

Meeting Notes
Executive Oversight Team

Colorado Railroad Relocation Implementation Study – R2C2
Denver, CO – August 4, 2008 2 – 4 p.m.

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

Colleen Deines -	Director, Public Private Partnerships
Nate Asplund -	Director, Public Private Partnerships
Cathy Norris –	Director, Governmental Affairs

Union Pacific Railroad

Mark Bristol -	General Director, Network and Business Development
Joseph Bateman -	Vice President – Public Affairs
Joe Arbona -	General Director, Policy and Partnerships

Consultant Project Team

Randy Grauberger -	PB Project Manager
Jack Tone -	PB Implementation Team Lead
Cassie Gouger	Railroad Plan. & Engineering Lead (FHU)
Jerry Albin -	Railroad Planning & Engineering (FHU)

Visitors

Charlie Quandel	Quandel Consultants (RMRA Project)
Bob Moore	Quandel Consultants (RMRA Project)
Chip Kraft	TEMS (RMRA Project)

CDOT Project Manager Tammy Lang welcomed everyone to the meeting. She noted that members of the consultant team for the RMRA study were in attendance following their meetings with both railroads related to RMRA study data. She indicated that this was a meeting of the R2C2 Study's Executive Oversight Team (EOT) meeting and asked if there were any concerns with these individuals sitting in on the meeting. BNSF's Cathy Norris stated that any issues related to any issuance of R2C2 Study information to the public must be cleared with CDOT's Office of Public Information.

Tammy next asked if there were any additions or corrections to the meeting notes from the June 12, 2008 EOT meeting. There were none.

Following introductions, PB Project Manager Randy Grauberger discussed a possible analysis of the ownership of the Joint Line. H C Peck and Associates is PB's sub-consultant for right of way related issues for the R2C2 Study. It was originally anticipated that Peck would evaluate the parcels along the "preferred bypass alignment". However, since it has been agreed that there will not be a preferred alignment selected in this Study, CDOT had suggested that Peck determine "which railroad owns which portions of the Joint Line between Denver and Pueblo". At the June 12 EOT meeting, this topic had been discussed and the railroads had stated that their valuation maps were frequently outdated and that this would be a very long, expensive, and difficult undertaking. H C Peck had proposed using county assessor's data and the Surface Transportation Board's on-line records to determine "who owns what".

A discussion followed that resulted in canceling such activity for this Study. It was stated that because of the Joint Line agreements between the BNSF and UP, both railroads would need to be partners in any future discussions related to the sale or lease of Joint Line right of way for future rail passenger purposes.

It was agreed to not have H C Peck do the "ownership analysis". Instead, the Consultant team will research how other states and public agencies that have implemented or are anticipating rail passenger service have developed agreements for use of freight corridors that may have similarities to the situation with the Joint Line in Colorado.

Randy will contact H C Peck and inform them not to proceed with their proposed task.

Cassie Gouger next discussed the latest version of the cost estimates. These new draft estimates, dated July 28, 2008, included added costs for the NEPA process and included other suggested changes from the TAC and EOT meetings held in June.

Colleen Deines indicated she believes the estimates related to grade separations (\$2.7 million each) are still low. Cassie will provide additional detail related to which type of improvement (grade separation or at grade with active warning devices.) is proposed for specific locations within the Alignment A and B corridors.

Randy next mentioned that he and Cassie had discussed the possibility of doing some additional refinement work on Alignments A and B for the purpose of showing the concerned eastern Colorado landowners that there could be refinements to the alignments to minimize impacts to landowners. Such refinements would be of such a minor nature as to not require further RTC modeling or revisions to cost estimates. After discussion of this topic, it was decided that there *would be no further refinements shown to the public*. The effort to further refine these "Study" alignments might further give the public the perception that one of these actual alignments "had been selected" to be built. Russell George recommended that the alignments be reviewed for areas that cannot be refined instead of making actual refinements.

Jack Tone next discussed a handout related to the latest results of the RTC modeling. He also provided a brief report from the modeling team members who had met the previous week with UP and BNSF in Omaha and Ft. Worth. The railroads were concerned that there appeared to be “editorial comments” included in some of the narrative associated with the RTC modeling results. Jack stated that the modelers were now making changes to the model incorporating the comments from both railroads in the Omaha and Fort Worth meetings and that this handout would be revised in the next week or so. He suggested the railroads hold their comments until they have reviewed the revised modeling results.

Colleen Deines asked if there had been further work on the cost per train hour data. Randy noted that this work was continuing but that it had been held up; awaiting final modeling results. It was noted that the decision had been made to once again go back to using the “AAR “green book” data for some of the elements of the cost per train hour estimates.

Randy then discussed the status of the public involvement effort related to the R2C2 project. A series of meetings between CDOT, the Consultant team and Boards of County Commissioners in eastern Colorado would take place the week of September 15. These would be followed by Open Houses in mid-October and presentations to the State Transportation Advisory Committee (STAC) and Colorado Transportation Commission in November.

The next item discussed was the latest version of the FAQs. Randy noted that Steve Rudy of the Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG) had provided comments on two FAQs and that those comments had been incorporated and the web site had been updated as of July 28. Randy suggested that these FAQs are subject to being updated so please provide any comments on the FAQs to Tammy or Randy at any time.

After some discussion it was suggested that, until better language can be developed, that the last sentence of the answer to the Question “Will there be economic benefit for residents and communities along the corridor?”; be changed to “There would be additional tax revenue coming into the cities and counties.” The Colorado Department of Local Affairs and the railroads are looking into a more appropriate answer to this question.

Tammy Lang indicated that because CDOT revised the schedule for public involvement, the original PB contract completion was going to be extended for “time only” until January 31, 2009. This would allow for input from the October and November meetings to be included in the final report documents.

Tammy next discussed CDOT’s application for \$200,000 in State Senate Bill 1 funding to pull together / coordinate the results of the R2C2 and RMRA studies in regard to next “appropriate steps”. \$100,000 of this Senate Bill 1 funding, *if it becomes available*,

would be expected to be spent in State Fiscal year 2009 (July 2008 through June 2009) and \$100,000 would be proposed to be spent in State FY 2010 (July 2009 – June 2010).

Nate Asplund asked Executive Director Russell George if the state's economy was as good as it would appear to be with the energy development industry so prevalent in the state. Russell responded that some parts of the economy were doing well, but that transportation funding remained very inadequate to meet the state's growing needs. He noted that Colorado has one of the lowest mineral severance taxes in the country, and that \$0 goes to transportation from that severance tax source.

Randy next discussed a handout entitled "NEPA – Next Steps". This document was developed, not only in response to the Scope of Work, but also from questions asked by the public at many of the spring Open Houses. Randy asked for all to review the document and provide comments back to either he or Tammy. Colleen Deines asked that the sources used in the document be footnoted.

It was noted that the RMRA project was scheduled to be completed by June 30, 2009. The railroads had met individually earlier in the day with the RMRA consultant project team members regarding the issues of rail data required for that feasibility study.

The last item was to set a date for the next EOT meeting. It was suggested that it be held enough in advance of the October Open Houses to allow input in the development of presentation boards and the PowerPoint to be used at the Open Houses. It was suggested that the next EOT meeting would be held in Denver at CDOT's Headquarters Building during the week of September 22. This would be more than one week after the next TAC meeting scheduled for September 11. Tammy Lang will send out an e-mail with possible dates before the end of the week.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 3:50 p.m.