

**High Performance Transportation Enterprise
Board of Directors Meeting Minutes
CDOT Headquarters Building, Conference Rm. 225
January 19, 2010**

PRESENT: Michael Cheroutes
Doug Aden
Heather Barry (on the Phone)
Dan Cleveland
Tim Gagen

ABSENT: Charlotte Robinson
Stan Matsunaka

ALSO PRESENT: Russell George, CDOT Executive Director
Peggy Catlin, Deputy Executive Director
Harry Morrow, Chief Transportation Council
Marina Krasny, HPTE Accountant

AND: Carla Perez, Governor's Office

AND: Other organization representatives, the public, and the news media.

1. Call to order and Roll Call

Chairman Michael Cheroutes convened the HPTE Board of Directors regular meeting at 10:35 a.m. Marina Krasny did the roll call. Chairman Cheroutes asked the audience to introduce themselves.

2. Public Comment

No public comments

3. Discuss and Act on the Regular Meeting Minutes for December 15th, 2009

Chairman Cheroutes asked for consideration of the December 15, 2009 HPTE regular meeting minutes. Director Gagen moved for adoption of the meeting minutes. Director Cleveland seconded the motion and on the vote of the Board, the minutes were unanimously adopted.

Resolution Number HPTE-6

BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED, the High Performance Transportation Enterprise Board of Directors' Regular Meeting Minutes for December 15, 2009 are hereby approved.

4. Follow up Discussion on HPTe Director Hiring Options and Qualifications

Chairman Cheroutes thought that there was good progress made focusing on alternatives. There was a sense that people were thinking in terms of an Interim Director arrangement and that it made most sense to look at existing contracts that may have existed with the Tolling Enterprise or with CDOT in general to see if there was anything with sufficient scope. Since that session a lot of time was spent trying to refine the functions list and to review the existing contracts to see what was out there to take advantage of. Several conversations took place with a few interested people.

Carla Perez reviewed the new handout regarding Director qualifications with the Board. The handout summarized the types of essential functions and activities the board might need to support their work over the next year. There are four major categories of functional activities that can help the Board to evaluate whether or not it is time to hire a fulltime Executive Director after a year of an interim contract.

- Define and develop internal organizational structure which includes activities such as By-laws, Articles of Organizations, strategic goal setting, policies and procedures, Executive Director and etc.
- Establish communication and outreach program. The importance of the Board being able to communicate with parties within corridors that may have an interest with working with HPTe to move the projects forward. Developing the materials needed for effective communication with Stakeholders within the various corridors
- Evaluating projects, starting with discussions with regions regarding various corridors and moving towards more technical evaluation such as establishing criteria for what to look at for the particular corridors and how to begin to evaluate or prioritize.
- Continuation of the I-25 HOT Lanes. Making sure that fiduciary responsibility of the Board continues to be an ongoing activity and that all obligations associated with that continue.

Director Cleveland asked about our current outreach approach in terms of sending out the minutes to all the regions and councils of governments. Marina Krasny responded that all information is posted on the CDOT website along with the Transportation Commission documents. The distribution list is also expanding as people request to be included. Chairman Cheroutes pointed out that more focused outreach occurs now on a more ad hoc basis and we really need to get into it in a more institutionalized way.

Director Aden stated that because of the way the legislation is structured we need to get the sense of where the local governments are at that would be impacted by some of the potential projects. Since their support and 100 percent buy-in is needed to move forward on anything, it is very important to have an understanding of their positions.

Chairman Cheroutes responded that the only communication right now is through CDOT website and we are currently checking into the possibility of developing our own website to make easier for people to see the information.

Carla Perez pointed out that since the Stakeholders may be different by corridor, we might need to develop different types of materials in relationship with to those corridors.

Director Gagen thought that it is very important to have a board face and proper staffing side. The Stakeholders need to know that we are very active and we on the ground type of group.

Overall, the Board agreed that presented summary covers all major areas.

