



# SOUTHWEST TRANSPORTATION PLANNING REGION

## Regular Meeting Agenda

Thursday, October 14, 2021, 9:00 a.m.

Video/Phone Conference – See connection details below

- |      |  |            |
|------|--|------------|
| I.   | Introductions  | 9:00 a.m.  |
| II.  | Consent Agenda   | 9:10 a.m.  |
|      | 1. August 2021 Meeting Minutes   |            |
|      | 2. Financial Report: July 2021 – August 2021   |            |
| III. | Reports  | 9:15 a.m.  |
|      | 1. August, September 2021 STAC Update  |            |
|      | 2. Transportation Commissioner Report – Mark Garcia  |            |
| IV.  | Discussion Items   | 9:45 a.m.  |
|      | 1. Division of Transit and Rail Director Introduction – Amber Blake  |            |
| V.   | CDOT Reports   | 10:00 a.m. |
|      | 1. 10-Year Plan Amendment Process - Annelies Van Vonno   |            |
|      | 2. Greenhouse Gas Rulemaking Update – Matt Muraro  |            |
|      | 3. Construction Update – Kevin Curry   |            |
|      | 4. Multimodal Transportation and Mitigation Option Fund, New Funding:<br>Federal Stimulus and Senate Bill 260 – Michael Snow |            |
| VI.  | Other Business   | 11:15 a.m. |
|      | 1. Updates – Round Robin   |            |
| VII. | Adjourn  |            |

Next regular meeting date: Thursday, December 9, 2021

Video/Phone Conference Info:

<https://zoom.us>

Webinar ID: 516436015

Or by Telephone:

US: +1 669 900 6833, Webinar ID: 516 436 015

295 Girard Street, Durango, CO 81303  
970.779.4592  
[www.swccog.org](http://www.swccog.org)

**Southwest Colorado Regional Transportation  
Planning Commission  
Thursday, August 12, 2021 - 9:00 a.m.  
CDOT Training Facility, 20581 US 160 W, Durango**

TPR Members in Attendance:

Sarah Hill – City of Durango  
Mark Garcia – Town of Ignacio  
Katie Sickles – Town of Bayfield  
Clyde Church – La Plata County (remote)  
David Black – Town of Bayfield (remote)  
Josh Joswick – Town of Bayfield (remote)  
Ronnie Maez – Archuleta County (remote)  
Steve Garchar – Dolores County (remote)  
Andrea Phillips – Town of Pagosa Springs (remote)  
Phil Johnson - City of Cortez (remote)  
Lyndreth Wall – Ute Mountain Ute Tribe (remote)  
Martin Schmidt – Town of Pagosa Springs (remote)

Others in Attendance:

Douglas Tooley (remote)  
James Dietrich – Montezuma County  
Laura Vanoni – Archuleta County (remote)  
Julie Bingham – Dolores County (remote)  
John Whitney – Senator Bennet’s Office (remote)  
Annelies Van Vonno - Colorado Department of Transportation  
Matt Muraro - Colorado Department of Transportation  
Kevin Curry - Colorado Department of Transportation  
Julie Constan - Colorado Department of Transportation  
TJ Burr - Colorado Department of Transportation (remote)  
Jessica Laitsch – Southwest Colorado Council of Governments  
Bryce Bierman – Southwest Colorado Council of Governments

The meeting was called to order at 9:07 a.m.

**I. Introductions**

**II. Consent Agenda:**

June 2021 Meeting Minutes  
Financial Report: July 2020 – June 2021

**Mark Garcia motioned to approve the June minutes, Josh Joswick seconded, unanimously approved.**

**Katie Sickles motioned to accept the financial report, Martin Schmidt seconded, unanimously approved.**

### **III. Reports**

John Whitney provided an update on the infrastructure bill under consideration and the ongoing efforts by Senator Bennet. Clyde asked if there are any funds anticipated for county roads. John replied he did not expect direct funds, although there may be avenues for funding that may help. Sarah asked about potential funds for local transit. John replied that transit investment is expected to be included. John will send out a current summary.

#### **1. June, July 2021 STAC Update – Sarah Hill**

Sarah reported that they received an update on the new transportation commission members. There was an update on the cleanup of the Glenwood Canyon slide. Julie mentioned that they are hoping to have one lane have open by Saturday. There was a presentation on the national freight program. She added that due to unanticipated funds there will be an updated four-year project prioritization process.

#### **2. Transportation Commissioner Report – Mark Garcia**

Mark reported that he is working with regional and headquarters staff to get up to speed. The TC passed a number of resolutions related to new pending funding. The Greenhouse Gas rulemaking process is ramping up. He mentioned that his contact information is on the transportation commission website.

### **IV. Discussion/Decision Items**

#### **1. MMOF Project Application Funding Allocation Decisions**

Matt described the purpose of this request. He summarized the project requests and CDOT's support for each of the requests. Julie and Steve summarized the Dolores County request. Matt and James described the request for match alleviation for Montezuma County. Sarah mentioned that CDOT currently has an open capital vehicle call. Matt clarified that this request is for matching funds for the CDOT call. Mark asked if Dolores could complete their project with a \$44,000 reduction. Julie replied they would need to narrow the width of the parking lot. Clyde suggested completing the projects that have begun, Phil expressed agreement. Julie, Steve, and James each stated that they could work with a reduction to the request. Katie suggested removing \$10,000 from the Dolores County request and the remaining \$5,000 from the Montezuma County request. Phil suggested fully funding the Dolores County request and reducing the Montezuma County request.

**Katie Sickles motioned remove the Southern Colorado Community Action Agency request, fully fund the Dolores County request of \$110,027, and remove the remaining difference from the Montezuma County request, Phil Johnson seconded, unanimously approved.**

#### **2. Ratification of letters of support for FTA Transit funds**

Jessica described that when letters of support were requested there were no concerns stated, this item is for ratification of the letters.

**Josh Joswick motioned to ratify the letters of support for FTA transit funds, Phil Johnson seconded, unanimously approved.**

## **V. CDOT Reports**

### **1. Construction Update – Kevin Curry**

- US 160 McCabe Creek Pagosa – Work has begun. They are relocating a thermal line; a winter shutdown is anticipated.
- US 550 Durango 9<sup>th</sup> to 12<sup>th</sup> – This project will have traffic impacts, expected completion by December.
- US 550 priority culverts – Work has begun, expected completion by October.
- US 160 West & Cortez PCCP Diamond Grind – Ongoing. Much of the work in Cortez is being done at night. Expected completion in September.
- US 160/SH 151 Wildlife Crossing Project – Ongoing. Working on the wildlife underpass, will continue until December.
- SH 145 Dolores Rico US 160 Cortez Htr Repave – Most of the work is complete, working on paving.
- US 550/160 Connection South Design – The Gulch A bridge has been paved, they are preparing to remove material. Upcoming work will include shifting US 550 traffic at CR 220.
- SH 172 at County Road 318 – Awarded, work expected to begin in October.
- US 160 Wolf Creek West Fiber – The bidder declared bankruptcy, looking at beginning next year.
- US 160 West of Pagosa – Surface treatment project. Martin asked about the scope of curb and gutter construction. Kevin replied there will be some overlap with other projects and they are working to sort out.
- US 550 and 30<sup>th</sup> Street – They are hoping to add this to an existing project as a change order.
- US 160 Four Corners to Aztec Creek – Repave and add shoulders, working with NMDOT. They are working on environmental clearance and looking at 2022.
- US 160 San Juan River Bridge Scour – Expected ad in 2023.

### **2. State Legislative update – Julie Constan**

Julie presented information on various bills and fees and the anticipated distribution for the resulting funds. Douglas Tooley suggested looking into corridor connectivity between Telluride and Cortez.

### **3. SB267 Year 3a and Year 4 Funding - Matt Muraro**

Matt summarized the projects proposed for funding for years 3 and 4 of the SB260 and SB267 programs.

### **4. Discuss Updates to the 4 Year Plan - Matt Muraro**

Matt described the necessity to reprioritize the unfunded projects in years 5-10. Sarah asked if there are opportunities to include newly prioritized projects from local agencies. Matt replied that the focus would be on reprioritizing the existing list of projects unless additional projects are needed. Julie added that agencies from other regions have asked the same question, so it may require a larger discussion.

