

Meeting Notes  
Colorado State Freight and Passenger Rail Plan  
Steering Committee

Denver, CO – December 2, 2011

Meeting Attendees

CDOT

Mark Imhoff	Director – Division of Transit and Rail (DTR)
Debra Perkins-Smith	Director – Division of Transportation Development (DTD)
Tracy McDonald	CDOT Statewide Planning
Bob Wilson	CDOT Public Relations

Steering Committee Members (or representatives)

Craig Caspar	Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments
Gary Beedy	Lincoln County/Colorado Counties, Inc.
Henry Stoppolecamp	Regional Transportation District (RTD)
Ann Rajewski	Colorado Association of Transit Agencies (CASTA)
Mark Radtke	Colorado Municipal League (CML)
Vince Rogalski	State Transportation Advisory Committee (STAC)
Sarod Dhuru	BNSF Railway
Pete Rickershauser	(for the Union Pacific Railroad)
Mehdi Baziar	State Rail Plan Project Manager
Sandi Kohrs	CDOT Statewide Planning and Performance Measure Manager

Via Conference Call

Jonathan Hutchison	Amtrak (SC Member)
Leo Wetula	Federal Railroad Administration (FRA)
Kyle Gradinger	Federal Railroad Administration (FRA)

Consultant Project Team

Larry Warner	PB Project Manager
Randy Grauberger	PB Deputy Project Manager
Matt McDole	LS Gallegos

Other Attendees

Dave Munger	Colorado Springs Mayor's Office
Dave Menter	Mountain Metro

CDOT Project Manager Mehdi Baziar called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. He welcomed everyone to the fourth meeting of the Steering Committee (SC) for the State Freight and Passenger Rail Plan (SFPRP). Mehdi asked everyone to make a self introduction including those calling in.

Following introductions, Mehdi asked Division of Transit and Rail Director Mark Imhoff to make introductory comments. Mark said he was looking forward to a good dialogue at this meeting in regard to the project prioritization efforts as well as draft State Rail Plan recommendations.

Mark informed the SC that CDOT today received a letter from the Victoria and Southern Railroad (V&S) notifying CDOT of V&S's intent to abandon the Towner Line from NA Jct. to Eads.

Randy Grauberger next provided the SC with the status of the effort to compile the overall freight and passenger rail projects and also to prioritize some of those projects. Randy noted the 8-person team that evaluated the projects consisted of: Mehdi Baziar and Wendy Wallach from CDOT, Vince Rogalski, Pete Rickershauser and Joan Shaffer from the Steering Committee/Stakeholder group, and three member of the consultant team.

Randy discussed the following handouts:

- Lists of all Freight and Passenger projects that would be included in the SFPRP.
- Lists showing Priority (High, Medium, or Low) of those projects that had been evaluated.
- Description of the various Freight and Passenger Rail project categories.

Randy also noted that one of the 10 evaluation criteria (safety) had a change in its descriptors. "Reduces the likelihood of derailment" had been added to the descriptors for the 'Safety' criteria.

The following are highlights of the discussion that took place regarding the above project lists and prioritization efforts:

- The cost shown for the potential relocation of Intermodal facilities for the BNSF and UP (\$100 million) may be too low. It may be more appropriate to show a range of costs for these projects.
- In the Notes show column that some of the Great Western Railroad projects have been submitted in a Tiger Grant application.
- City of Colorado Springs and Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments (PPACG) believe that the concept of Eastern Colorado Freight Rail Relocation should be included in the project lists and not just referred to in the text of the SFPRP. It was noted that since this is considered a 'Vision' document a major project such as this should be included even if there isn't much likelihood of it being implemented in the near future. This major freight related project should be treated similarly to the Advanced Guideway System (AGS) rail passenger service in the I-70 mountain corridor and the Greenfield High Speed Passenger Rail projects in the Front Range.
- FRA suggested that a list be included in the appendix that includes "all projects" proposed throughout the stakeholder outreach process.
- Several changes were suggested to the columns labeled "Project Source". This may be changed to "Entity Submitting Project", "Project Sponsor" or something similar.
- Show RTD as the 'project source' for the Union Station Redevelopment Project.
- Under the heading "Property Owner", a note will suggest that 'some adjacent property may also be required to implement some of these projects'.
- For the High Speed Rail projects showing RMRA as the project source; change 'RMRA' to 'Interregional Connectivity Study'.
- Pete Rickershauser will follow-up with the railroads to get additional project details and cost estimates where possible.
- Consider adding "Moffat Tunnel improvements" as a new project.
- Add 'RFTA' (Roaring Fork Transit Authority) to the list of acronyms.
- Provide an enhanced definition to the High Speed Rail project description.
- Break out the "High Speed Rail- Denver to Pueblo" into two projects; 1) Denver to Colorado Springs, and 2) Colorado Springs to Pueblo.
- Be consistent in rounding the "costs" to the nearest \$100,000.

- Make sure that the text describes how the cost estimates were arrived at; some were previous studies; some are in existing programs (Section 130, etc.).
- Use the “Notes” column to describe potential benefits of projects to the state’s transportation network.
- The Rail Plan should contain a discussion of the importance of rail stations that references the Inter-regional Connectivity Study (ICS).
- The Rail Plan should reference the ICS and AGS and indicate that the findings of the associated reports will be considered when those studies are complete.

Craig Caspar asked to be provided a copy of the evaluation spreadsheets showing the scoring for each of the 10 criteria.

The Consultant Team will revise the lists based on these comments and re-submit to the SC for additional comments.

Randy next provided the SC with the schedule for the remaining elements of the development of the SFPRP. The Draft plan is expected to be put on the website for review and comments on January 30, 2012

It was noted that the State Transportation Advisory Committee (STAC) will be briefed on the Draft Plan at their February 10 meeting. The final Steering Committee Meeting date was also set for February 24. The Transportation Commission will be expected to adopt the Final SFPRP at their March meeting to be held on March 22, 2012.

The last item on the agenda was a discussion of the preliminary recommendations to be included in the State Rail Plan. Several comments were provided and a revised list of recommendations will be provided in the next 10 days. Members were asked to submit any additional comments on the recommendations to Mehdi Baziar by close of business 12/9.

There being no further business, Mehdi thanked everyone for their attendance and participation and adjourned the meeting at 4:05 p.m.