



**I 70 Mountain Corridor  
Collaborative Effort, Meeting 3  
December 19, 2007  
The Keystone Collaborative Center, Keystone, CO**

**Draft Meeting Minutes**

**Report from NEPA Independent Advisors Effort Selection Subcommittee**

- Members of the Collaborative Effort requested independent expertise regarding the application of NEPA, especially for a transportation study at the programmatic level. In addition, several members of the group requested that the independent advisors lead a group discussion on fundamental principles and requirements of environmental studies under NEPA.
- The small group reviewed a set of resumes and selected Gina McAfee and Dr. George Sherk as independent advisors.
- The Scopes of Work will outline the duties and the standards for independence of the advisors.
- CDOT will be responsible for identifying and securing appropriate contracts for the advisors which are separate from the Scopes of Work.

*Action: draft Scopes of Work for the advisors will be drafted by the facilitators, with the help of the advisors. The Scopes of Work will be edited and approved by the subcommittee which selected the advisors and are empowered by the group to finalize these Scopes of Work.*

**Consultative Principles**

The Collaborative Effort discussed the principles and guidelines for future, cooperative transportation planning. These principles should guide the actions of all stakeholders, including, but not limited to the lead agencies. Key principles of consultation and engagement include:

- Listening to the breadth of stakeholder interests
- Forthcoming and honest discussions of needs
- Clear about assumptions and criteria for decision making
- Be flexible, be creative
- Address “real” problems: be applied
- Focus on achieving positive results and outcomes
- Utilize good information for decision making
- Apply the principles of adaptive management. Acknowledge the dynamic and long term nature of the issues in the corridor
- Remain up to date on principles for adaptive management
- Coordinate and educate regarding regulatory requirements for all agencies involved
- Focus on feasible, achievable solutions
- Build dialogue into stakeholder engagement, avoid one-way discussions or presentations
- Clearly define questions at-hand
- Be open to trusting others, be trustworthy

*Action: Facilitators will draft for group review a more formal list of Consultative Principles based on the above.*

### **Elements and Characteristics of Useful Evaluation Criteria**

The Collaborative Effort discussed and decided the following makes for useful criteria:

- Able to be measured quantitatively or qualitatively
- Helps distinguish among alternatives
- Relevant to decisions at hand
- Support core values
- Works within regulatory requirements
- Grounded in political and economic reality
- Consistent with meeting purpose and need

### **Criteria for Transportation Alternative Evaluation**

The goal is to find a sustainable transportation system for the I-70 Mountain Corridor. After group discussion, Collaborative Effort decided that a successful transportation solution will:

- Manage and guide growth in desirable ways
- Enhance mobility for all
- Integrate land use planning with transportation planning
- Maintain and enhancing ecosystem health
- Support a diversity of lifestyles and choices
- Maintain flexibility but acknowledging and addressing constraints
- Mitigate community impacts of roadway/transportation infrastructure
- Support an agreed upon amount of travel demand
- Recognize the economic interdependency of mountain communities
- Reduce congestion and improving safety
- Be economically viable and sustainable
- Utilize a phased, adaptive and relevant solution
- Is built upon a local, regional and statewide visions for transportation
- Respond to global trends such as climate change and fuel price/availability
- Recognize the corridor as a critical conduit between the Front Range, Mountain Communities and the West Slope.
- Be planned with a long term perspective
- Support green communities
- Optimize the use of existing footprints
- Connect with other planned and existing transit systems
- Optimize the guest/traveler experience
- Be implementable in a reasonable timeframe
- Utilize a variety of modes

### **Analysis and Data for Evaluation Criteria**

The group began an initial discussion on the disposition of the following Criteria and related analysis in the Draft PEIS:

Key:

- “\*” Need more information
- “%” will be difficult to measure

- “#” will be useful to distinguish among alternatives
  - “+” Currently there is quality, adequate information
- Private and public economic viability: Cost and financing (capital and operational/management)\*
  - Framework for mitigation (cost)
  - Safety +
  - Mobility +
  - Community values and impacts
  - Environmental impacts %
  - Wow factor/compelling design
  - How quickly it can be implemented
  - Aesthetics
  - Adaptive to future trends
  - Secondary impacts +/\*
  - Technologically feasible
  - Connectivity to systems\*
  - Footprint +
  - Economic impact

### **Public Comments to Collaborative Effort Team**

- It is almost trivial to enter into a discussion about technology when nine out of ten transit projects never see completion in the United States.
- The next step will have to be to answer cost, marketing, and a writer ship study. Those answers, if developed, would be extraordinarily helpful though expensive.
- It is one thing for this group to get its hands around transit but it is another to have people utilizes transit, and to have the costs allocated for transit.
- There have been studies done by the Victoria Transit Institute. Gina McAfee will send this information to Caelan McGee and Sarah Alexander who will send out to the Collaborative Effort.