### **5. Greenhouse Gas Rulemaking Update – Annelies Van Vonno**

Annelies provided an update on the next steps in the greenhouse gas rulemaking process. Matt added that the public comment meeting in Durango is tentatively scheduled for mid-September.



## **VI. Other Business**

### **1. Community Updates – Round Robin**

Katie reported the Town of Bayfield has an RFQ out for engineering of the trails project.

Clyde reported that CR 220 will be closed at US 550. La Plata County is doing a culvert replacement. They will be doing a mill and overlay on CR 203 and CR125, chipseal on CR 204, and pave and chipseal on CR 205.

Steve reported Dolores County is dealing with the lack of water.

Andrea reported that in Pagosa Springs the McCabe Creek project has begun. They applied for a larger infrastructure grant for the Hotsprings Blvd reconstruction and multimodal improvement. They have selected a planning firm for the east end multimodal project. They are working on the Town to Lakes Trail. Martin added that they will be doing restriping on Putt Hill. They submitted a crosswalk proposal for 1<sup>st</sup> Street.

Laura reported that Archuleta County selected a firm for predesign of the bus facility. They are updating the long-range transportation and safety plan.

Lyndreth reported the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe experienced flooding and will be doing repairs.

Phil reported the City of Cortez the repaving and microgrind project is going well. They are doing some chipseal work and ADA improvements.

Sarah reported the City of Durango submitted an RFP for design of Camino crossing project and received one bid. They are finishing design on the College and 8<sup>th</sup> safety project with construction scheduled next summer. They are working on IGA for transit capital project on US 550. Completed signage for Safe Routes to School project. They are looking to expand transit routes.

The meeting ended at 10:58 a.m.

# SWTPR Financials 7/1/2021-8/31/2021

To: SW Colorado Transportation Planning Region

From: Jessica Laitsch

Date: 14 October, 2021

---

Comments: A profit and loss report for the period July 1, 2021 to August 31, 2021 is attached.

The TPR grant runs on a state fiscal year (July 1 to June 30). The attached P&L shows the current grant status. Because this is a reimbursement grant, the net income is showing in the negative as funds have been spent but not yet reimbursed.

# Southwest Colorado Council of Governments

## Profit and Loss January - August, 2021

	TOTAL
Income	
<b>Total Income</b>	
GROSS PROFIT	<b>\$0.00</b>
Expenses	
Administrative Costs	
Operating Expenses	
Information Technology (IT)	
Software	165.38
<b>Total Information Technology (IT)</b>	<b>165.38</b>
Office Supplies	53.79
Rent	175.00
<b>Total Operating Expenses</b>	<b>394.17</b>
Personnel Expense	
Insurance Expense	
Health	97.46
Worker's Compensation	8.35
<b>Total Insurance Expense</b>	<b>105.81</b>
Salary and Wages	550.17
457 Retirement	22.01
Car Allowance	0.87
Cell Phone Allowance	6.99
Payroll Processing Fee	7.17
Payroll Tax	47.04
<b>Total Salary and Wages</b>	<b>634.25</b>
<b>Total Personnel Expense</b>	<b>740.06</b>
<b>Total Administrative Costs</b>	<b>1,134.23</b>
Project Costs	
SWTPR Internet Connection	320.08
<b>Total Project Costs</b>	<b>320.08</b>
<b>Total Expenses</b>	<b>\$1,454.31</b>
NET OPERATING INCOME	<b>\$ -1,454.31</b>
NET INCOME	<b>\$ -1,454.31</b>

# STAC Summary – August, September

To: SW Colorado Transportation Planning Region  
From: Jessica Laitsch  
Date: 14 October, 2021

---

Comments: Below are some highlights from the August and September 2021 Statewide Transportation Advisory Committee (STAC) meetings. The draft minutes for the August and September meetings are attached.

August:

CDOT Updates

Update on recent mudslides

Federal Legislation report

Revitalizing Main Streets Program update

Greenhouse Gas Rulemaking update

STAC representative updates

September:

Transportation Commission update

Federal Legislation report

Greenhouse Gas Rulemaking update

Multimodal Transportation and Mitigation Options Fund (MMOF) update

10-year Plan Amendment Process update

For more information about STAC, visit:

<https://www.codot.gov/programs/planning/planning-partners/stac.html>

---



Statewide Transportation Advisory Committee (STAC)  
Meeting Minutes

Location: CDOT Headquarters Auditorium & Via Web Conference  
Date/Time: August 13, 2021; 9:00 a.m.  
Chairman: Vince Rogalski, Chair, Gunnison Valley TPR

Attendance:

Denver Area:	Ashley Stolzmann, Tammy Maurer, Ron Papsdorf	San Luis Valley:	Keith Baker, Vern Heersink
Central Front Range:	Dick Elsner	South Central:	Walt Boulden
Eastern:	Chris Richardson	Southeast:	Jim Baldwin, Stephanie Gonzales
Grand Valley:	Dana Brosig, Dean Bressler	Southwest:	Sarah Hill
Intermountain:	Bentley Henderson	Upper Front Range:	Scott James, Elizabeth Relford
North Front Range:	Suzette Mallette, Becky Karasko	Southern Ute Tribe:	N/A
Northwest:	Heather Sloop	Ute Mountain Ute Tribe:	Bernadette Cuthair
Pikes Peak Area:	Holly Williams, John Liosatos and Kathryn Wenger	FHWA:	John Cater, Bill Haas
Pueblo Area:	Chris Wiseman, John Adams	FTA:	Kristin Kenyon
Gunnison Valley:	Roger Rash, Michelle Hayes		

Don Stanton (Transportation Commissioner)  
Kathleen Bracke (Transportation Commissioner)  
Karen Stuart (Transportation Commissioner)  
Hermann Stockinger (CDOT Deputy Director)  
Steve Harelson (CDOT Chief Engineer)  
Jeffrey Sudmeier (CDOT Chief Financial Officer)  
Marissa Gaughan (CDOT Manager, Multimodal Planning Branch)  
Theresa Takushi (CDOT Greenhouse Gas Climate Action Specialist)  
Jerad Esquibel, (CDOT Director, Division of Project Support)  
Sally Chafee (CDOT Chief of Staff)  
Jim Eussen (CDOT Region 4 Environmental Programs)  
Brian Varrella (CDOT Region 4 Hydrology)  
Rebecca White (CDOT Director, Division of Transportation Development)  
Jason Smith, (CDOT Acting Region 3 Regional Transportation Director)  
Mike Goolsby (CDOT Region 3 RTD, and Glenwood Canyon Incident Commander)

Kay Kelly (CDOT, Director of Innovative Mobility)  
John Lorme (CDOT Division of Maintenance and Operations)  
Julie Constan (CDOT Region 5 RTD)  
Mike Timlin (CDOT, Division of Transit and Rail)  
Heather Paddock (CDOT Region 4 RTD)  
Nathan Lindquist, (CDOT Land Use Planner/Analyst)  
Nathan Vander Broek, (CDOT Bicycle/Pedestrian Section)  
Julie George (CDOT Office of Policy and Government Relations)  
Jamie Grim (CDOT Office of Policy and Government Relations)  
Erik Sabina (CDOT Information Management Branch)  
Molly Bly (CDOT Temp/Office of Innovative Mobility)

