

Meeting Notes
Executive Oversight Team

Colorado Railroad Relocation Implementation Study
Denver, CO – March 28, 2008

Meeting Attendees

CDOT

Russ George -	Executive Director
Jennifer Finch -	DTD Director
Tammy Lang -	CDOT Project Manager

RTD

Henry Stoppolecamp -	Engineering Technical Services Mgr.
----------------------	-------------------------------------

BNSF Railway

Nathan Asplund -	Director, Public Private Partnerships
Colleen Deines -	Director, Public Private Partnerships
Mike Sickler -	Corridor Superintendent, Dispatch Center

Union Pacific Railroad

Mark Bristol -	General Director, Network and Business Development
Joseph Bateman -	Senior AVP – Government Affairs
Joe Arbona -	General Director, Policy and Partnerships
Dick Hartman -	Govt. Affairs, Colorado and Wyoming

Consultant Project Team

Randy Grauberger -	PB Project Manager
Jack Tone -	PB Implementation Team Lead
Bob Felsburg -	Principal Advisor (FHU)
Cassie Gouger -	Railroad Planning & Engineering (FHU)
Jerry Albin -	Railroad Planning & Engineering (FHU)

Following introductions, Tammy noted that the Union Pacific contingent would be late arriving due to airline issues leaving Omaha. They were expected to arrive around 10:30 a.m.

Tammy then turned the meeting over to Randy Grauberger, Parsons Brinckerhoff's (PB) Project Manager for the Rail Relocation Study.

Randy distributed copies of the minutes for the previous EOT meeting that was held on November 2, 2007. No additional comments were suggested, and therefore the minutes were finalized.

Randy then reviewed the highlights of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting held on February 28. Colleen Deines, Jack Moy and Mike Sickler attended that meeting for BNSF; Grant Janke, Dick Hartman, and Bill Brunskill attended for the UP; and Henry Stoppolecamp attended for RTD.

Cassie Gouger discussed with the TAC members the two bypass Alignments (A and B) being evaluated in this Study. She also discussed the railroad design criteria that are being used for the bypass alignments. She asked the railroads to provide comments on the design criteria and also asked the railroads to address their specific needs at the north, south, and intermediate connections as well as issues related to maintenance, mechanical and fueling facilities.

A major portion of the TAC meeting was devoted to a discussion of the Rail Traffic Controller (RTC) operations modeling effort for the Study. Members of the PB team discussed the modeling and assumptions used for the existing system (the base case). Randy provided a handout to the EOT members which was a summary of the TAC meeting presentation.

Mike Sickler suggested two changes to the handout. He noted that coal trains require two (not three) crews between Sterling and La Junta, and also stated that because the coal trains have been shortened from 128 coal cars to 120; the speed over Monument Hill has increased from 9 mile per hour to 13 mile per hour . He also noted that if either Alignment A or B were built, 128 – 135 car trains could then be utilized. Four locomotives in a 2 x 2 power distribution configuration is assumed.

Randy noted that the PB modeling team would be meeting with each of the railroads' RTC modelers on April 2 and 3 in Omaha and Fort Worth.

There was also a presentation at the TAC meeting on the transportation benefits associated with the possible construction of a new north/south bypass. This discussion centered on the issues of grade separation structures not needed with the reduced train operations and reduced delays at existing at-grade rail crossings. It was suggested by the railroads that the recommended discount rate of 2.15% for the benefit/cost analysis was "too low". It was also suggested that the Project Team look at the figures developed by the Texas Transportation Institute (TTI) for costs per hour of delay for autos and trucks. CDOT confirmed that these data are available from a recent TTI study for Denver, Colorado Springs and Boulder.

There was also a very preliminary discussion of the funding/financing element of the project. It was suggested that CMAQ funds also be considered as an eligible funding source for the Bypass project.

Draft copies of the “Purpose and Need” developed for environmental issues related to the Study were also distributed for TAC member comments at that TAC meeting. Randy noted that he and UP’s Grant Janke will discuss UP’s comments on this Draft document in the next few days. Comments on the Purpose and Need were requested by April 1.

The next TAC meeting will be held on May 8th.

Cassie Gouger next discussed the comments that had been received from UP in regard to the design criteria and the north and south bypass connections. She said additional work was being done to ensure the bypass connected to the Brush Subdivision instead of the Akron subdivision. Cassie will forward the UP requested design criteria and connections to Colleen Deines.

Jack Tone distributed a mileage chart for the existing route and two proposed alignments. This information was inconsistent with route mileages previously determined by BNSF. BNSF will review their data.

The next item discussed was the status of the Draft of the four party Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). UP has submitted comments and when BNSF reviewed UP’s comments, BNSF suggested that it may be more productive to proceed with the Study as proposed by CDOT’s Scope of Work rather than investing resources of all parties to agree on the specific language within an MOU.

UP countered that MOUs in Texas were useful in dealing with potential legislative issues. (It was noted however, that these MOUs were between the individual railroads and Texas DOT, not a joint MOU as is being proposed for this Colorado study).

A brief conversation on “competitive balance” resulted in a conclusion that this term could not be calculated, but is “in the eye of the beholder”.

After more discussion, it was agreed that another attempt would be made regarding the MOU. It was suggested that the document will not be binding and won’t get into project specifics. A revised version of the MOU will be provided to both railroads and RTD after it is revised considering today’s discussion; comments previously received from UP; and, comments to be submitted in the near future by BNSF.

The last item on the agenda was a proposal to issue the Draft Press Release announcing the Study. Both railroads wanted to review the Press Release that the project team was proposing be issued on April 11. There was concern from the railroads that it might be too early to issue this press release. Randy noted that the 18-month Study has now been going on for nearly 10 ½ months and there needs to be a preliminary round of public open houses on this effort. The Rocky Mountain Rail Authority’s Consultant is about to be selected and there will undoubtedly be press releases coming forward from that effort that mention the Rail Relocation Implementation Study. Therefore, it is imperative that the Press Release go out no later than April 11 because the initial series of Open Houses

were tentatively being scheduled for April 28 – May 6. Limon, Brush/Ft. Morgan, Las Animas, Pueblo and Castle Rock have all indicated an interest in hosting these meetings.

After the railroads suggested that Open Houses not occur until after the MOU is finalized, Jennifer Finch said that will not be the case. She asked Randy to e-mail the Draft Press Release to the railroads for their review and comment, and asked for comments to be returned to Randy so that they might be considered for the final version of the Press Release and that it would go out April 11.

Under the agenda topic “Other Issues”, BNSF noted they have completed a detailed analysis and that Alignment A does not produce enough benefit for them to be willing to financially participate in that Alignment.

It was decided that the next EOT meeting would be held in Denver at CDOT’s Headquarters Building on June 12 from 11 a.m. to 1:30 p.m.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned.