

DRAFT STAC
September 10, 2010 Meeting Minutes

Location: CDOT Headquarters Auditorium
Date/Time: September 10, 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
August Meeting Minutes	<i>August 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"> • <i>Safety Programs</i>- Discussion of various safety programs including "100 Days of Heat," teen driving programs, etc. Programs appear to be having an impact as fatalities are down significantly. • <i>Budget Formulation Workshop</i>- Discussion of new budget software • <i>FY 2012 Budget</i>- Discussion of revenues for FY 12 budget • <i>TIGER Grants</i>- Review and approval of TIGER grant application submittals and letters of support • <i>FASTER State Transit Funds</i>- Discussion on distribution of funds • <i>Division of Transit and Rail Director</i>- Mark Imhoff selected as Director • <i>Bridge Enterprise Workshop</i>- Transfer of bridges that are fully depreciated; working on procedures to set in place bonding program • <i>Election of Officers</i>- Les Gruen elected as new Chairman 	No action taken
FY 12 Budget Update- Ben Stein	At last month's Transportation Commission meeting we discussed revenues for the FY 12 budget. Several options for revenues were presented. Based on the Commission's direction, for budgeting purposes, we estimated what we believe will be the actual HTF collections in FY 12 and Colorado's allocation based on historical allocation. For state funds, the Commission has decided to use the	No action taken

	<p>resource allocation number. This results in a total revenue figure of roughly \$1.26 billion for FY 12. The Commission has decided to budget assuming that Proposition 101 fails. There is, however, a plan to address this should that not be the case. We estimate a decrease in the budget of approximately \$314 million should Proposition 101 pass.</p> <p>The revenue figure we are currently using is approximately \$34 million less than what is in resource allocation. A significant amount of this will be in areas where there will be reductions by federal formula. This amounts to about \$12 million, leaving \$22 million for the Commission to eliminate from the budget. The Commission has asked that the discussion at next week's meeting focus on more significant budget items that could be adjusted to make up this shortfall. Before the budget workshop the Commission will see presentations on rockfall mitigation, surface treatment, bridge and Maintenance Level of Service (MLOS). This will provide the Commission with some perspective going into the budget discussion.</p> <p>Three scenarios will be presented to the Commission:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Scenario 1- Reduce Strategic Projects- Highway funding by \$22 millionScenario 2- Proportionally reverse increases made to Strategic Projects- Highway, ITS, and Surface Treatment as part of the 2035 Amendment Resource Allocation.Scenario 3- Reduce Earmark Contingency/RPP funding by \$22 million <p>The Commission might also consider changes to other categories. These are highlighted in orange on the budget handout and include Rockfall Mitigation, Congestion Relief, and TC Contingency funds, in addition to those categories discussed within the three scenarios to be presented. A final draft budget needs to be approved by the Commission in November and submitted to the legislature for review.</p> <p>Question- Commissioner Wayne Williams: What is triggering the \$67 million increase in HUTF revenue, and the \$30 million increase in miscellaneous revenue?</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>Ben Stein: The HUTF figures are based on long-term historical numbers. In the winter we will run the revenue model again with updated numbers. At that point we will have to see if revenues appear more in line with historical trends or on short-term forecasts. We are not, however, ready to do a short-term forecast of revenue at this time. We would like to get a little more data before we attempt to forecast these numbers, and as such, the budget indicates that these numbers are subject to change. Miscellaneous revenues are primarily composed of interest earnings.</p> <p>Question- Craig Casper: It seems that this is a very optimistic forecast with respect to state revenues, and a pessimistic forecast with respect to federal revenues. Why don't you use a more optimistic forecast with federal revenues and assume there is a general fund transfer consistent with past history, and take a more conservative approach with the state forecast since we are not able to do a short-term forecast at this time?</p> <p>Ben Stein: I am certainly willing to take that as a possibility to the Commission.</p> <p>Question- Commissioner Barbara Kirkmeyer: Has CDOT considered doing two budgets, one showing the impact of Proposition 101 and one assuming it fails?</p> <p>Jennifer Finch: When you take a quarter or more of our budget away, the decision making process entails a large amount of discussion, work and analysis. It is a much bigger discussion than just trying to put the numbers on a piece of paper, and it is not something we can get done in time for a discussion in advance of the November election.</p> <p><i>Handout: FY2012 Draft Budget</i></p>	
<p>Federal and State Legislative Update- Mickey Ferrell</p>	<p>The President announced the release of the US DOT White Paper for Reauthorization. This included a \$50 billion plan attached to a six year reauthorization bill. This is the first time the administration has expressed interest in moving forward with a surface transportation authorization bill. The administration wants to front-load a reauthorization bill. This \$50 billion program, if it is front loaded, would first apply in FY 11. We don't know if this</p>	<p>No action taken</p>