Agenda Item / Presenter (Affiliation)	Presentation Highlights	Actions
Introductions & STAC Minutes – Vince Rogalski, STAC Chair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Motion</u> by Ashley Stolzmann to approve the minutes of the July 9, 2021 &amp; July 14, 2021 STAC meeting minutes with recommended edits; Seconded by Scott James; approved unanimously as edited during the meeting.</li> </ul>	Minutes approved
CDOT Update on Current Events – Mike Goolsby, Glenwood Canyon Incident Commander – Herman Stockinger, CDOT Deputy Director	<p>Mike Goolsby:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A detailed report was provided on the scale of damage and mitigation efforts to the river, roadway and railway caused by the catastrophic July 2021 flooding in Glenwood Canyon as a result of the Grizzly Creek Fire of 2020.</li> <li>• Barring no other setbacks, CDOT expects to get Interstate 70 open through the Canyon again by Saturday, August 14, with one lane open in each direction.</li> <li>• As cleanup continues, CDOT has asked that construction operations cease on US50 east of Montrose to minimize the impacts from detoured I-70 traffic.</li> <li>• Once the Canyon is open to traffic again, it will be capable of handling all forms of vehicular and truck traffic and public information will be updated so that freight movers no longer choose to detour.</li> </ul> <p>Herman Stockinger:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Herman Stockinger shared some work that has been completed on the format of the 10-Year Plan in response to discussion and feedback received in July. Two additional drafts were shared, showing different presentations of additional information related to the projects in the Plan, including adding the highway labels, which year the project is listed in the Plan, what strategic funding is proposed and awarded on each, and links to project fact sheets. These are draft only at this point, as a suggested guideline for the next 10-Year Plan effort.</li> </ul> <p><u>STAC Discussion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vince Rogalski: The Glenwood Canyon closure is a very good example of why we need to continue with Resiliency planning and developing good plans for how to handle detours in situations like this.</li> <li>• Tammy Maurer: It would be helpful to also provide in the 10-Year Plan lists, specific project information that would explain why, for instance, a project in later years is being funded earlier, or vice versa. Similarly, information on a project like the Eisenhower Tunnel project as to why it was determined needed urgent funding. This kind of information in the lists would be helpful.</li> </ul>	No Action.
Transportation Commission Report (Informational Update) – Vince Rogalski, STAC Chair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Commission heard the concerns expressed by STAC as to the hurried pace and timing that we received the Senate Bill 267/Senate Bill 260 project funding proposals.</li> <li>• The proposed SB267/SB260 project list was approved and the GHG Rulemaking was started as planned.</li> </ul> <p><u>STAC Discussion:</u> None  <i>To accommodate the full agenda, the MPO/TPR Reports was moved to the end of the meeting.</i></p>	No Action.

<p>State &amp; Federal Legislative Report</p> <p>– Herman Stockinger, CDOT Deputy Director</p> <p>– Jamie Grim, CDOT Office of Policy and Government Relations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Jamie Grimm: An overview was provided of the \$1 Trillion US infrastructure and transportation reauthorization bill that passed the US Senate this week. Considering the bill must first pass the US House, which was called back from recess August 25th, it is likely to see many changes or perhaps is killed altogether. This was passed with strong bipartisan support, garnering 69 votes. It contains over \$550 Billion in new funding with the majority going to roads and bridges but also includes significant funding for transit, rail, electrification, clean energy, water &amp; environment, broadband and resiliency programs.</li> <li>● Jeff Sudmeier: In total, it will bring roughly \$795 million annually to Colorado highways for the next five years, which is about \$230 million increase over previous years' federal funding. This includes approximately \$20 million formula dollars in each of two new programs, one for carbon reduction, one for resiliency. Similarly, transit would see roughly \$185 million annually compared to \$140 million in recent years.</li> <li>● Jamie Grimm: In addition to the infrastructure &amp; reauthorization bill, the Senate has also moved forward to consider an additional \$3.5 Trillion budget reconciliation bill. It's very uncertain what will happen on that bill or if it will impact the likelihood of the infrastructure bill passing the House, which includes the 5-year reauthorization. The current authorization expires September 30.</li> </ul> <p><u>STAC Discussion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Holly Williams (via chat): How does Colorado compare in what we get compared to smaller population states like Wisconsin or Minnesota? Do we still get 100 million more or less every year?</li> <li>● Jeff Sudmeier: I'm not sure what you're getting at. But Colorado is one of those states that gets slightly less than it puts in, about 97%. That's been the same formula since before the SAFETEA- LU Authorization. The way the formula is, eastern states get the bulk of federal funding typically. We've worked very hard with our Congressional delegation to educate them on this issue and the fact that states like Colorado have such a growing population. Our Senators joined with Senator Ted Cruz of Texas recently to set up a study committee to look at the situation.</li> <li>● Sarah Hill: Will any of the FTA Programs be impacted with respect to project eligibility, such as with CARES which expanded the FTA5311 program to be eligible for transportation for health care programs?</li> <li>● Jeff Sudmeier: We know more about its impacts on highways, but right now we don't know its impacts on FTA programs.</li> <li>● Kristin Kenyon: That's correct – at this point, we don't know yet.</li> <li>● Keith Baker: In our rural areas, many of us have old off-system tunnels and railroad grades that are a constant issue. We know the federal stimulus funds have very few restrictions on them and can be used off-system. But it would be helpful if perhaps through rulemaking or the writing of these things, that it be made eligible for use off-system.</li> <li>● John Cater: Will there be Resiliency funding in this Bill?</li> </ul>	<p>No Action</p>
--	---	------------------

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jeff S: Yes, that is one of two new programs in the Bill for which we would be provided about \$20 million for Resiliency in Colorado.</li> </ul> <p><i>Break at 10:18am; resumed at 10:31 am.</i></p>	
<p>Main Streets Listening Session (Informational Update)</p> <p>– Nathan Lindquist, CDOT Land Use Planner/Analyst</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff provided a summary of past project investments in the Revitalizing Main Streets Program (RMS). The program has awarded 109 awards to 76 communities. Another \$22 million of program awards were announced this August for larger Safer Main Streets (SMS) grants. CDOT received 72 applications for that program, totaling \$96 million requested. Colorado’s Senate Bill 21-260 also appropriated another \$85 million to the RMS and SMS programs over the coming ten years.</li> <li>• An overview was also presented on the results of CDOT’s recent outreach efforts to gain input on the many types of needs that continue to exist for these programs and to discuss how the program should be structured and implemented going forward.</li> </ul> <p><u>STAC Discussion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kristin Stephens: We’re thankful for your visit with Wellington. They have a lot of pedestrian mobility and American with Disabilities Act (ADA) challenges and like many smaller communities, they don’t have the resources to do this sort of work, nor do they know who to connect with for technical assistance. Similarly for transit, with new funding coming we should bring in folks that can support smaller communities that have unfilled transit needs. Meeting in person with them can help alleviate the fear of engaging with big public forums such as STAC.</li> <li>• Nathan L: Thank you. Molly Bly deserves a lot of credit also, for the outreach and direct support she’s provided to agencies needing the support of the program and for the success of the initial program.</li> <li>• Rebecca White: Just to remind everyone, that the legislature approved \$30 million of state stimulus funds in Senate Bill 110, providing another \$8 million to the small grants program, which has helped communities adjust infrastructure to respond to COVID. Those funds remain available and awarded on an ongoing basis for projects of \$150,000 or less. The remaining \$22 million was put to use for these larger awards, which also looked at safety and economic benefits in the projects. The \$85 million provided to the program in SB260 also contains another \$22 million of federal stimulus funds immediately available for projects. We will announce another call for projects for those funds very soon, and we’ll reach out to the applicants that were not awarded funding this round and encourage them to resubmit those applications. Additionally, there is still some federal stimulus dollars remaining for the legislature to allocate to programs. Considering the strong demand and the long list of quality projects that did not get funded this time, we will argue for additional funding to be given to RMS.</li> </ul>	No Action.
<p>GHG Rulemaking Update (Discussion Item)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff provided a status and overview of the preparations and outreach in drafting the Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Reduction Rule.</li> <li>• Theresa Takushi reviewed stakeholder meetings and involvement, modeling for determining feasibility of GHG reduction, and time frame for reduction levels. Theresa explained that the GHG rule is limited to regionally significant projects that increase capacity. Basic safety and repaving projects are not</li> </ul>	No Action



