

**DRAFT STAC Meeting Minutes
November 10, 2011**

Location: CDOT Headquarters Auditorium
Date/Time: November 10, 2011 9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.
Chairman: Vince Rogalski
Attendance: Sign-in sheets were distributed to note attendance at the meeting.

Agenda Items/Presenters/ Affiliations	Presentation Highlights	Actions
Introductions/October Minutes- Vince Rogalski/STAC chair	Everyone in the room gave self-introductions. The October meeting minutes were approved.	<i>Minutes approved.</i>
Transportation Commission (TC) Report- Vince Rogalski/STAC chair	<p>The October Commission meeting at CDOT was short, as Commissioners were leaving for their road trip. Commission approved the staff recommendation for the \$229 M in additional funding, with \$90 M for surface treatment, \$ 60 M for the Twin Tunnels, \$34 M for the Regional Priority Program (RPP), \$ 31 M for I-25 North and \$14 M for rockfall mitigation, road equipment, beetle kill removal and a loan to DTR for Transit Operator’s grants.</p> <p>Tolling discussion continued, addressing vehicles using toll roads without a transponder. Identification methods include systems to take license plate photos, subsequently generating tickets. There was further discussion of the proposed FY ‘12-’13 Budget, particularly, the “off-the-top” concept. . Commissioners considered STAC’s request for policy guidance on several issues. Some Commissioners felt the Commission has the authority and responsibility to make needed decisions, regardless of agreements, while others thought policies would be helpful. However, Commissioners listened to STAC’s concerns regarding the inability to plan without policy guidance. STAC’s request led to Commissioners’ questions about future directions for some of these areas, so the Commission agreed to discuss various specific topics in the next ninety days (see discussion below). Vince will continue to bring STAC’s concerns before the Commission.</p>	No action taken.

<p>Federal and State Legislative Update/ Herman Stockinger/ Office of Policy and Government Relations</p>	<p>December will be Mickey's last STAC meeting, as he is leaving CDOT to start a new business venture of his own. He thanks STAC for allowing him to participate these past few years.</p> <p>The House and Senate are each working on their versions of a bill, and the directions the two branches are taking are becoming more apparent. Mickey passed out a summary sheet. After its August recess, the House continued to express its desire to do a six-year bill; however, doing so requires identifying over \$100 B in additional revenue - very hard to produce in this economic climate. Achieving this might require raising the gas tax, an unpopular approach. So the House has been unable to move forward. Members looked at linking Energy and Transportation - incorporating potential new revenue sources from leases for both offshore and onshore drilling to help fund transportation. However, they recently concluded that this is probably not going to produce the revenue needed for a six-year bill, and have gone back to look at other revenue sources from oil and gas production; however, projections may fall well short of the revenues needed, and they may yet be forced to do an 18 month bill.</p> <p>The Senate's bill is based on the assumption that the Finance Committee will be able to produce financial title to fund it at current levels. The bill's premise is to provide as much funding directly to the states as possible. Earmarks are eliminated, as well as discretionary programs - standard business for many years.</p> <p>However, Congress would still like to keep a small amount of discretionary funding available for states. Asset management plans and performance measures reporting will be critical, with associated penalties for non-performance. Interstate Maintenance, National Highway System, and Bridge projects are combined into the new National Highway Performance Program, which contains about 50 percent of the funding that would come back to Colorado. The Secretary will set out criteria for Investment Plans; states will produce the plans, and must measure performance against them, although actual performance measures are not yet known. If</p>	<p>No action taken.</p>
---	--	-------------------------