	<p>would be accomplished with an extension, or through the FY 11 appropriations, which is still out there. Our current extension only goes through the end of the calendar year, so something will need to come out of Congress before the end of the year. Congress returns next week and will be in session for a couple of weeks before adjourning before elections. We anticipate seeing additional details in the next few weeks.</p> <p>Question- Commissioner Trent Bushner: Is there any discussion about a fuel tax increase?</p> <p>Mickey Ferrell: The administration continues to be opposed to any increases in fuel taxes. The \$50 billion proposal is focused on increasing taxes on oil and gas extraction or production.</p> <p>Question- Vince Rogalski: What about the cap and trade legislation?</p> <p>Mickey Ferrell: I think that issue is dead at the moment, but may come up again with the next Congress.</p>	
<p>Strategic Projects Discussion- Jennifer Finch</p>	<p>Last month you saw presentations on the remaining incomplete 7th Pot projects. This month each Region will discuss what has already been accomplished with completed 7th Pot projects.</p> <p>Region 6 Needs addressed by completed 7th Pot projects in Region 6 included capacity needs, lack of modal choice in major corridors, functionally obsolete infrastructure, and the inability to complete large projects due to limited funding. Projects added capacity throughout the region, added modal choice with light rail and HOV lanes, improved quality, safety and functionality of infrastructure, and allowed the completion of large ongoing projects that were faced with funding limitations. 7th Pot funding moved forward projects with funding delays, advanced project completion and, in the case of T-REX, allowed for a project that may not have been possible without the funding source. The remaining 7th Pot Corridors (East and West Corridors) remain a high priority in the Region.</p>	<p>No action taken</p>