<p>– Rebecca White, CDOT DTD Director</p> <p>– Theresa Takushi, CDOT GHG Climate Action Specialist</p>	<p>impacted by the rule. There would be more detailed policy directives developed because the policy analysis that is required isn't suitable for the regulations. Policy issues include how to establish measures, how to calculate emissions, consideration of disproportionately impacted communities. After the rule is filed, there will be a 60-day comment period. Various meetings are scheduled and written comment is accepted as well.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Rebecca White: We particularly want to acknowledge and thank the amount of time and effort the members of the GHG Advisory Group have contributed to the rulemaking effort as well as the staff and members of the MPOs. We will continue the drafting of the Rule throughout the day and we are still aiming to file the Rule as planned today. We'll likely will send out public notice of the filing on Monday.</li> <li>● Herman Stockinger noted that the official filing of the Rule is only the first important stage in the rulemaking and begins the formal 60-day public comment period.</li> </ul> <p><u>STAC Discussion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Scott James: Why were Weld County and the Upper Front Range TPR not on the GHG Advisory Group, especially since Weld County is so impacted by the legislation.</li> <li>● Rebecca White explained that the goal for the group was representation from all Colorado but not necessarily to have a representative from each TPR. She explained that Commissioner James could be involved, and they can meet to discuss this. She also explained that CDOT will be getting input from the Secretary of State on how to continue to engage with stakeholders during the public comment period.</li> <li>● Scott James: I would like to know the Secretary's response regarding SB260 and Disproportionally Impacted Communities.</li> <li>● Heather Sloop: I would also like to be involved in the GHG Advisory Group.</li> <li>● Holly Williams: Will other construction projects be affected, specifically those by public highway authorities or Regional Transportation Authorities (RTAs)? I'm concerned that with this ruling, RTAs will become useless.</li> <li>● Herman Stockinger: RTA projects that both create and mitigate GHG emissions would be modeled and counted toward the limit. If there are regionally significant projects that go over GHG reduction targets, your STBG and CMAQ funds would need to support projects that reduce GHG emissions. In no way, however, will the Rule prevent an RTA project from moving forward, regardless of what the project was.</li> <li>● Kristin Stephens: Our NFR MPO staff want to be sure to have enough time to do the data analysis for commenting on the Rule. We think this will provide enough time, but in case it is not, we want to be sure there's an opportunity to extend the public comment period.</li> <li>● Rebecca White: The Rule affects the five MPOs, and it affects CDOT in the non-MPO areas. We want to work as partners and help with analysis and support. And we understood the request for more time to comment if analysis can't be finished.</li> <li>● Ashley Stolzmann requested e-mail notification of the Rule filing and Rebecca White acknowledged that she will do this.</li> </ul>	
--	--	--

<p>Transportation Planning Region (TPR) &amp; Federal Partner Reports</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <u>DRCOG</u>: Last TPR meeting was on July 21. The board approved the 2022-2023 Unified Planning Work Program. New initiatives include community-based transportation plans to improve mobility options for low income and disadvantaged communities, and corridor plans for priority regional multimodal corridors. DRCOG also reviewed their 2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program process and set the stage for upcoming discussions on policy for developing the 2024-2027 TIP. At the August 4<sup>th</sup> Board Work Session, there was discussion on the GHG rulemaking, and they received a briefing on the Regional Complete Streets Toolkit Project so that people can build complete streets and understand how to do that better.</li> <li>● <u>CFR</u>: Projects are moving along well: Highway 50 in Coledale, the cable rail east of Canyon City, Hwy115 sidewalk project in Canyon City, Highway 24 Wilkerson Pass for truck mobility including guardrails for safety. The US285 bridge replacement is postponed because US285 is alternate route when I-70 is closed. Highway 9 was going to be the detour, but it doesn't have a big enough shoulder. The push for electric cars is a strain on emergency services in the mountains. There aren't enough charging stations in the mountains. CDOT should get the message out that electric cars in the mountains are a difficulty.</li> <li>● <u>Eastern</u>: We've had no TPR meeting since last STAC so nothing new to report. We appreciate CDOT's efforts on the mudslides and I-70.</li> <li>● <u>Grand Valley</u>: This week we held an open house and Local Coordinating Committee (LCC) meeting to give partner and public opportunity to comment on the 2022 Unified Planning Work Program. We updated our FTA Title 6 Plan and developed a new Public Participation Plan. The plans are currently out for review. There will be a Board meeting on Aug 23 and the different plans will be presented. Theresa Takushi and Rebecca White will be presenting on GHG to Board.</li> <li>● <u>Gunnison Valley</u>: Little Blue Creek Canyon project is suspended while I-70 is closed. US50 is being used as the alternate route for I-70. Some work on chain up stations on east and west side of Monarch is underway. The west is side almost done; the east side still has work being done. We have some work on US550 south of Montrose and Hwy92 between Austin and Hotchkiss. We've heard some complaints about Hwy92 when US50 is closed because it is a narrow, winding, altitude changing highway and only two lanes. There was an accident several weeks ago. Speed is recommended to not be excessive on that highway. Our next TPR meeting is not until September 30th or 31st.</li> <li>● <u>Intermountain</u>: No report.</li> <li>● <u>North Front Range</u>: August 5<sup>th</sup> was our last MPO meeting. We received updates about Front Range Passenger Rail and about the GHG Budget rulemaking. North I-25 segments six, seven and eight are continuing and the SH56 interchange over I-25 is close to completion. That closure will last no more than 140 days.</li> <li>● <u>Northwest</u>: At the last TPR meeting a couple weeks ago we discussed the GHG rulemaking, focusing mostly on trying to separate larger MPOs from rural communities that could have future impacts with this rule, and a clear definition of "Regionally significant". There are many construction projects on the</li> </ul>	<p>No Action.</p>
---	---	-------------------

western part and lots of planning for construction on the eastern part of our TPR. The impact of the detour has been significant for Highways 40, 9, 13, 131, and 14. Truck rerouting is the biggest issue. We discussed with Director Lew about better emergency action planning for detours in the event of mudslides or if Glenwood shuts down. The TPR echoed the concern that shoulders are nonexistent on Hwy40 and 9, and if anything can happen to have funding for resilience that would be appreciated. Resiliency is important for any emergencies in the northwest territory.

- PPACG: Resiliency is an important issue. Any time there is a fire there will be flooding issues. Truckers were able to use Highway 50 during the closure of Glenwood Canyon. But it might be a good idea to do infrastructure updates on those Northwest detour routes. Because we have so many new members on our PPACG Board, we are holding two transportation seminars. The first one last week covered the federal bill and CDOT discussed the new transportation bill and the GHG rule. The seminar next week will also include discussion on water. Some money was put to Southwest Chief for a potential station in downtown Colorado Springs and this led to discussion on Front Range Passenger Rail. The updated 2022-2025 Transportation Improvement Plan will be released for public review. We are keeping a close eye on the federal legislation, and we are concerned about forest health. The Federal Government is not mitigating a lot of their properties as they should. We should be getting federal money for dealing with resiliency after wildfires.
- PACOG: We're moving ahead with work on: US50 Pueblo West, purchasing wetland that is needed for the 50 bypass off I-25, and tying Joe Martinez Blvd in Pueblo West to Pueblo Blvd.
- San Luis Valley: Last TPR meeting was on August 5th. There was a ribbon cutting for the state highway intersection in Alamosa. Projects underway include shoulder widening and resurfacing on SH17 for Villa Grove down to Alamosa. Mudslides have had some impacts on traffic. There was the first meeting with new transportation commissioner Mark Garcia for Region 8. The San Luis Valley Transit Council representatives gave us a briefing. They obtained a HOPE grant from the FTA. They received a briefing on the House Bill and SB267. Hwy17 and 160 are completed. Wolf Creek fiber project is on hold due to contractor issues, which has huge implications for ITS safety along there. The ADA project in Manassa is a joint project between the Region and Town of Manassa. Deer fencing for Johnson Village is on hold because the only bid received was 35% over budget. Our next TPR meeting is on November 4th.
- Vince Rogalski suggested that DOLA had money available for Broadband and the new Infrastructure bill has money for Broadband.
- South Central: July 29 was our last TPR meeting. One question raised was about whether people would have access to the conduit CDOT is running down I-25. Can that be used for laying broadband fiber in rural areas? We've finally broke ground on the I-25 Exit 11 project.
- Southeast: Our TPR meeting was last month. We discussed Senate Bills 267 and 260 allocations. Several communities are interested in RMS funding. Transit mobility is a big focus in our area. We hired a mobility manager facilitator to coordinate outreach and marketing to underserved populations. Efforts to grow participation in our Regional Coordinating Council is going well and they are having scheduled trainings, including Train-the-Rider and education for people needing Commercial Driver Licenses. Our

	<p>MMOF projects are moving forward. The RMS project in Lamar is in full swing; preventative bridge maintenance projects are in progress also. Oct 27th is our next TPR meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <u>Southwest</u>: Our TPR meeting was yesterday. We reallocated 146k of MMOF funding returned from a cancelled project to Dolores County Bus Facility and to Montezuma County's Trails to Mesa Verde project. The meeting also covered the SB260 and 267 bill updates on Year 4 projects and they are looking forward to reviewing projects knowing more money is coming through. They look forward to more information on filling projects for Years 5-10 of the Plan.</li> <li>● <u>Upper Front Range</u>: Our next meeting is September 2nd. Burlington Northern – Santa Fe (BNSF) is to talk about a multimodal facility at I-70 and County Road 8.</li> <li>● <u>Southern Ute</u>: No Report</li> <li>● <u>Ute Mountain Ute Tribe</u>: We have hired a new transportation specialist who will attend the next STAC meeting.</li> <li>● <u>FHWA</u>: We were able to secure the \$11 million emergency funding for Glenwood Canyon. That's based on an estimated total cost of \$160 million, so we'll see if it ends up being that high. We commend both the crews on the ground and those in the office that got that funding done. We did a ribbon-cutting this week at School of Mines who has started a six-passenger, fully autonomous electric vehicle shuttle in Golden, doing three separate routes there.</li> <li>● <u>Federal Transit Administration (FTA)</u>: FTA has obligated 90% of the CARES funds and the majority is already spent. Also 40% of the CRSSA funds are obligated. Getting started on committing the \$30 Billion in ARPA stimulus funds. We want to commend the City of Fort Collins - they received \$3.5 million in FTA 5311 LowNo funds for battery electric bus replacements. On September 14, we are offering a real estate workshop to go over FTA requirements for procuring real estate for transit projects. Reach out to us for sign up information if you're interested.</li> </ul> <p><u>STAC Discussion</u>: None</p>	
Other Items:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Vince Rogalski: Shoshana Lew met with directors of the Montrose area, and they talked about I-70 and Blue Creek Canyon. Federal Lands is cooperating to pause construction and keep Highway 50 open during the detours.</li> <li>● We will reserve time for TPR reports at the end of future STAC meetings.</li> <li>● Heather Sloops expressed concern that they might get dropped from meetings if the meeting is running on. Chairman Rogalski said he will ensure they aren't dropped.</li> <li>● The next STAC meeting will be held September 10, 2021, 9:00am at CDOT headquarters, with support for remote participation for those that need it.</li> </ul>	Meeting Adjourned

Meeting Adjourned at 11:55 am



Statewide Transportation Advisory Committee (STAC)  
 Meeting Minutes

Location: CDOT Headquarters Auditorium & Via Web Conference  
 Date/Time: September 10, 2021; 9:00 a.m.  
 Chairman: Vince Rogalski, Gunnison Valley, TPR Chair

Attendance:

Denver Area: Ashley Stolzmann, Ron Papsdorf  
 Central Front Range: Dick Elsner  
 Eastern: Chris Richardson  
 Grand Valley: Dana Brosig, Dean Bressler  
 Intermountain: Bentley Henderson  
 North Front Range: Suzette Mallette, Becky Karasko  
 Northwest: Heather Sloop  
 Pikes Peak Area: Holly Williams, John Liosatos  
 Pueblo Area: Chris Wiseman  
 Gunnison Valley: Vince Rogalski

San Luis Valley: Keith Baker, Vern Heersink  
 South Central: Walt Boulden  
 Southeast: None  
 Southwest: Sarah Hill, Jim Candelaria  
 Upper Front Range: Elizabeth Relford  
 Southern Ute Tribe: Doug McDonald  
 Ute Mountain Ute Tribe: None  
 FHWA: John Cater  
 FTA: None

Karen Stuart (Transportation Commissioner)  
 Eula Adams (Transportation Commissioner)  
 Herman Stockinger (CDOT Deputy Director)  
 Jeffrey Sudmeier (CDOT Chief Financial Officer)  
 Marissa Gaughan (CDOT Manager, Multimodal Planning Branch)  
 Michael Snow (CDOT Statewide and Regional Planning Section)

Fahad Khan (CDOT Office of Policy and Government Relations)  
 Aaron Willis (CDOT Manager, Statewide and Regional Planning Section)  
 Kathleen Collins (CDOT Statewide and Regional Planning Section)  
 Rebecca White (CDOT Director, Division of Transportation Development)  
 Jamie Grim (CDOT Office of Policy and Government Relations)  
 Erik Sabina (CDOT Manager, Information Management Branch)

Agenda Item / Presenter (Affiliation)	Presentation Highlights	Actions
Introductions & STAC Minutes  – Vince Rogalski, STAC Chair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No minutes were discussed or approved.</li> <li>The order of agenda items was modified to hear the GHG rulemaking, MMOF, and 10-Year Plan updates first. TPR/Agency Reports were moved to the end of the meeting, as time allows.</li> </ul>	No Action.

<p>Transportation Commission Report</p> <p>– Vince Rogalski, STAC Chair</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At the last Transportation Commission (TC) meeting there was discussion about the damage at Glenwood Canyon, the greenhouse gas (GHG) rulemaking process, and Revitalizing Main Streets.</li> <li>There was a lot of public input at the meeting.</li> <li>A number of resolutions were passed including advancing \$22 million for Revitalizing Main Streets.</li> <li>Next week, commissioners will visit I-70 and Glenwood Canyon in person.</li> </ul>	<p>No Action.</p>
<p>CDOT Update on Current Events</p> <p>– Herman Stockinger, CDOT Deputy Director</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Deputy Executive Director Stockinger passed on CDOT updates in order to provide more time for the other agenda items.</li> </ul>	<p>No Action.</p>
<p>Legislative Report</p> <p>– Jamie Grim, CDOT Office of Policy and Government Relations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are currently two bills of interest: the Infrastructure Bill and the Senate Reconciliation Bill. The Senate Reconciliation Bill includes Fiscal Year 2022 appropriations and Fast Act reauthorization. Moderate Democrats have asked for the Infrastructure Bill to be voted on first, but Speaker Pelosi would like both bills to pass at the same time. Speaker Pelosi has promised that both bills will be voted on by September 27th. If the Reconciliation Bill is not passed by September 30th, then there will need to be a continuing resolution to maintain the current flow of Fast Act funds. The House is still drafting amendments on the Senate Reconciliation Bill regarding the size, how to pay for it, and what is included.</li> <li>The debt ceiling must be raised, and it is estimated that this will happen in October. This could impact the Infrastructure Bill and the Senate Reconciliation Bill.</li> </ul> <p><u>STAC Discussion</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ron Papsdorf: Will there be earmarks in the Senate Reconciliation Bill? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Jamie Grim: Earmarks are not expected for the bill, though that could change.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Ashley Stolzmann: If no infrastructure bill passes, and a continuing resolution is passed for Fast Act funds, how much will our area receive? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Jamie Grim: A continuing resolution will maintain current numbers and formulas for Fast Act funds, but the time frame of the extension can vary.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Ashley Stolzmann: Can STAC send a letter to Congress requesting approval of transportation funding? As a united group of diverse constituents, this letter might have an impact. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Herman Stockinger: Yes, STAC can. We can draft this letter, or your staff can draft it.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Write letter to Congress that transportation funding needs to be approved.</p>
<p>GHG Rulemaking Update</p> <p>– Rebecca White, Director, Division of Transportation Development (DTD)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rule background: The GHG Rule started with House Bill 1261, which set statewide GHG reduction goals. This led to a GHG Pollution Roadmap, authored by multiple state agencies. The Roadmap describes a pathway for meeting reduction targets. For the transportation sector, the target is 12.7 million metric tons. It is anticipated that half of this goal will be met without intervention through increasing vehicle efficiency. This leaves 6 million metric tons. 2 million can be reduced if the goal is</li> </ul>	<p>Send Heather Sloop a copy of cost benefit analysis.</p>

