



**Transit and Rail Advisory Committee
 Meeting Minutes
 March 9, 2018
 1:00 – 4:00 PM**

4201 E. Arkansas Ave, Shumate Bldg, Mt Evans A & B Conference Room

Member	Organization	Yes	No	Member	Organization	Yes	No
Ann Rajewski	CASTA	X		Rob Eaton	Amtrak	X	
Sara Cassidy	Union Pacific RR	Phone		Kurt Ravenschlag	TransFort		
Bill Van Meter	RTD		X	Larry Worth	Rural Transit		
Craig Blewitt	Mountain Metro Transit			Mike Ogborn	Omnitrax	X	
David Johnson	Roaring Fort Transit			Danny Katz	CoPIRG	X	
Jim Souby	Colo Rail	X		Steve Hurlbert	I-70 Coalition / Local jurisdictions		
Matthew Helfant	DRCOG	X		Peter Rickershauser	BNSF Railway	X	
Terri Binder	Club 20	X		Will Jones	Greeley Evans Transit / Small urban areas	phone	
Vince Rogalski	STAC	phone					

Others Present	CDOT Present
Jacob Riger, DRCOG Evan Enarson-Hering, Cambridge Systematics Lee Cryer, RTD Tim Wilder, Fort Collins / Transfort Ryan B. Brian V.	David Krutsinger, Director/Division of Transit & Rail Moira Moon, Grants Unit/DTR Maria Johnson, Bus Operations/DTR Brodie Ayers, Grants Unit Mgr/DTR

1. Introductions/Meeting Overview/Welcome

2. Southwest Chief & Front Range Passenger Rail Commission

a. Summary of SWC & FRPRC Meeting Earlier in the Day – Jacob Riger

- The SWC & FRPRC decided, based on feedback from several of the agency Boards of Directors, that local match would not be pursued for the state legislative request.
- Two other pillars of the project development are (1) Key Issues / Strategic Considerations to be addressed by the Commission and (2) a Multi-Phase Plan to Implement Front Range Rail.
- The New Chair for SWC & FRPRC is Jill Gaebler, effective for the May 2018 meeting

b. TIGER 9 Award - Pete Rickershauser

- TIGER 9
 - TIGER 9 completes 38 miles in Colorado, 8 miles in Kansas for TIGER 9
 - After completion of TIGER 9, only 29 miles of bolted rail will remain

- A key section of concern is in New Mexico from Lamy to Albuquerque
 - Amtrak pays the maintenance
 - BNSF completes cross ties, signals, and also stabilizes the Devils Throne area

3. State Freight & Passenger Rail Plan – Sharon Terranova & Evan Enarson-Hering (attachment)

- Evan thanked the TRAC and Rail Plan Working Group members for their work on, and suggestions for the Rail Plan
- FRA had previously allowed more latitude with regard to the document structure, but is now requiring Rail Plan documents to follow the guidelines exactly. This is cause for revisions to the document as compared to the most recent version of the Draft that had been published.
 - 95% of content will be the same
 - 5% changes will focus on the RSIP / 4 year constrained and 20-year vision sections

4. State Management Review Feedback – Brodie Ayers

- The Grantee Information Request (GIR), from FTA to CDOT, used to be 600 questions with more of a “tell me” emphasis, which changed in late 2017 to FTA asking for 100 procedure-based documents with more of a “show me” emphasis.
- 2 CFR 200, aka the Super Circular, drives a lot of administrative requirements now
- The goal is to use the State Management Plan to build capacity of CDOT and transit agency grant partners (sub-recipients).
- By following 2 CFR 200, all transit agencies are then also able to apply for other federal funds
- Internal & external stakeholder committees will be used for input and review of the State Management Plan as the new document is developed

