Welcome & Introductions
Tracey MacDonald from CDOT kicked the meeting off and asked that all participants introduce themselves.
Project Background
Tracey MacDonald from CDOT provided an overview of the planning processes for the Statewide Transit Plan and for the Regional Transit and Human Service Coordination plans.

Tracey reviewed materials included in the meeting packet, including: public involvement and agency coordination for the planning processes, review of the Statewide Transit Plan goals and objectives, guiding principles for transit planning at CDOT, what will be included in the Statewide Transit Plan, the key elements of the Local Transit and Human Service Coordinated Transportation Plans, and an overview of the project schedule.

Public Involvement Approach
Tracey MacDonald from CDOT, with support from the Public Involvement team members for the project, reviewed the strategy for public involvement for both the statewide transit plan and the local coordinated transit plan. The schedule at present includes a public open house in the fall of 2013 and a second open house in the spring of 2014. Input was solicited as to the best approaches and locations for public meetings in the Intermountain region.

Public meeting input/strategies:
- Distribute public meeting and plan information on transit system vehicles
- Grand Valley MPO conducted an electronic town hall via a website that had great success and involvement
- Consider ways for the LEP population to get involved besides a traditional public forum and consider need for potential Spanish translation
- BBB and Chamber able to help market the meetings/outreach
- Consider posting a short survey on the project website to garner feedback
- Good open house locations include Eagle, Gypsum and Glenwood Springs
- Consider the need for childcare and refreshments (partner with local businesses)
- Meetings in a box would be useful

Key Elements of a Coordinated Transportation Plan
Cady Dawson, Transportation Planner for Felsburg Holt & Ullevig (FHU), reviewed a handout that covered the basic components of a coordinated transportation plan. Some of the key elements of completing a coordinated transportation plan include the following:
- Provide a forum for transit providers and human service agencies to discuss issues
- Identify opportunities for collaboration and coordination (reducing cost inefficiencies)
- Create a list of priorities and projects
- Satisfy requirements of MAP 21.

Regional Planning
Cady Dawson, Transportation Planner for FHU, reviewed the demographic materials that have been created to date by the consultant team. The following maps/information was presented with a request for participants to provide comments:
- Major Activity Centers and Destinations
  Potential map additions discussed:
o Amtrak
o Regional airports
o Community/senior centers
o Employee housing locations in resort areas
o Community housing/affordable housing
o Oil and gas locations
o Create a separate map that highlights the 11 ski resorts within the region.
  o Create sub-areas highlighting different areas of the TPR due to the large number of resorts/activity centers
  o Enlarge some of the towns to better see the activity centers

Changes to the Activity Center table:
  o Determine if big box retailers (Target, Wal-Mart, Costco etc.) are broken out by a different mapping code and add to activity center map and table.
  o Include a listing of resort areas.
  o Feedback was also provided on several activity centers that are missing and some that were no longer open and/or relevant to this project.

• Employed Working Outside of County of Residence
  Comments:
  o Offset lines indicating commuters from Rio Blanco to Garfield County and vice versa so that they are not overlapping.
  o Offset lines indicating commuters from Mesa to Garfield County and vice versa so that they are not overlapping.
  o Review data for commuter trips from Delta to Garfield County. Participants surprised that no trips were indicated within these counties.

• Intra-County Public Transit Commuters
  Comments:
  • Is it possible to show the trips from city to city and/or break out data by sub-area?
  • 2011 Percentage of Households with No Vehicle
  • Percentage of Residents Age 65+ for 2013, 2020, 2030, and 2040
  • Job Growth from 2000 to 2040
  • 2011 Veteran Population
  • 2011 Minority Population
  • 2011 Percent of Population with No or Limited English Proficiency (LEP)
  Comments:
  • This data does not seem to be correct as Lake County is showing less than two percent LEP, which it is likely more than 20 percent. The consultant team indicated that they will review the data with the GIS team and has already discussed the possibility of needing to use K-12 English Learners data from school district data to more accurately represent the region.