Chairman Cheroutes and staff reviewed all existing non-project specific contracts and have not been able to find many with a scope that is extensive enough to comprehend the functional outline. We discussed several alternatives including bringing in a Senior Executive under the department umbrella at whatever cost that would be to the Enterprise, advertising for consulting services, and looking for existing contracts. The HNTB contract, which has been discussed in the past, seems to be broad enough to cover the Executive Director functions. We had a discussion with HTNB regarding how this task could be structured under our contract and we'll be talking about that later.

Chairman Cheroutes addressed Executive Director George regarding day to day staff support for the Board that is missing in his opinion. Marina and Peggy have been helping with brining things together; however, they both have other responsibilities within the CDOT. He would like see someone dedicated to the Board similar to the support staff for the Transportation Commission. Executive Director George expressed that he would like to continue that discussion.

5. Overview of the corridor projects

Chairman Cheroutes started the discussion with the reminder that the next meeting will take place in Frisco and date has been changed to February 3rd to accommodate the I-70 Coalition Group. HPTE Board will have a joint meeting with them open to the public to get a sense of where they are on various ideas for that corridor.

Peggy Catlin has put together some helpful information regarding three projects: C470, US 36, and I-25 North up into Larimer County. She introduced Tony DeVito, Region 1 RTD and Chuck Attardo, Region 1 Environmental Manager to provide an overview of the I-70 East Corridor.

I-70 Corridor

Over the past 10 years, Region 1 has been involved in the Tier 1 programmatic study and in 2004 a draft document was released with 21 alternatives for the corridor. Shortly after that release the project came to a grinding halt because of the political sensitivity and some of the concerns that were raised. There was a collaborative effort recommendation was developed. Basically the recommendation took a multi-modal

HES advanced guide way approach to this corridor. It identified non infrastructure related components advanced guide way systems, highway improvements that were specific and other highway projects that could be done. The recommendation is a blend of a lot of the 21 alternatives.

They are currently working with FHWA to move it to a release of a final programmatic EIS. From there they can start working on some solutions which can bring some immediate improvements to this operational system that are much needed. It is a 144-mile corridor that runs from the park-n-rides from the hogbacks all the way up to the Eagle Airport.

They have been asked whether or not tolling had been considered. It was never fully screened out of any of the alternatives in the draft. They were relying on about \$200 million identified in SB-1 funding as the primary source of moving the corridor forward. With the evaporation of SB-1 funds they are wondering what the future is. One of the things that spun out of the success of the collaborative effort is the formation of the I-70 Coalition. This topic will be discussed further when HPTPE meets with the I-70 Coalition later. The Coalition has been very supportive at looking at Tolling as a funding option. There have been some open discussions. A possible next step would be working with the HPTPE on a feasibility study or a white paper that would get them to what th Enterprise can bring to the corridor. The atmosphere on the corridor from 2004 to now is at a point where everybody just wants to move something forward. He believes it's an optimal time, an optimal corridor to try something.

Chairman Cheroutes asked if is there a priority list of increments that have a major impact on what goes on at that corridor. Tony DeVito stated that a lot of the focus has been on the TDM managing existing lanes. The Rocky Mountain Rail Study is trying to determine on the advanced guide what a feasibility of a high-speed rail component would be. Some specific highway improvements they are looking at include a six-lane component from Floyd Hill through the Twin Tunnels including a bike trail on the frontage road from Idaho Springs east to Hidden Valley. Empire Junction is one of the identified points, an eastbound auxiliary lane from Eisenhower to Herman Gulch, a westbound auxiliary lane from Bakerville to Eisenhower. There were other improvements identified from east Glenwood Springs, Gipson, Eagle County Airport, Eagle, Edwards, Avon, and Minturn. There is a list of about fourteen interchanges all the way to Georgetown that could be identified for some sort of improvement options. Tony DeVito will provide the Board with the copy of the consensus recommendations.