<p>– Herman Stockinger, CDOT Deputy Director</p>	<p>met for electrifying Colorado vehicles. This leaves 4.7 million metric tons to be addressed in order to meet the 2030 goal for Bill 1261. The Roadmap lays out a strategy for a GHG planning rule. Senate Bill 260 directed CDOT to implement this rule.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The GHG Rule is housed in Section 8 of the Transportation Planning Rules.</li> <li>• The rule applies to all 5 Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) planning areas and to CDOT for non-MPO areas. The rule provides benchmarks for 2025, 2030, 2040, and 2050. For the first 2025 benchmark, only CDOT, Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG), and North Front Range will need to comply with the rule. This graduated approach is dictated by Senate Bill 260, and makes sense since these organizations have experience with modeling relating to ozone conformity. The transition to GHG will be easier for them.</li> <li>• Based on future planned projects, models have determined anticipated vehicle miles traveled (VMTs) and emissions. Based on these models, reduction targets have been set for 2025, 2030, 2040, and 2050. CDOT and each MPO have individual targets. If a target cannot be met, there is a provision to use mitigation measures. Each MPO is also required to produce a GHG report.</li> <li>• Important definitions for the rule are “applicable planning documents,” “mitigation measures,” and “regionally significant projects.” Applicable planning documents for MPOs are the regional transportation plans; for CDOT it would be the 10-Year Plan. Regionally significant projects are those that make fundamental changes to the transportation system and that impact the way people move. Mitigation measures are non-regionally significant projects that reduce GHG. A TC Policy Directive will be finished in April 2022 to provide more guidance on mitigation measures.</li> <li>• A chart was presented showing the reduction targets for each MPO for each year. In later years, there is a dip in reduction levels to account for more electric vehicles. Therefore, reducing VMTs will be less impactful on GHG emissions.</li> <li>• Before a Regional Plan is approved by the TC, the Air Pollution Control Division will need to verify a GHG Transportation Report produced by the applicable MPO/CDOT. If the Division does not respond within 30 days, TC can move ahead with approval.</li> <li>• Enforcement: If CDOT or an MPO cannot meet reduction targets, TC will restrict use of funds. The Commission can also waive restrictions on certain projects if it is demonstrated that significant effort was made to reach targets and the project does not result in a substantial increase to GHG emissions.</li> <li>• Communication efforts regarding the GHG Rule include press releases, social media, targeted emails, a website, resources in Spanish, and public hearings across the state (with Spanish interpreters at most hearings). The first public hearing is on September 17<sup>th</sup>. There is a 60-day written public comment period ending on October 15th. The Commission can extend this period.</li> <li>• The TC is anticipated to adopt the Rule on November 18th. It will become effective in January 2022. The first set of affected MPOs (DRCOG, North Front Range) and CDOT will need to update their Plans by October 2022.</li> </ul>	<p>Herman Stockinger to check if amendments can be made to the cost-benefit analysis.</p> <p>Motion passed to extend comment period by 30 days from when North Front Range receives their data.</p>
--	--	---

- There are only 15 public comments on the Rule to date, though more are expected. Comments focused on reprioritizing investments, edits to the regulation, equity issues, and subjects not related to the GHG rule.
- A cost-benefit analysis has been conducted. It includes the anticipated economic benefits and costs; adverse effects on the economy, consumers, small businesses, job creation, private markets, and economic competitiveness; and two alternatives to the proposed rule including the cost and benefit of pursuing those benefits. The analysis also examines vehicle operating costs, the social costs of carbon, air pollution, safety (crashes), traffic delay, and physical inactivity. The cost-benefit analysis assumes that targets will be met at a net neutral investment level (i.e., no boost of additional funding to meet targets).

STAC Discussion

- Sarah Hill: Is there a boundary defining CDOT non-MPO areas?
  - o Rebecca White: There aren't individual boundaries. The area is statewide.
- John Liosatos: A statewide target for non-MPO areas will make it difficult for rural Transportation Planning Regions (TPRs) to understand how the GHG rule specifically impacts them.
  - o Herman Stockinger: The 10-Year Plan process will address this question with the rural TPRs. In addition, it is rare for a non-MPO area to have a regionally significant project. The focus on non-MPOs will be regarding mitigation measures.
- Ron Papsdorf: If there are misstatements in the cost-benefit analysis, can we amend it?
  - o Herman Stockinger: Herman will check with the rules expert to see if amendments can be made.
- Keith Baker: On the reduction levels chart, the 2050 baseline projection goes up, while prior baseline projections go down. Why is that?
  - o Erik Sabina: CAFE standards will require increased vehicle mileage through 2026 and subsequent years. When old cars in the fleet are replaced by new cars, the new cars will meet the 2026 standards and GHG emissions will decrease. By 2040, we will have wrung all the good out of the 2026 CAFE standard for vehicle efficiency. Then, the increase in population and resultant increase in VMTs will cause the baseline projection to go back up. It is important to note that baseline projections only assume the electric vehicles (EVs) we already have, and not more. This rule is a planning rule and not about how many EVs are in the fleet. Although more EVs are anticipated, the model for the baselines does not factor increased EVs.
  - o Keith Baker: Rebecca said that requirements will decrease over time because of increased EVs.
  - o Erik Sabina: The baseline projection does not factor in EVs, but the anticipated reduction level does. We do not want to pretend that we removed a large number of gas cars that weren't really there. By 2050, we expect that close to all light duty vehicles will be EV, and so we won't



	<p>have a big pool of dirty vehicles to move off the road. This needs to be factored when estimating the expected size of GHG reduction levels for 2050.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Keith Baker: Does the model assume that CAFE standards will remain the same over the decades?</li> <li>o Erik Sabina: Yes, we are assuming no new or changed rules.</li> <li>• Suzette Mallette: We have requested data to make comments but haven't received it. In July, we requested a technical report from CDOT that describes the modeling process for demonstrating compliance and we requested documentation for the Energy and Emissions Reduction Policy Analysis Tool (EERPAT) model. We requested per capita data, and we are awaiting model runs from the Air Pollution Control Division. We also have a correction for the reduction model. We found that VMT reductions were applied to all vehicle types resulting in unreasonably high GHG levels. We raised this issue in July and CDOT staff are taking this under advisement. In summary, we need more time to receive the data, review it, and make data driven comments. We would like 30 days beyond Oct 15. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Herman Stockinger: An Ad Hoc committee of three commissioners can approve an extension.</li> <li>o Suzette Mallette: We can wait closer until the deadline to know if we need an extension.</li> <li>o Commissioner Williams: Was that a motion? I would make that a motion.</li> <li>o Herman Stockinger: Yes, Suzette made a motion for a 30-day extension.</li> <li>o Vince Rogalski: Moved and seconded.</li> <li>o Suzette Mallette: The request is for a 30-day extension after receipt of the data.</li> <li>o Holly Williams: I accept the amendment.</li> <li>o Rebecca White: I am hesitant about the term "the data." It is not well-defined.</li> <li>o Suzette Mallette: I can send a written request on the data.</li> <li>o Rebecca White: Is the entire resolution based on CDOT's response to the North Front Range?</li> <li>o Holly Williams: The recommendation to the TC is for a 30-day extension.</li> <li>o Vince Rogalski: The original motion related to receiving the data, but we need a clear definition of the data.</li> <li>o Ashley Stolzmann: I am supportive of the motion, and it is clear we can work offline to clarify what the data is. The motion benefits us all.</li> <li>o Vince Rogalski: Vote: non opposed. Resolution passes.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Ashley Stolzmann: If we don't meet targets and need mitigation measures, how are 10-Year Plan projects impacted? These projects have federal requirements too, so it is complicated. And what about CMAQ and STBG funds? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Herman Stockinger: Only regionally significant projects within the 10-Year Plan will be impacted. It is anticipated that the rule will not apply to CMAQ and STBG funded projects, regardless of whether it is regionally significant.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Vince: Regionally Significant varies by the region. For some places a \$10 million project is significant. For other places, \$100 million is significant.</li> </ul>	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Herman Stockinger: Regionally Significant is not each individual's perception of significance. There is a definition in the rule, and there is an opportunity to modify the definition.</li> <li>• Heather Sloop: We need a clearer definition for "Regionally Significant Project." It is too subjective and could potentially harm areas that are included or excluded because of the broad stroke definition. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Rebecca White: An interagency group can modify the definition. The process of an interagency group is borrowed from how ozone is treated for transportation conformity. This process has been tried and tested for decades, and so I believe it can work for us in this GHG context.</li> <li>o Herman Stockinger: Submit this point as a formal public comment.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Elizabeth Relford: CDOT is making a mission shift from transportation to air quality. Weld County and Upper Front Range would also appreciate a delay for commenting. We need enough time for stakeholders to respond. The concern from the rural perspective is that mitigation measures are for non-MPO areas. These mitigation measures do not reflect what rural areas do. We just have a list of examples of mitigation measures, but we need more quantifiable data on the mitigation measures. We have done regionally significant projects and it is not an accurate assumption that there aren't capacity projects in rural Colorado. How does CDOT have such high reduction goals for the rural areas without any data on the mitigation measures? Weld County has their own air monitoring program, and we care about air quality. But we want to make sure we have a rule that is data driven. We haven't received the data to support it and to know if we can or cannot meet thresholds. We need to specify that the rule is not intended to be punitive. CDOT is using a 10-Year Plan but the rest of us are using 25-year plans. How is that being addressed? Why are the rural TPRs going through planning efforts if these plans won't be used?</li> <li>• Ashley Stolzmann: Is there going to be a special meeting of STAC to formally comment on the rule? I also hope there will be an extension and that at the next STAC meeting we can take a position on the rule. If there is no extension, STAC will have to write up the comments at the next STAC meeting on October 15<sup>th</sup> and submit them that day. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Rebecca White: We can schedule a special meeting of STAC to facilitate the conversation.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Ron Papsdorf: Rule filing indicates that CDOT can revise the rule by September 24<sup>th</sup>. Does CDOT anticipate doing that? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Rebecca White: We do not.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Break at 10:51 AM; resumed at 10:57 AM</i></p>	
--	---	--