	<p>targets are not met, penalties could require the transfer of funds from a state's other programs in order to meet the targets. This theme continues through program after program, although there might be different criteria for each one.</p> <p>The new authorization, Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) is due March 31st, but many pieces still need to come together to make that date. The overall amount of money coming into Colorado is only slightly reduced, from \$ 553 M last year to \$522 M this year. However, overall funding is no longer based on the traditional method, using lane miles, population or geography; instead, all discretionary funds in SAFETEA-LU were averaged, and then adjusted to make sure each state gets 95% of its contribution returned. Of the total expenditures in SAFETEA-LU, Colorado was 46th of 50.</p>	
<p>FY 2012-2013 Draft Budget- Ben Stein/CDOT CFO</p>	<p>A short version of the budget was distributed. Ben noted that it is now close to Commission approval. For now, OFMB is predicting revenues to be approximately the same as FY '12. However, changes in the authorization require that funds be re-distributed among re-organized categories. OFMB also expects HUTF to decrease, as compared to last year, while FASTER funding may increase. Federal monies will be increasingly allocated by formula, which may be less flexible, meaning further adjustments may yet be needed. OFMB anticipated using Resource Allocation as the basis for the proposed FY '12-'13 Budget – and would prefer to do so – however, with this degree of uncertainty, the FY '12 budget is a better base to start from. Right now, staff recommendation for Maintenance is at the FY '12 level. However, working through this approach still does not allow placement of the same dollar amounts in the same categories – a \$45 M difference.</p> <p>OFMB proposes this remedy: without change to RPP (further decreasing RPP would create other problems), use Surface Treatment as the balancing factor, moving funds from Surface Treatment to increase funding to Bridge. CDOT already matches federal Bridge funding with a significant overmatch of state funding. OFMB, therefore, recommends then taking about \$ 10 million of these State Bridge Match funds, and</p>	<p><i>Motion Approved Unanimously- Recommend to the Transportation Commission adoption of the FY 2012-2013 Draft Budget.</i></p>

	<p>moving them back to Surface Treatment, to help backfill that program.</p> <p>The Bridge program would thereby receive approximately the same total funding, but this approach lessens the burden to Surface Treatment. Should additional federal funds ultimately be identified, Surface Treatment should be identified as the place to restore them. CDOT's goal has always been to approve a final budget in March, and state statute requires delivery of a final budget to the Governor on April 15th. However, with the ongoing uncertainty, it appears CDOT may be late in meeting this requirement. In summary, staff recommendation is to fund Maintenance, at the FY '12 level, shift \$10 M of state funds out of Bridge to Surface Treatment, and then take the balance from Surface Treatment to balance the draft budget, leaving RPP as is.</p> <p>Gary Beedy of Eastern TPR suggested changing the name of the "Roadside Appearance" line item to "Roadside Maintenance" as there is concern that the word, 'appearance' may sound less-than-critical, and yet, removal of view-blocking weeds, and similar actions, are safety issues. Strategic Projects debt service is included in the budget. The Governor's budget message indicates his intent to "modify the triggers of SB-228". The current trigger is 5% growth in personal income. It appears that the new trigger will directly relate to total general fund revenues or the rate of growth of general fund revenues. Craig Casper requested OFMB try running this budget with the \$ 522 M (amount anticipated in new authorization) to see how that would affect the budget. However, this is problematic, as funds in the new authorization also come with new requirements, unlikely to match the rest of the budget, in its current structure. Budget revisions are anticipated once the final authorization is available.</p>	
MOUs with DRCOG and PPACG- Debra Perkins-Smith/DTD Director	The MOUs were the result of years of discussion of "fair share". Currently those are set to expire at the end of December. CDOT talked with DRCOG and PPACG, discussing an 18 month extension to allow time to revisit, see what comes out of the reauthorization, and better coordinate with the	No action taken.