	<p>Region 4 Completed projects in Region 4 include I-25 Owl Canyon Rd. to Wyoming, US 34 I-25 to US 85, US 287 Broomfield to Loveland, and North I-25 SH 7 to SH 66. Projects included major benefits to system quality, mobility, safety and system continuity, and provided additional multi-modal choice. These projects could not have been completed without 7th Pot funding. Between 1999 and 2010, Region 4 received \$224 million in Regional Priority Program (RPP) funds, with an additional \$366.6 million in 7th Pot funds.</p> <p>Region 2 Completed 7th Pot projects in Region 2 include the I-25/US 50/SH 47 interchange, and I-25 from South Academy to Briargate. The first project included the reconstruction of the busiest interchange in Pueblo, as well as reconstruction on US 50 and SH 47, and the construction of Dillon Drive. This project resulted in reduced congestion at the northern gateway to Pueblo. The extension of corridor improvements westward remains a high priority in the Region. I-25 South Academy to Briargate consisted of the reconstruction and expansion of I-25 from 4 lane to 6 lane for 12 miles, as well as the reconstruction or replacement of interchanges and bridges. This project eliminated the daily traffic jams in central Colorado Springs.</p> <p>Region 5 Completed 7th Pot projects in Region 5 include US 160 Wolf Creek Pass, US 160 SH 3 to Florida River, US 160 Wolf Creek Pass, and US 550 New Mexico to Durango. The Wolf Creek Pass project improved safety, reduced the number and severity of accidents, increased travel efficiency and capacity, and updated the facility to current standards. The US 160 SH 3 to Florida River also increased travel efficiency, capacity, and safety and addressed access control issues. Finally the US 550 project improved safety, travel efficiency and capacity, and reduced access deficiencies.</p> <p>Additional phases of these projects remain high priorities in the TPR and Region, and include the completion of corridor improvements to Wolf Creek Pass, the addition of a passing lane between Durango and Bayfield on US 160, and the construction of a passing lane and intersection improvements on US</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>550.</p> <p>Region 1 Completed 7th Pot projects in Region 1 include US 40 Winter Park to South of Berthoud Pass, US 285 Goddard Ranch Ct. to Foxton Rd., and I-70 East Tower Rd. to Kansas. The US 40 project addressed operational efficiency, safety, mobility, and resolved roadway deficiencies associated with snow storage, water quality and erosion control, slope stability, wildlife passages and historic and visual resources. The US 285 project increased capacity and enhanced safety on a 14 mile section through safety improvements and widening. Finally, I-70 East included concrete reconstruction, the addition of full-width shoulders and embankments and drainage extensions, improving safety and accommodating larger commercial vehicles.</p> <p>Region 3 Completed 7th Pot projects in Region 3 include US 50 Grand Junction to Delta, and SH 82 Basalt to Aspen. Work on SH 82 will provide adequate capacity for the next 20 years, and significant improvements in travel time, improving the level of service from E or F to B. 7th Pot funding accelerated the project's completion. Remaining work on the corridor includes the entrance to Aspen and the portion between the Airport Business Center and Aspen. This work remains a priority in the TPR. The US 50 project included safety and capacity improvements. The corridor now has adequate capacity for the next 20 years. Prior to improvements the fatality rate was 3x the state average for similar roadways. It is now below average for similar roadways. The project was originally scheduled for completion in 2012, but with 7th Pot funding was completed in 2004.</p> <p>Jennifer Finch: In this time of reduced resources, how does the completion of 7th Pot projects fit in with other priorities? The Commission is looking for feedback from STAC in terms of how this program fits into the discussion of priorities.</p> <p>Commissioner Wayne Williams: I think it is important that we continue to fund some portion of this. If you tried to do this through regional allocation funds</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>you'd never get these projects done. I think it is important that CDOT continue to take some portion of funds off-the-top to fund 7th Pot projects.</p> <p>Commissioner Barbara Kirkmeyer: I think we need to stick to the commitments for funding that were made back in 1997 or 1998. These are still state strategic projects and should be completed.</p> <p>Verniece Thomas: I concur with Wayne. I think we need to keep the 7th Pot alive and continue to put money towards it. We have that commitment and we need to stand by that commitment, even if it is not a lot of dollars each year.</p> <p>Cliff Davidson: The 7th Pot concept has been a tremendous success. Where would we be today if we had continued going with regional allocations without an off-the-top 7th Pot?</p> <p>Vince Rogalski: To summarize, what I am hearing is that 7th Pot is still a priority and that funding for the 7th Pot should come off-the-top.</p> <p>Jennifer Finch: I don't think there will be any decisions made prior to the election. There is no discussion on this topic scheduled with the Commission this month, but the Commission has indicated a desire to continue the discussion in October. The Commission has been struggling with what other programs would need to be sacrificed if we are to keep funding the 7th Pot. They have also been looking for direction on whether these projects are still the high priority projects. It sounds like these are still high priority projects within each of the TPRs and MPOs.</p>	
<p>FASTER State Transit Funds- Jennifer Finch & Tom Mauser</p>	<p>We have already made decisions on how to allocate the \$5 million in local FASTER transit funds. Now we are trying to determine how to distribute the \$10 million in state funds for transit. We think that this should be a slightly different program than the local program. If that wasn't the legislature's intent they probably would have just made a single \$15 million local grant program. Some of the \$10 million has been used to match FRA dollars for the State Rail Plan and the High Speed Rail Connectivity Study. We will also be using some of these funds to fund the new Division of Transit and Rail.</p>	<p><i>Motion approved- Recommend approval of the implementation guidance for FASTER State</i></p>