<p>Multimodal Transportation &amp; Mitigation Options Fund (MMOF)</p> <p>Michael Snow, CDOT Statewide and Regional Planning Section</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SB260 has provided 10 years of funding to MMOF. The funds are a mix of federal and state sources. \$146.8 million of federal stimulus funding are available in the current fiscal year. Of this, \$124.8 million will be distributed to TPRs for local MMOF projects.</li> <li>• The name has changed from “Multimodal Options Fund” to “Multimodal Transportation and Mitigation Options Fund.” The acronym “MMOF” will stay the same.</li> <li>• Improvements are recommended for the MMOF distribution formula and the formula for determining match reductions. This is based on changes to program goals and lessons-learned from administering the program.</li> <li>• The distribution formula currently splits funding by 19% rural and 81% urban. There are 10 different criteria for figuring out how to distribute funds within that split. The proposed change is to swap out disadvantaged community factors (% disabled, senior, or low income; and % income required for housing and transportation) with Disproportionately Impacted (DI) Communities factors. All other factors such as transit ridership and safety (crashes) will likely carry over to the new distribution formula. This focus on DI Communities is an additional program focus and not a shift away from focusing on seniors aging in place and mobility for people with disabilities. A DI Community is defined as a census block group with &gt;40% low-income households, &gt;40% minority households, or &gt;40% of households that are housing cost burdened. Low income means the household income is less than or equal to 200% of the poverty level. Poverty level varies for each household depending on the number of people in the household.</li> <li>• The current match reduction policy is that an applicant can request a reduction if they are a municipality with a population below 20K or a county with a population below 50K. Applicants also immediately qualify for a reduction if they are below the state’s mean poverty rate. Or, the applicant can justify fiscal hardship through other indicators. Applicants must submit a request for match reduction to TC. The match rate ranges from 0 to 96.5%.</li> <li>• The new proposal for match reduction is based on a local agency’s fiscal health. DOLA’s State Demographer has recommended two indicators proven to be strong gauges of local government’s ability to generate income: median household income and median home value. Likewise, there are two recommended indicators of fiscal burden for local government: poverty rate and % population over 65. The recommended formula and policy will determine eligibility for all counties and municipalities, so applicants will not have to submit a special request for match reduction. SB-260 has allowed CDOT staff to recommend reductions to specific projects if the formula doesn’t do so. TC would decide if a reduction outside of the formula is granted. The recommendation is also to potentially simplify the match to tiered rates: 10%, 20%, 30%, 40%, 50%.</li> <li>• SB260 also has new reporting requirements for MPOs and TPRs to provide CDOT an annual MMOF project status report. Staff will produce a draft form and present it to STAC in October.</li> <li>• CDOT has encountered current MMOF projects with cost overruns, unanticipated delays as well as missed cost-saving opportunities. To prevent this in the future, MPOs and TPRs are encouraged to</li> </ul>	<p>At the next STAC meeting, CDOT staff will present the updated distribution formula, the updated match reduction requirements, and an example of the new reporting requirement.</p> <p>CDOT staff to present MMOF Committee with option to include seniors and people with disabilities in distribution formula.</p>
---	--	--

	<p>seek CDOT input on proposed projects regarding project scope, budget, feasibility, and cost-saving opportunities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The original MMOF Advisory Committee formed in 2019 will be reconvened in late September or early October to consider and recommend changes to the MMOF distribution formula. The recommendations will be presented to STAC in October and will be presented to TC in November for final adoption.</li> <li>● MPOs and TPRs may start their project selection process as early as October when draft funding allocations and match reduction requirements will become available.</li> <li>● Due to lack of time, the following items will be tabled for the STAC meeting in October: VMT reducing projects are eligible, implications of funding being federalized.</li> <li>● <u>STAC Discussion</u></li> <li>● Vince Rogalski: If the focus of MMOF is on rural areas, shouldn't the 19%/81% split change? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Michael Snow: The factor that weighted most heavily to rural regions was transit ridership and that was at about 19%. Whether that warrants review is open for discussion.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Walt Boulden: DI doesn't include seniors and people with disabilities. The majority of our rides are these people, and I would like to see something put back in to account for these people. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Michael Snow: If you look at your senior, disability, and low-income population as a proportion of the state, you might find that it isn't as strongly weighted to your region as you think.</li> <li>○ Walt: If you compare the proportion of these populations in relation to the total area population (and not to state), then it is high.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● John Liosatos: We are doing a disservice to not include disabled populations. Even if it doesn't change the end number, the disabled community would assume they weren't considered. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Michael Snow: An option to include seniors and people with disabilities will be presented to the MMOF committee.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Heather Sloop: I am concerned about how low-income and cost-burdened households are calculated. Cost burden is very variable, depending on the area. A person can make \$70K and be completely cost burdened. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Michael Snow: We haven't yet seen the figures, so we are going to look at the data and it might confirm this point.</li> <li>○ Rebecca White: Housing cost burden is defined as 30% of household income. But it is just one factor.</li> <li>○ Heather Sloop: You will find that 80% of mountain communities will be housing cost burdened.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Sarah Hill: I strongly agree with Walt and John, and I would like to see people with disabilities and seniors represented in the criteria. Also, as a rural TPR, we might not hit those thresholds of greater than 40%, though we have significant transit dependent populations.</li> <li>● Ashley Stolzmann: In the urban areas, our populations are also aging, people need more transit, and many are housing cost burdened. Housing is very expensive. These are issues statewide and</li> </ul>	
--	--	--

