



Appendix F: Technical Advisory Committee Minutes





Statewide TAC Meeting Minutes

Date: January 31, 2013
Time: 3:00 PM – 5:00 PM
Location: CDOT Headquarters, Auditorium
4201 East Arkansas Ave.
Attendees: See attached sign in sheet

Meeting Summary

The following summarizes the discussion that occurred at the kick off Statewide TAC meeting.

Introductions

John Valerio welcomed the group and asked them go around the room with self-introductions. A sign in sheet and handouts were passed around the room. The handout included an agenda, TAC syllabus, existing intercity bus maps, and meeting worksheet. There are two committees that will provide guidance throughout this project, the Statewide Technical Advisory Committee, and the I-70 Technical Advisory Group. An operator and station subcommittee will also be formed as part of the TAC and the TRAC Regional Commuter Bus Subcommittee will also provide input.

Roles and expectations of the TAC

Holly Buck reviewed with the group the meeting goal – the introduction the project, understand the role of the TAC and initiate discussion about issues that exist today with the system.

The TAC is expected to meet five times over a seven-month period. A draft TAC syllabus is included in the handout. The TAC will be asked to:

- Review the analysis, findings, and recommendations
- Be actively involved in developing the goals
- Assist with evaluating alternatives
- Participate in prioritizing services and strategies
- Act as liaison to community and local stakeholders

Project intent, scope, and schedule

Suzanne O'Neill provided background on the study. TransitPlus and KFH worked on the 2008 plan. This study will update that work. This study also has a separate focused effort to evaluate the I-70 corridor. The I-70 tasks will be completed parallel to the other work efforts. Two statewide meetings are planned and three newsletters to ensure that the public remains informed and has opportunity to participate in the process.

Existing conditions

Suzanne reviewed the definition of intercity bus and regional bus with the group. These are not mutually exclusive services but ICB typically operates between cities, connects to the national intercity bus network, and transports passengers' baggage. RB operates between communities, operates 20 to 60 miles and is typically schedule to service a specific market such as commuters.





Mike Timlin stated that there is another type of service, different from the legacy intercity bus: cur-to-curb service such as Mega Bus. It is traditional in that point-to-point service is operated, primarily serving routes that are no more than four to five hours in length. They have low fares, provide curbside drop-off and pick-up, reserved seating, and travel times competitive with the auto. These services sell fares on the internet and have no stations so their overhead is very low.

Fred Fravel provided a brief overview of the 2008 study findings and the existing conditions. The 2008 study identified two preferred networks the intercity bus network and the regional bus network. ICB service would have access to FTA 5311f funding but would be primarily supported by fares. The study found that there were more ICB services needed in rural areas. Regional bus services would be funded by local entities. The study found that more regional service was needed to support employment trips, reduce congestion, and build ridership for future fixed-guideway systems.

Since the 2008 study was completed a number of changes in the ICB and RB network have occurred. These include the initiation of FLEX, and cessation of FREX, among others.

John Valerio provided an overview of CDOT's evaluation of potential regional commuter bus service. The preliminary look at this potential service indicates that it would focus on peak period commuters, and connectivity between regions. Potential corridors include I-70 and I-25. The estimated annual investment is \$2.5 million and is to be funded entirely with FASTER statewide transit funds. CDOT is anticipating asking connecting transit agencies for in-kind contributions such as the use of stops, stations, overnight parking. RTD and Greyhound said that they would both be will to consider allowing CDOT to purchase vehicles under their existing contracts. RFTA would be willing to help with fueling (diesel, gas, CNG), maintenance, and storage of buses, if Glenwood Springs is an appropriate location for this activity.

Existing Statewide Issue Statements

The TAC was asked to break into small groups and identify issues that existing with the current ICB and RC system. These issues will be used to help the team more fully understand the problem and what recommendations need to accomplish, assist with goal setting, evaluate and prioritize alternatives.