5. State & Federal Legislative Update – Andy Karsian

- Andy explained that transportation funding could be done through a sales tax, property tax, or Specific Ownership Tax “SOT” on vehicles (i.e. licensing fee).
- A sales tax is the current proposal on the table by the Metro Mayors Coalition and a host of other economic development interests across the state. It would be for a November ballot.
 - Ballot titles often get sued to block them from actually being put on the ballot.
 - Different groups across the state want different percentages for the ballot from one-half cent (0.5%), to two-thirds (0.62%), to a full penny (1.0%) on every dollar spent.
 - The transportation system has a \$9 Billion shortfall over the coming years, and a 1.0% sales tax would deliver about \$8 Billion in projects.
- SOT proposal has a more direct nexus to transportation than a sales tax
 - The SOT would increase fees on older vehicles by removing the currently allowed depreciation, or, in other words, levy a tax on vehicles regardless of age.
 - A fee would also be levied on electric vehicles
 - Some argue that an SOT polls better than a sales tax
- Senate Bill 1 (SB 18-001) is a third state transportation funding proposal currently on the table.
 - Passed out of Appropriations and is likely to sit until after March revenue forecast.
 - As written, it is a very tough “ask” to bond projects, paid by future general fund revenues.
 - There are variations of this bill that would share the funds with local governments
 - There are variations that do or don’t support use of funds for toll/managed lanes

6. Transit Development Program – Michael Snow (attachment)

- Michael Snow introduced this topic and noted that the Development Program is a planning tool.
- The tool can be used to prioritize and select projects for the Ballot measure, but its focus is not the ballot measure itself.
- The Development program is also not intended to prioritize small projects or substitute for on-going funds that are released through DTR’s annual Consolidated Capital Call for Projects (CCCP)
- Many of the legislative and ballot proposals have a multi-modal fund which includes, pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and possibly other multi-modal options.
- Michael noted he’d be meeting with every TPR and TRAC asked to be provided the schedule
- By May the goals for the Transit Development Program
 - Refine the unconstrained list of projects, currently 200+ projects, and \$6.2 B
 - Establish a “Tier 1” prioritized budget amount called a “Planning Target”, maybe in the range of \$1 to \$2 Billion, which would be a subset of the total list
 - Define how Regional Allocation amounts are determined, what share of the Planning Target would be available for each Transportation Planning Region (TPR), so there are sub-targets, with which each TPR can do their own prioritization.
- A sub-committee of TRAC will do the detailed work to reach the May goals.
 - Terri Binder, Matthew Helfant, and the City of Denver all volunteered for the sub-committee

7. Rural Regional Operations Planning Update – Maria Johnson (Attachment)

- Maria described to TRAC that the rural regional goals are different than for the commuter-oriented Bustang service. Rural regional service (Outrider) is more essential-service oriented.
- Several existing routes will change their branding between May and July, as the new buses become available and contracts are completed.
 - SRDA (operator), Lamar – Pueblo Route
 - SRDA (operator), Alamosa – Salida – Pueblo Route
 - TBD (operator), Gunnison – Salida – Denver Route
 - SUCAP (operator), Durango – Grand Junction Route
- Planning work is being done to consider future expansions of this branding, and a technical report on that will be available in July.

8. Regional Mobility Update – Moira Moon (Attachment)

- Moira presented how local and regional coordinating councils (LCCs/RCCs) have the potential to increase the effectiveness of services and the awareness of options for travelers
- LCC/RCC – establish or strengthen (work together to assist seniors, disabled, low income)
- Examples of LCCs/RCCs around the state
 - Denver LCC – sounding board for Colfax BRT
 - NWCOG RCC – longer distance trip making & coordination
 - Cripple Creek / Teller County efforts with branding
- Partnerships – rich for problem solving
- CDOT is offering \$25,000 grants to three TPRs plus CASTA technical assistance and consultant facilitation. Those TPRs are: San Luis Valley, Central Front Range, and Southeast TPRs
- The TRAC asked that a list of existing LCCs/RCCs be made available, possibly on the CASTA website

9. Meeting adjourned at 3:30 pm – Ann Rajewski