>Commissioner Dianne Mitsch Bush: I think that is a great idea.</p> <p>Question- Steve Rudy: My other question is should we set aside time for the STAC to provide a few updates from TPRs?</p> <p>Cliff Davidson: We have requested that in the past and would like to see that.</p> <p><i>Handout: STAC Roles and Responsibilities</i></p>	
Other Business	<i>Meeting adjourned.</i>	No action taken