Breaking into smaller groups, TAC members developed the follow list of issues:

- More service for short distance day time users for interregional trips
- Capacity limits at DUS
- Space concerns at Colorado Springs downtown station
- Access between intercity service and regional service Quality of service as a result of traffic
- Customer information does not include info on all modes.
- FREX has been eliminated – federal coverage for operations only lasted 3 years
- Need a link between Pueblo and Colorado Springs
- Need links regionally to games and events
- Need links to national parks
- Address air quality and pollution as a result of private auto congestion
- Gaps in service remain based on the needs identified in 2008





- No entity acts as coordinator between various systems and modes. CDOT should at least act as coordinator
- Facilities are out dated or missing completely
- City and County of Denver zoning does not allow street loading, cab pick up on street, etc.

In addition to these issues, the group also identified the following topics that they felt the study should address and a few questions the study should clarify. These were identified during the TAC meeting as well as based on comments received after the TAC meeting.

- Identify how facilities will be coordinated between CDOT and transit operators.
- Look at type of markets to be served
- What type of rider are we attracting? Can we attract choice riders?
- Identify the roles and responsibilities of CDOT and local public providers in the system
- Ensure adequate oversight
- Look at demand time points, departures to satisfy demand – lines on a map can be deceptive
- Where is the funding coming from, how much is it, and what’s left for existing systems
- Is the service intended to be more of a Human Service transportation program to get older persons and persons with disabilities back a forth between where they live to/from hospitals at some of the regional medical centers? Or does CDOT expect that commuters and tourists might benefit from it
- Is service meant to reduce congestion
- Might funds be better spent operating a robust Denver to Vail service on weekends during the winter in order to alleviate congestion?
- Provide a critical look at this service before going too far down the path towards implementation.
- Define what success look like. Provide service standards and describe what happens if the service can’t meet them.
- How much time and funding are needed to provide a fair demonstration of the service's capability?
- Will this be the best investment of these limited funds?
- Would a more limited and targeted service area be a better way of dipping CDOT's toe into the Intercity Bus service water?
- Identify opportunities for implementing service in segments of corridors where there would be an almost immediate demand, and then continue to identify those types of service areas and gradually expand services as demand grows.
- MCI makes a CNG OTR bus, which is what I think CDOT should consider.
- How will the system handle transfers to/from the regional systems?

Wrap-up

The group discussed potential meeting dates. The next meeting will be held March 14th at 1:30 PM. The 2008 study, and the meeting PowerPoint will be posted to the project web site. The team will be sending the existing conditions technical report in the next month.







Statewide TAC Meeting #2 Minutes

Date: March 14, 2013
Time: 1:30 PM – 4:00 PM
Location: CDOT Headquarters
4201 East Arkansas Ave.
Schumate Building
Attendees: See attached sign in sheet

Meeting Summary

The following summarizes the discussion that occurred at the second Statewide TAC meeting.

Introductions and Welcome

John Valerio welcomed the group and asked them go around the room with self introductions. A sign in sheet and the meeting PowerPoint were passed around. The meeting goal was to identify a clear purpose and need statement and identify initial goals for review at public meetings.

Recap and updates

John Valerio and Suzanne O'Neill provided the group an update on I-70 TAG activity. The I-70 TAG conducted their kick off meeting and meeting #2 since the TAC's meeting in January. They have defined three markets that need to be evaluated employee, human service and recreation. All need infrastructure. A couple of options have been identified; one is CDOT's proposed RCB service, the second would fill gaps between existing services without adding an entire new service over the top of the existing providers. Through the evaluation of the market it was determined that there was not enough demand between Rifle and Grand Junction to make this corridor a priority. In addition, Grand Junction to Glenwood was dropped as a result of low demand. CDOT is hearing demand regionally for shorter trips just outside the RTD district.

The group had a number of questions about the roles of the various committees and a suggestion was made to combine them into one group. If not, then the team needs to provide a clear definition of what each groups role is. The team will prepare a chart illustrating how each committee fits together, their unique role in the process and how each will contribute to the Statewide Transit Plan as well as the Statewide Transportation Plan.