Director Aden asked if they have to go through another site specific EIS process. Tony DeVito responded that they have to go through a site-specific environmental clearance which will be determined at each location.

Peggy Catlin pointed out that the original feasibility study in 1984 looked at only tolling the Tunnels. She wondered if the Coalition has now expanded their view for what might be tolled. Tony DeVito responded that based on the past several meeting he believed the I-70 Coalition philosophically has changed their views. Director Gagen confirmed that the group has become more practical in their views due to the evaporating funding.

Tony DeVito stated that the main focus right now is to get the Record of Decision before looking into financing and other specifics from the programmatic perspective. His recommendation would be to give the priority to the “bottleneck” areas, because solving those problems will bring immediate visible results and will start building the momentum for the larger projects. The anticipated timing for the Record of Decision is 2011.

C-470

Peggy Catlin presented an overview of the C-470 corridor. There was a proposal for managed lanes for C-470. The initial process started with Region 6 completing an Environmental Assessment (EA). The EA was completed and signed during February 2006. After the signing of the document, there was no consensus reached regarding preferred alternative for C-470 corridor. Therefore a decision document was not pursued.

There are currently two general purpose lanes in each direction of C-470. The EA preferred alternative would keep the two existing general purpose lanes in both directions. One buffer separated managed lane would be added to both directions of C-470 from Kipling to Wadsworth and also, two barrier separated managed lanes in both directions from Wadsworth to I-25 would be added.

To allow access to the managed lanes, slip ramps from the general purpose lanes would have been located between Lucent and Broadway, Broadway and University and between Yosemite and I-25. In addition to the slip ramps, direct connections would have to be used at Colorado Boulevard, Quebec, and I-25. The estimated construction cost of EA was over \$300 million. Some other options included buffer separated lanes, which could reduce the cost. Currently the AARA project is reconstructing the general purpose lanes, which would cause the original estimate to change.

Because the information is dated, a re-evaluation of the EA would need to be performed. To determine how to proceed, meetings with Federal Partners and Stakeholders (Douglas County, Arapahoe County, Jefferson County, City of Centennial, City of Lone Tree, Park Meadows Metropolitan District, Highlands Ranch Metropolitan District, Highlands Ranch Community Association, Colorado State Parks, and City of Aurora) would be necessary. The traffic numbers and cost will need to be updated to reflect current information. The timeline to perform a re-evaluation would be approximately ten to twelve months and would cost \$750,000 to \$1,500,000. A phase approach could be used by constructing one managed lane, then using the revenues from the managed lane to help fund construction for additional projects.

There were issues with C-470 and Santa Fe interchange. Region Six has proceeded with clearing the flyover from southbound to eastbound. The flyover was cleared separately with a Categorical Exclusion (CE). The Transportation Commission approved a 1601 System Level Feasibility Study in December 2009.

Reza Akhavan added that since the Record of Decision was issued on preferred alternative for US 36, the dynamics in the corridor have changed possible opening new opportunities for us in C-470 corridor.

Jim Paulmeno pointed out that there is recognition of the limited funding among stakeholder and they might be open to the options they opposed in the past to bring in funding into the corridor.

In order for the Enterprise to become a Stakeholder in the C-470 corridor, they will need to take a proactive approach.

US 36

The Corridor Governments Committee (CGC) Technical Support Committee proceeded through the draft FEIS for the US 36 corridor. After the draft FEIS was completed, a Preferred Alternative Committee was formed. The Preferred Alternative Committee made recommendations for the preferred alternative to be included in the FEIS and ROD.

The final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) was signed, and the preferred alternative includes a combined bus rapid transit component that operates in one managed lane in both directions. The preferred alternative also includes a bikeway and auxiliary lanes along the entire corridor.

The Record of Decision (ROD), which is the first phase of the US 36 corridor, was signed in December 2009. This phase included the one managed lane and a bikeway. The estimated cost of the first phase was \$550 million.