• 2011 Population below Federal Poverty Level

Intermountain TPR 2008 Plan Summary
Cady Dawson, Transportation Planner for FHU, reviewed the 2008 Intermountain Plan Summary document with participants. Ms. Dawson reiterated that this information is the outcome of the last plan update in 2008 and is being used to get an idea as to whether or not the key issues, strategies, goals, etc. are still in line for the region.
Additionally, Cady Dawson led a more detailed discussion to obtain feedback on current vision and goals for the region. The following are the key concepts that emerged from the discussion for the Intermountain region:

- Connectivity between regions and within the region
- Multi-modal transportation network – ability to connect to other modes
- Sustainable
- Enhance quality of life
- Preservation of rural character
- Congestion relief
- Plan for generational shifts in travel patterns
- Regional/local connectivity
- Access to recreation / economic impacts
- Access to jobs
- Access to human services and medical facilities
- Provide a mode for all users – attract choice riders
- Make transit a competitive choice
- Education and outreach to communicate the benefits of transit
- Interaction of aviation into multi-modal plan
- Eliminate incentives for vehicle parking

Regional Transit Needs, Projects, and Priorities
A portion of the first Transit Working Group meeting was used to discuss project needs within the Intermountain TPR. A “Project List” was developed based on the 2008 Transit Plan and “other” CDOT plans to be used as a reference and starting point for the discussion. The projects were discussed using the following categories: operating, capital and coordination. The discussion outcomes are below.

Capital Projects and Needs
- RFTA BRT (Glenwood Springs to Aspen)
  - Parking and multi-modal infrastructure at BRT stations
  - Expansion of Rubey Park transfer center in Aspen
  - Pedestrian underpasses (multi-modal infrastructure)
  - Glenwood BRT station on north side of town
- Town of Snowmass Village – Mall Transit Station
- Glenwood Springs - need for transit facility infrastructure and a multi-modal transfer station (Amtrak, Greyhound, BRT, local services)
- Vail – I-70 underpass to create a multi-modal transportation solution (Simba Run)
- Preservation of RR corridors

Operating Projects and Needs
- Need for more operating funds on an ongoing and consistent basis; lack of connectivity is in part due to lack of operating funds; no money to operate new capital
- Additional operating dollars for paradigm shifts – choice riders and aging adults in particular; many older adults are aging in place and are often living in very rural areas far from needed services
- Maintain existing service
- Focus on key areas where there are the most riders
• Glenwood Canyon transit connection
• Connection of Summit Stage, Eco Transit and RFTA
• Feeder service to support BRT from Glenwood to Aspen

Coordination Projects and Needs
• Creation of multi-modal commuter connections
• Increased vehicle sharing and multiple types of riders on the same vehicles
• Reduce redundancy of service in Glenwood Springs through increased coordination
• Connecting RFTA and ECO Transit services
• Inventory of transit providers and services
• Need for statewide capital replacement plan schedule
• Coordination on medical trips to Denver
• Coordination on regional transportation services including specialized transit (HHS, Vets, etc.)

Next Steps
The meeting closed by discussing what we need from the Transit Working Group and what they can expect in the months to come, including:
• All project correspondence and information will be distributed via email and online
• Feedback on demographic data/maps – send any comments to Cady Dawson (see contact information below)
• Transit Provider and Human Services Surveys to be distributed in mid-August
• Next Transit Working Group Meeting – October 2, 2013
• Please send Cady Dawson (email below) any contact information of people that should be included in the Transit Working Group

Adjourn
Tracey MacDonald of CDOT thanked the group for attending and reiterated the value of their participation and that we look forward to working with them over the next several months.

PROJECT CONTACTS:
CDOT Project Manager: Tracey MacDonald tracey.macdonald@state.co.us  
Work: 303-757-9753

Lead TPR Planner: Cady Dawson cady.dawson@fhueng.com  
Work: 303-721-1440

Project Web Site: http://www.coloradodot.info/programs/transitandrail/statewidetransitplan