	<p>not just rural. We need to think about these things less as urban and rural and more on a statewide level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Walt Boulden: Ashley, I agree that metro and rural areas have the same problems. I wasn't suggesting changing the 19%/81% split. I am suggesting simplifying the match. Can CDOT suggest a match range, and allow each TPR or MPO to decide within that range? Extremely rural areas can assign matches within 0-10%, and the ranges can go up for the other TPRs/MPOs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Michael Snow: The Attorney General said that TPRs cannot make the determination. The match needs to be built into the formula or the TC itself makes the decision.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Ron Papsdorf: I don't see the retail delivery fee as a funding source for MMOF. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Jeff Sudmeier: That is correct, we are missing the retail delivery fee in the table of revenues.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Vince Rogalski: Does the funding from SB260 expire? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Michael Snow: The federal funds expire in December 2026, and the state funds have a 10-year expiration.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Heather Sloop: Is the new match policy at the county or municipal level? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Michael Snow: It is at both levels.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Ron Papsdorf: The varying match rates might be challenging to administer, with different jurisdictions within an MPO having different match ratios. Similarly, what about a project that spans multiple jurisdictions? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Michael Snow: Didn't DRCOG decide not to apply for a match?</li> <li>○ Ron Papsdorf: That was only because DRCOG didn't qualify for a match under SB-1.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Suzette Mallette: Would it be allowable to use federal MMOF funds to match state MMOF funds? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Michael Snow: No, MMOF funds cannot be used to match other MMOF funds.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Vince Rogalski: Will each TPR and MPO still have an assigned dollar amount, and when will that amount be available? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Michael Snow: Yes, The specific amounts allocated to each MPO/TPR will be available when the distribution formula is finalized. We can share what the amounts would be if the formula weren't changed. This will likely be close to the amounts resulting from the new formula as we don't expect the updated formula to cause large shifts.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Ashley Stolzmann: CDOT is already involved in project selection. How does the suggestion of increased CDOT involvement impact us? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Michael Snow: The recommendation for increased CDOT involvement does not impact DRCOG since CDOT is already so involved. This is more relevant to other TPRs.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Ron Papsdorf: Are the new MPO/TPR reporting requirements retroactive to existing MMOF projects from SB-1? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Michael Snow: Yes, the reporting requirements are retroactive. And we will have more information on this at the October STAC meeting.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Ron Papsdorf: It makes sense for CDOT to have an administrative fee. But should it be the same percentage as when the program first started, and in the context of CDOT receiving increases in HUTF, I'd rather the fee be based on need than on a flat percentage. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Jeff Sudmeier: That is a fair point, and we are still working through this. A flat percentage on funding that is variable doesn't make sense. We may set an aside or a rate. I think we would want it to be actual costs, and can adjust.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<p>10-Year Plan Amendment Process</p> <p>– Rebecca White, Director, Division of Transportation Development (DTD)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Due to time constraints, the planned presentation on the 10-Year Plan background was skipped.</li> <li>● There are three major reasons for updating the plan. Firstly, due to stimulus dollars, we have completed more projects than anticipated and might need to begin projects listed in years 5-10. We are receiving a fourth year of SB-267 funding, but don't have a full fourth year of projects. Secondly, we now have a more specific idea of our future budget constraints. In October, we will present a more specific estimate of the constraint, based on SB-260 and assumptions of Federal legislation. It will probably be less than \$500 million a year. Finally, the GHG Rule requires us to update the plan.</li> <li>● The amendment process timeline is still under consideration. This will be presented to STAC in October.</li> <li>● The process will entail meetings with TPRs and MPOs. We are aware that TPRs and MPOs have their own planning cycles and we are getting right in the middle of that. We will figure out a way to work together.</li> <li>● We are committed to delivering the first four years of projects. Then we need to look at projects already selected for years 5-10. For projects in years 5-10, we are going to review the accuracy of the cost estimates.</li> <li>● Considerations for the plan update are regional equity, fiscal constraints, Transportation Commission Guiding Principles, GHG requirements, and new projects to add to the plan.</li> <li>● The TC has three new members. At a recent retreat, they discussed the possibility of updating the TC Guiding Principles. CDOT will assist with this. For example, GHG, DI Communities, and environmental justice could be included. We will bring the updated Guiding Principles to the next STAC meeting.</li> <li>● SB260 does not have a set-aside for transit. The plan will try to move toward a multimodal approach instead of bifurcating transit.</li> </ul> <p><u>STAC Discussion</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Ashley Stolzmann: How much money will be available for next year? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Jeff Sudmeier: In the last two years we received \$560 and \$620 million. That is an order of magnitude to Rebecca's point that we will have more than enough to finish the year 4 projects and still have dollars remaining.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>CDOT to bring to October STAC: estimate of budget, the amendment process timeline, updated TC principles</p>

- Ashley Stolzmann: What about years 1-4 projects that have been completed but could benefit from additional scoping, e.g., the Lone Tree Mobility Hub?
  - Jeff Sudmeier: Probably one third to one fourth of projects from the first four years have room for additional scope.
  - Herman Stockinger: We would look at the funding commitment for that project.
  - Ashley Stolzmann: So projects that have room for more scope would have to be added as new projects.
  - Herman Stockinger: There are projects in years 5-10 that aren't funded, and estimates need to be reviewed. There are projects from years 1-4 that have been funded but not constructed. We need to have conversations about these.
- Ashley Stolzmann: MPOs have SB-260 requirements to update their plans. We need to figure out how to coordinate this with the 10-Year Plan. Also, we are concerned that large interstate projects impact regional equity calculations such that small state facilities near the large interstate projects cannot get prioritized. Can funding for large interstate projects and projects of statewide interest be a separate pot?
- Ron Papsdorf: There is concern about CDOT updating the regional plan prior to DRCOG (and North Front Range) updating their own. Maybe CDOT can proceed with the other MPOs and wait for DRCOG and North Front Range to finish their own plans.
- Elizabeth Relford: What is the timeline for completing this update?
  - Rebecca White: We think we will need 4 months. The question is when we will start the process. We are still deliberating and will bring the timeline next month.
  - Elizabeth Relford: There is a history of difficulty in fully funding long range plans. I like the idea of having a separate pot for regionally significant corridors so that we can complete these regionally significant projects and then focus on the maintenance of the system that we have. Northern Colorado's population is expected to double by 2045. What I understood from the presentation is that SB-260 is not going to have as much money as we thought, and we won't have enough money for the 10-year plan.
  - Rebecca White: When we came up with the 10-Year Plan, SB-260 didn't exist. So, our expectation of SB-260 hasn't changed. We adopted the plan before we knew the real amount of money. We assumed \$500 million/year from SB-267, and now we don't have as much as we hoped.
  - Elizabeth Relford: It is remiss for the slides to say that we are going to engage transit stakeholders when we did that already. This 10-Year Plan update isn't a new effort to engage stakeholders because we did that the last time.
  - Rebecca White: The main point is that we don't have a 10% set aside anymore for transit and we are always trying to do a better job at creating a multimodal list.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Elizabeth Relford: You have had your lists separated before and now you have combined them. We recognize that.</li> <li>• Vince: We did a lot of work to pick the years 5-10 projects. Can we just move those up? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Ron Papsdorf: The GHG Rule impacts the priorities, so we will have to take that into account when rethinking existing priorities.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Suzette Mallette: Are we starting all over with projects or are we reevaluating existing projects, taking into account any new criteria TC would require, like GHG. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Rebecca White: We are not starting all over again. This is an update. We do need to look at 5-10 year projects and make sure numbers are still right. And to echo Ron's point, should TC adopt the GHG Rule, we need to take it into account. We must look at selected projects, run them through the model, and bring the results to you all.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Vince Rogalski: The definition for regionally significant projects will be important.</li> <li>• Dana Brosig: It is a good idea to review years 5-10 transit projects since CARES Act funding has covered some projects, and Covid-19 has impacted ridership.</li> <li>• Vince Rogalski: Transit would help with GHG emissions. I understand there is more money coming for transit, so we could add that to our plans.</li> </ul>	
STAC Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ashley Stolzmann: I would like to add a future agenda item: funding for electrification. We would be interested in any information the state wants to present on ways local communities can access funding, whether the state has a plan, and if we could all get under a joint purchase order for vehicles. We are also interested in information on how to get charging stations and vehicles that meet our requirements.</li> <li>• Vince Rogalski: We will try to get that on the agenda. The next meeting is on October 15<sup>th</sup>. It would be good to have people in person.</li> </ul>	Future agenda item for state to present on funding for electrification.

*Meeting Adjourned at 12:20 pm*