The Stakeholders (Adams County, Boulder County, Jefferson County, City and County of Denver, City of Louisville, City of Superior, City of Boulder, City and County of Broomfield, FHWA, FTA, RTD, US Army Corps of Engineers, and 36 Commuting Solutions) applied for various TIGER grants that had a range of \$100 million to \$200 million through the AARA funding. There is \$60 million in State funding that would be available for this project if the ARRA funding is received.

If the Stakeholders secure \$260 million from the TIGER grant, the grant money would be used to construct a managed lane from I-25 to the Interlocken interchange. However, if the Stakeholders only secure \$160 million, the grant money would be applied to construct a managed lane between I-25 and Broomfield interchange. If a TIGER grant is not received, a small project will be completed to reconstruct a portion between 92nd and 104th Avenues. There is not a lot of capacity to sell on this stretch so the potential revenue stream is not significant enough to attract private sector partner.

Jim Paulmeno confirmed that the next step is just waiting to hear whether the ARRA funding is awarded. The receivers of the TIGER grant are scheduled to be announced in February 2010.

Russ George used US 36 as an excellent example of smaller communities and local organizations coming together. This coalition was able to be productive and proactive and accomplish a common goal. Russ George would like to see CDOT taking a lead on forming something similar in the C-470 corridor.

North I-25

Peggy Catlin presented an overview of the North I-25 project. The draft Environmental Impact Statement is complete and the final statement is schedule to be complete December 2010 with the Record of Decision in spring 2011.

The preferred alternative in that corridor includes:

- One new general purpose lane each direction adding capacity from SH 66 to Fort Collins SH 14;
- Additional buffer separated managed lane form the end of existing managed lane to SH 14 in Fort Collins;
- Reconstruction of 16 interchanges:
- Express bus service on I-25;
- Commuter rail from Fort Collins to Longmont and then to Thornton;
- Commuter bus on US 85 from Greeley to Denver with queue jumps and transit signal enhancement at 17 locations.

Estimated cost of this project is \$2.6 billion (in 2005 dollars), which includes commuter rail. Region 4 has put together a phased funding plan. There are many different stakeholders in this project. Peggy turned it over to Myron Hora to go over the phasing specifics.

Phase I (2035) - \$640 million includes:

- Additional lane from SH 66 to SH60 including the intersections;
- Right-of-Way acquisitions to set the stage for the commuter rail in the future;
- Right-of-Way acquisitions for the bus service from Greeley;
- A few other operational improvements.

Phase II (2055) - \$975 million includes:

- Commuter bus operation form Longmont to Loveland;
- Continuation of roadway work from SH 60 to Fort Collins.

Phase III (2075) - \$975 million includes:

- Addition of the fourth lane in each direction from Fort Collins to US 36 ;
- Finishing the commuter rail.

Peggy Catlin pointed out that there was some discussion regarding interim strategies. One of which is that wide shoulders on the stretch from US 36 going up north could be converted into the interim managed lanes. This could start generating some revenue early on to be used for maintenance and the bigger project down the road.

Myron stated that currently, consultants are looking into revenue projections and traffic modeling based on this preferred alternative. Also, one of the early action items could be the extension of existing managed lanes up to 120th avenue, which is where the traffic starts during the peak hours. There was a discussion with the NATA group regarding this improvement and they expressed their support for the project.

Director Gagen reminded that the next meeting is tentatively scheduled for 10:30 am at Frisco Town Hall. I-70 Coalition will have their meeting first, after which we will have our joint meeting. The Coalition will probably have a short presentation on who they are, where are they at regarding corridor issues and how they think HPTE can help.

6. Other Matters

No other matters were discussed.

7. Adjournment followed by Board of Director's luncheon

The meeting was adjourned at 12:10 pm followed by Board of Director's luncheon. During the luncheon the Board continued the discussion regarding Executive Director Contract.

DRAFT