Holly Buck provided a quick recap of the previous meeting's activity which included discussion on:

- Role of Statewide TAC and I-70 TAG.
- Relationship to the TRAC Subcommittee and CDOT's proposed RCB service
- Review of existing conditions and changes since 2008 study
- Problem that exist with the RCB and ICB today

John agreed to check on the status of the project web site. All tech memos, presentations and minutes will be uploaded to the web site and made available to the committees.





Draft Technical Reports

Suzanne and Fred Fravel provided an overview of each of the three technical reports distributed to the group earlier in the week. Comments on the tech reports should be directed to Holly Buck at Holly.Buck@fhueng.com by March 28th.

Technical Report #1 provides the policy context with descriptions of the 5311(f) program and significant state changes such as the creation of the Division of Transit and Rail, and the availability of FASTER funds. David Menter suggested that a discussion on the value of connecting the metro area has increased because of the large FasTracks investment.

Technical Report #2 summarized the existing conditions and the major changes in service. A correction to the existing conditions map was made – there is a gap in service just south of Durango.

Technical Report #3 summarizes the need for service. The report includes information on demographic and economic characteristics, activity centers and demand. Key findings include:

- Gilpin County has the highest percentage of employee transit ridership at 26%
- There is a need for medical trips between Gunnison and Montrose
- The new Sucap service is starting in Mar connecting Durango, Cortez, and Grand Junction.

TAC discussion suggested that the Gunnison Montrose service will be more successful if it connects to the SUCAP service.

It is difficult getting people who want to travel west from Gunnison and Montrose. Greyhound eastbound will connect to SUPCAP.

Today, people from Alamosa heading south go north to Salida and over to Pueblo and then south from Pueblo.

It would be helpful to add text about what is happening in other states to the existing conditions. Suzanne will add this text.

There appear to be a number of hospitals missing from the map. Fred will check to determine if there was a minimum size that was included.

Suzanne will set up a call with select set of the group after Jeff Becker has provide an initial report. Angela with DRMAC said that she would like to participate.

Suzette Mallette said that the NFR is in the process of completing a park and ride study. They will make this available for use by this study.





Project guidance

Holly reviewed with the committee the difference in various project guidance documents: Purpose and Need, Goals and Objectives, Performance Measures, and Service Standards. The group reviewed a set of draft problem statements that were developed based on the issues identified by the TAC at the kick off meeting in January. For each statement the group was asked to determine if the statement accurately represents a real, defensible problem and if the problem identified is correctable by recommendations in this study. The exercise resulted in the following problem statements which will be translated into goals:

Service Gaps

- Census-based household and employment travel demand indicates that there is strong commuter demand for travel in the numerous corridors with potential to be captured by transit, that currently have limited or no transit service.
- Resort, recreational, and sporting event destinations in Colorado have extremely high seasonal travel demand that is served only by private auto and limited private shuttle services limiting access to key economic generators.
- Limited or no access to medical or other services between communities and regional service centers.
- Limited or not access to regional travel hubs for personal travel.

Infrastructure

- Today, transit services traveling in congested corridors are slow and often not reliable.
- Many communities lack facilities or have substandard facilities for intermodal activity.
- Current regulations often do not accommodate on-street intercity bus and regional commuter bus activity.

Customer Information

- Today's transit information resources often do not provide information on all available services.

Services and Modes

- (this category was combined with Service Gaps, above)

Funding

- Current funding sources and amounts do not align well with current operating needs.

Wrap-up and next meeting

The next meeting will be held during the CASTA conference in Black Hawk at the Ameristar Resort in mid May. Details on day, location and time will be sent in the next couple of weeks.







Statewide TAC Meeting #3 Minutes

Date: May 16, 2013
Time: 1:15 PM – 3:00 PM
Location: Ameristar Resort, 111 Richman Street, Black Hawk, CO
Attendees: See attached sign in sheet

Meeting Summary

Introductions and Welcome

John Valerio welcomed the group and asked them go around the room with self introductions. A sign-in sheet was passed around. The meeting goal was to solicit input from group on ICB and regional potential service, funding, and partnership alternatives to address the identified need.

Recap and updates

John Valerio and Suzanne O'Neill provided a recap of activity since the last TAC meeting in March.