### **Report on Transit Studies**

The Collaborative Effort heard presentations on the I-70 Coalition Study and the Rocky Mountain Rail Authority (Rocky Mountain Rail Authority) study.

Brief presentations outlined two transit studies which have just begun, and which may inform decisions about transportation systems in the corridor.

- The I-70 Coalition is conducting a transit study that will focus on questions of how transit may integrate with the land uses in different communities in the corridor, potential alignments for transit and some questions about the collection and distribution of transit users. The study area boundaries of the Coalition study is not
- Rocky Mountain Rail Authority (Rocky Mountain Rail Authority) is evaluating several rail alignments including north/south along the Front Range, as well as east/west into the mountain corridor. The goal is to advance a seamless passenger rail system for Colorado. The study will focus on transit ridership, benefits to non riders, investigating options and opportunities for financial support, coordination with landowners to secure rights-of-way and some questions about collection and distribution.

Please see presentations at [www.i70mtncorridor.com](http://www.i70mtncorridor.com)

### **Questions and Discussions regarding the I 70 Coalition Study**

*Are the geographic boundaries in the study identical to the I70 boundaries?*

The I70 Coalition study area boundaries are not exactly the same, and extend farther east than the Draft PEIS.

*Is the Request for Proposals for consultants available for the public?*

Yes, currently it is posted on the Coalition's website.

*What is a fixed guideway?*

Fixed guideways can serve both bus and rail routes. The purpose of this study is not to for Collaborative Effort a railway into the I70 corridor. The study is to provide information.

*Who will look at Collection and Distribution issues?*

Both the RMRA and the I 70 Coalition studies are refining their scopes and will likely include analysis of collection and distribution issues for a fixed guideway system through the corridor.

### **Questions and Discussion Regarding the Rocky Mountain Rail Authority Transit Study**

*Will the study look at guideways and financing solutions developed in the Collaborative Effort?*

Yes, to some extent, the scope of study is still being refined. The feasibility of a solution will be measured by taxpayer willingness to support.

*Are your ridership projections going to look at different costs to riders?*

Yes, a good study should consider carefully pricing schedules and affect on ridership.

*Will the Rocky Mountain Rail Authority study include freight as well?*

Most likely any future transit system would not share rail infrastructure with larger freight trains and cars.

*When will this study be done?*

The Rocky Mountain Rail Authority study anticipates completion in the middle of summer in 2009. There is a detailed scope of work and the RFP for the Coalition study is located at [www.rockymountainrail.org](http://www.rockymountainrail.org)

*Many of the trains around the world would not meet the USA's safety requirements. With this in mind, what types of trains are considered?*

The study will not look at this level. The goal is to look at if things are feasible. This study is not to decide what is to be built.

### **Next Steps and Deliverables for Next Meeting**

- Distribution of summary matrices used in the Draft PEIS to compare alternatives versus evaluation criteria
- Coordinate background NEPA discussion with independent advisors
- Small groups were established to determine next steps for the examination of the following issues and evaluation criteria:
  - o Mitigation: Gary Frey, Carol Kruse, Shaun Cutting

- Transit Options: Harry Dale, Dr. Flo Raitano, Ann Rajewski, Jon Esty
- Economic Analysis: Bert Melcher, Eric Turner, Tresi Houpt, Kevin O'Malley
- Construction Impacts: Stan Zemmler, Dennis Lunberry, Carol Kruse
- Peak Oil/Sustainability: Harry Dale, Peter Runyon, Melanie Mills, Art Ballah
- Air Quality: Bert Melcher, Carol Kruse, TJ Brown
- Early Action and Interim Projects: Ann Rajewski, Thad Knoll, Beth Ganz