



# MEETING SUMMARY

**Project:** Southwest Chief Thru-Car Alternatives Analysis

---

**Subject:** Stakeholder Coalition Meeting 1

---

**Date:** June 9, 2022

---

**Time:** 3:00pm to 4:30pm

---

**Location or Call In:** Google Meeting, [Link Here](#)  
By Phone: 617-675-4444; PIN: 282 442 666 7041#

---

## OBJECTIVES

- Introduce the SW Chief Thru-Car Alternatives Analysis Project and Schedule
- Confirm the roles and responsibilities of the project's Stakeholder Coalition
- Confirm the Draft Purpose and Need
- Discuss Existing Conditions
- Present the Draft Evaluation Process and Criteria

## AGENDA

Key discussion topics included:

- Review of Pre-Meeting Project Portfolio
- Draft Purpose & Need
- Existing Conditions
- Evaluation Process

## SUMMARY

Prior to the meeting Coalition-members reviewed and answered questions of an Online Pre-Meeting Project Portfolio to confirm their understanding of the project. The Portfolio's information and questions included an introduction of coalition-members, information on the project background, schedule, and status updates; and the Draft Purpose & Need.

## PROJECT OVERVIEW

During a presentation of an overview of the project, Coalition-members expressed interest in learning additional details about the project, including:

- Price point for tickets; looking to ensure that low income communities in southern CO could have access to the rail service
- Frequency of trains per day; the project team replied there could be up to 4 trains per day
- Potential disruption the flow of roadway traffic; the project team replied that the passenger trains in question would be much shorter than freight trains and would cross streets for a duration approximately the same as a traffic light
- Sequencing the thru-car with the Front Range Passenger Rail (FRPR); seeking to understand whether this would be a first phase of FRPR; whether this would continue to operate simultaneously, but separately from FRPR; or whether this would be discontinued once FRPR begins

## PURPOSE & NEED

During the meeting, Coalition-members confirmed the Draft Purpose & Need for the project.

A key focus of the meeting was on the alternatives evaluation process and sought to understand Coalition-members' interests and concerns of potential evaluation criteria.

## EVALUATION PROCESS & CRITERIA

To understand Coalition-members' interests and concerns of evaluation criteria, the group divided into online breakout groups. The breakout groups each had a facilitator from the project team. The breakout groups used a "virtual whiteboard" that was pre-populated with a draft list of potential criteria. Coalition-members ranked criteria options using both the draft list and additional criteria they developed themselves.

The draft list of suggested criteria included (1) Level of Expected Ridership, (2) Connectivity, (3) Effects to Freight Network, (4) Environmental, (5) Financial and Economic Factors, and (6) Project Readiness. Members were encouraged to suggest additional criteria.

By combining the input provided by Coalition-members, several key themes emerged, including:

- Members emphasized the **importance of mitigating Effects to Freight Networks**.
- **Connectivity ranked highly**—particularly connectivity between communities and the resources they seek to access (e.g. healthcare, education) as well as between modes of transportation.
- **Project Readiness ranked highly** for many members.

- **Members ranked Environmental concerns lower** in the context of proposed service that is contained to an existing rail corridor.
- **Members suggested the following additional criteria:**
  - Equity in Impacts and Benefits
  - Future Expandability and Flexibility.
  - Safety (e.g. grade separation, disruption of emergency response)
  - Community Support (from business, agriculture, and political groups)
  - Generation of Tourism
  - Benefits of Economic Resiliency (i.e. tying rural communities to healthcare and education)

## STAKEHOLDER AND COALITION-MEMBER ATTENDANCE

Organization	Name
Amtrak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tim Wells</li> </ul>
CDOT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lisa Streisfeld</li> </ul>
Colorado Springs, City of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brian Vitulli (also represented Mountain Metro)</li> </ul>
CO Springs Chamber & EDC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dave Dazlich</li> <li>• Devin Camacho</li> </ul>
CO Springs Downtown Partnership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chelsea Gondeck</li> </ul>
CSU - Pueblo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• John Adams (also represented PPACOG)</li> </ul>
ColoRail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• James Souby</li> </ul>
DOLA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tara Marshall</li> </ul>
El Paso County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kevin Mastin</li> <li>• Victoria Chavez</li> </ul>
FRA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lyle Leitelt</li> </ul>
La Junta, City of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rick Klein (also represented Action 22 &amp; Nat'l. Assoc. of Rail Passengers)</li> <li>• Paul Velasquez (Council Member)</li> </ul>
La Junta Chamber	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greg Kolomitz</li> </ul>
La Junta Transit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dawn Block</li> </ul>
Monument, Town of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Debbie Flynn</li> </ul>
Otero College	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tim Alvarez</li> </ul>
PPACOG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• John Liosatos</li> </ul>
Pueblo County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mike Ricottone</li> </ul>
Union Pacific Railroad	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mark Bristol</li> <li>• Vic Stone</li> </ul>