	<p>We are looking to allocate funds out for three years. The Commission would like to emphasize projects that have more of a statewide impact or provide inter-regional connectivity. This is on the Commission agenda for discussion on Wednesday and action on Thursday.</p> <p>We are looking at FY 10, 11 and 12 funding amounting to \$23.3 million in funds available. After three years we would do an evaluation of this guidance and see how it is working. Eligible sponsors are the same as with the local funds- public agencies, transit operators (public or private non-profit) that provide either public transit or open door specialized transit. CDOT Regions can also be sponsors of projects.</p> <p>There is a 20% local match and locals will also be required to sign a maintenance of effort agreement. Funds can be used to match federal funds. For each project request, we will classify it as either a statewide project, an interregional project, a regional project or a local project. We will give highest priority to statewide and interregional projects, the next highest to regional projects, and the lowest priority to local projects. The same criteria will be used as in the local program- criticality, financial capacity, financial need, impacts of project and readiness. The minimum project size would be \$100,000, with an exception for projects as small as \$25,000 in rural areas. The same kinds of projects in the local program are eligible here- facilities, technology improvements, rolling stock. Additional eligible projects include park and rides, technology improvements to human services transportation, HOV/HOT lanes, queue jumps, bus pullout lanes, BRT projects, and bus lanes. This is multi-modal funding so projects that assist multi-modal projects are also eligible such as enhanced modal connections, and bike improvements that serve transit. Planning and studies are eligible, but we recommend that we limit this to 10% of funds.</p> <p>We have already been receiving requests for projects through the local program, but suggest an additional call for projects for statewide or regional projects. We will do an analysis of what should be considered statewide, inter-regional, regional or local. If there are projects are statewide or interregional</p>	<p><i>Transit Funding with caveat that in the future we believe operating needs to be addressed, and recommend changes to the interregional definition.</i></p>
--	--	--

	<p>and have strong merit, we would fund these off-the-top. Whatever funds are left after this would then be allocated to the Regions. The Regions would then select projects in consultation with the Division of Transit and Rail to identify the projects that best fit statewide and interregional criteria. Local projects could be funded with remaining funds.</p> <p>Thad Noll: I want to emphasize that we really keep the focus on statewide and interregional projects, followed by regional and then local. If we do that, then this guidance is great.</p> <p>Commissioner Wayne Williams: I'll repeat my statement that I think this needs to include operating.</p> <p>Joelle Riddle: The flip side of that is that we have a large Region and the possibility of doing an interregional or even regional project is minimal. This is a huge disadvantage to us in the smaller, rural areas.</p> <p>Commissioner Barbara Kirkmeyer: It looks like the way it is prioritized, there is an emphasis on the urban areas as opposed to the non-urban areas. Most of the rural TPRs would not have projects that would be considered interregional.</p> <p>Commissioner Wayne Williams: I move the STAC recommend to the Transportation Commission approval of the implementation guidance for FASTER State Transit Funding with the caveat that in the future we believe operating needs to be addressed.</p> <p>Commissioner Joelle Riddle: I will be voting against this draft recommendation unless we can remedy what appears to be a bias against the rural TPRs in the interregional language.</p> <p>Jennifer Finch: What if we added something in the second sentence of the interregional bullet point on line three that included connections between regional services?</p> <p>Commissioner Wayne Williams: I propose a change to the motion to further</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>recommend modifying the interregional definition to read: "This would include intercity bus services, commuter routes <i>between significantly separated urban and/or rural areas</i>, mobility management projects associated with the coordination of human services transportation, and services that connect multiple regional services."</p> <p>Commissioner Barbara Kirkmeyer: I am not going to agree to the motion if it includes the recommendation on operating funds. If local governments are not willing to commit to operating funds, then why is it that the state should commit to operating funds.</p> <p>Commissioner Gary Beedy: I also disagree with the state funding of operating. If you can't build a system that cannot self-operate, it is not a sustainable system.</p> <p><i>Motion approved with three votes in opposition.</i></p> <p><i>Handout: Implementation Guidance for FASTER State Transit Funding</i></p>	
<p>Recognition of Service to the STAC- Vince Rogalski</p>	<p>Motion to approve a resolution recognizing Mick Ireland for his years of service to the STAC. <i>Motion approved.</i></p>	<p>Motion approved- Recognition of Mick Ireland for service to the STAC</p>
<p>Other Business</p>	<p>The TPR Update from Gunnison Valley TPR has been rescheduled for next month's meeting.</p>	<p>No action taken</p>