	<p>upcoming new Statewide Plan. The Transportation Commission is expected to take action on an 18 month extension running through June 2013 next week.</p>	
<p>Transportation Commission Policies and the 2040 Statewide Plan- Debra Perkins-Smith/DTD Director</p>	<p>At the last Commission meeting, there was much discussion of how to allocate funds in times of austerity, and whether policy guidance is needed. Commission members ultimately identified several topics for further consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MOUs • Tiering the system • Transit Planning – how funding decisions are made and how to integrate into the Statewide Plan • Strategic Projects, a.k.a. the 7th Pot, which relates to “off-the-top” • Use of Commission Contingency funds – when to use, how to request, etc. • Local Match for projects <p>The Commission would like to address these topics within the next ninety days, as these issues, and any subsequent policy, will work into the new Statewide Transportation Plan development effort, which will kick off in February, 2012. Staff will first focus on tiering in a December presentation to the Commission. A number of Commissioners are new, so the presentation will begin with the ways CDOT already does tiering. One example is snowplowing: a recent Policy Directive addressed snowplowing on roadways under 1,000 AADT. Then, other possible tiering scenarios will be presented. One possible scenario, for example, might be: First, Interstate, next, NHS roads, and then all other state highways. Another scenario might be to give a percentage of funds to each region, and let the regions tier themselves. Staff is watching the new authorization, particularly how performance measures and asset management are addressed and how this might affect tiering. Staff will be bringing this issue back to STAC as it moves forward.</p> <p>Although CDOT will move forward with a 2040 Statewide Transportation</p>	<p>No action taken.</p>

	<p>Plan, both CDOT and FHWA agree the use of a different horizon year by an MPO can be accommodated.</p>	
<p>Transit and Rail Advisory Committee (TRAC)/Division of Transit and Rail (DTR) Update- Mark Imhoff/DTR director</p>	<p>Wendy Wallach will be leaving to pursue other career opportunities. CDOT thanks Wendy for all her hard work on completing the mountain corridor PEIS.</p> <p>FASTER applications for 2013 have been submitted. 78 applications were received, totaling \$36 M. It is great to see the interest in the program, and the number of viable transit projects around the state anxious for funding.</p> <p>The State Rail Plan effort is coming to a close, and staff is currently evaluating and prioritizing freight and passenger projects and programs throughout the state. DTR will update STAC on results in December.</p> <p>TRAC is discussing performance measures for transit, looking at systems operation and longer term performance. A consultant, CH2M Hill, has been selected for the Inter-Regional Connectivity Study, and DTR anticipates project kick-off early next year.</p> <p><i>Tom Mauser/Transit Programs Section Manager</i> - At the national level, there is increasing emphasis on coordination of human services transportation programs. Transportation for veterans has traditionally been siloed. FTA is providing new grant opportunities to promote better coordination to get veterans transportation programs integrated into others - especially "one call one click" programs. CDOT submitted grant applications for four projects: one in Denver, one in Colorado Springs, one in Montrose, and one for the Northwest Council of Governments for</p>	<p>No action taken.</p>

	<p>mobility management. All four were funded, for a total of \$ 1.3 M, making Colorado more successful than other states. The grant program for Veterans transportation is a one-time, capital-only program. The potential for future funding is unknown.</p> <p>FASTER project applications focused mostly on bus replacements, but there were also intermodal facilities. DTR is emphasizing “fix it first”. A committee comprised of DTD and DTR staff will review and score applications, including statewide, regional, and interregional projects, and anticipates notifying the regions and STAC of the results in December.</p>	
<p>Other Business - Jim Austin/Central Front Range TPR</p>	<p>A FASTER Safety project has been awarded to Custer County. This project will widen the shoulders of SH 69, to better accommodate slow-moving vehicles, specifically, Amish buggies. The risks to other vehicles attempting to pass the buggies – including school buses – is a real safety concern. However, a group of concerned citizens opposes the use of these funds for this project, saying the schools are the priority candidate for any funds, as they have endured severe funding cuts.</p> <p>There is a “disconnect”, in that the public does not understand limitations on funds use, or “color of money” rules; i.e., FASTER safety funding cannot be used to backfill the schools’ budgets. Local officials struggle to explain the rules for use of grant money. Perhaps, as the Commission goes forward in considering how to better educate the public on transportation funding issues, a piece helping people to understand limitations on funds use would be important. This is similar to CDOT’s preparation of posters for County Clerk’s offices, used to help explain to the public how their FASTER fees are being used – the Clerks have reportedly found this helpful – as people don’t understand what CDOT does with money or what CDOT can’t do with money. Other STAC members echoed these issues.</p>	<p>No action taken.</p>