- Since the TAC met last, the team has initiated discussions with the operator and station agents. They were sent a letter and survey asking about unmet needs.
- The I-70 TAG met and the team heard that there is less interest in connecting to Denver than to other destinations along the I-70 corridor. Greyhound is adding service in the I-70 corridor.
- The TRAC Subcommittee continues to make progress on developing a regional commuter bus network. They have heard strong support for service along the south Front Range. On the north Front Range there has been a request for CDOT to fund existing FLEX service and to allow use of FASTER funds for operating expenses. CDOT will be considering this request in the next several weeks. CDOT was asked to keep in mind the impact of this on available capital funds.
- A few comments were received on the technical reports distributed at the March meeting. Many of the comments focused on CDOT's RCB effort rather than this study. It was noted that the maps should be labeled City of Castle Pines rather than Castle Pines North. There was also a correction on service south of Ignacio.

Goals, objectives, and policies

Prior to the meeting the group was sent a memo on goals, objectives, strategies, and performance measures dated May 7th. This memo used the problem statements and needs identified by the TAC in previous meetings to develop goals and objectives for the study and for statewide service.

Suzanne led a discussion focused on the objectives and described some of the strategies that could be used to achieve the objectives. There was discussion of the importance of infrastructure, the role of state and local entities in provision of service and infrastructure, and importance of stable financing. The financing of intercity services is a fairly straightforward





blend of private carrier and 5311(f) funding, while the financing and development of regional services is a more complex of private, local public funding, and human service program funds. The group was asked to review the memo and provide input before the next TAC meeting. Comments can be sent to Holly.Buck@fhueng.com

Service Network – Discuss draft plans

Fred Fravel reviewed some of the key figures provided in Tech Memo #4 which describes the potential network of services. Figure 4-3 illustrates potential stop locations overlaid on the existing network with population density in the background. The population density is used to identify the relative need for transit service. Figure 4-4 illustrates the same information but focuses on the Front Range.

Suzanne review the terminology used for the classification of existing services. Rural corridors connect rural communities to the nearest regional city and the intercity bus network. Emerging corridors are located in urbanized areas with growing transit demand. High capacity corridors serve many established and urbanized areas with a high transit dependent population. They typically have at least eight round trips a day throughout the week.

Comments from the TAC and meeting participants on intercity service included a note that Ramblin' Express stops at Woodland Park. Suzanne reviewed existing and potential regional service with the group. The process evaluated existing routes and level of service based on the number of one-way trips. A proposed number of trips was presented for each of the potential regional corridors along with an estimated number of miles, riders and cost. Participants were asked to provide input on the proposed levels of service prior to the next meeting.

The following observations were made regarding regional services:

- Casino shuttles are not shown
- Ramblin' Express goes to Cripple Creek
- Sky Ute casino service
- Can't connect from the casino routes to the intercity bus routes
- On regional service there would stops between end points
- Regional service is needed between Castle Rock and Denver
- The Carbon Valley communities could be another segment.

Input on public outreach

The group was asked to provide input on how best to conduct outreach and solicit input from the public for this study. It was suggested that a webinar might be a good mechanism and that newsletters are not as effective. The team will look into webinar style meetings.

Next meeting: July 18th was suggested as a tentative date (but this did not come about).





TAC Meeting #3
Sign-in Sheet
May 16, 2013

Name	Organization	Phone & Email
Amy Ciezadlo	Yellow Cab / Veolia	720.306.3542 amy.ciezadlo@veolia-transdev.com OR amy@coloradocab.com
Larry Kendenholz	Veolia - RTD	LKendenholz@veolia-transdev.com
Ryan Hatt	VEOLIA - RTD	Ryan.Hatt@VEOLIATRANSDEV.COM
David Johnson	RFTA	djohnson@rfta.com
John Valerio	CDOT	303-757-9769 John.Valerio@dot.state.co.us
Suzette Malotte	NFRMPO	
Stephanie Conterman	ISACCS	
Robert Ryerson	RTD	
Fred Frawel	KFH Group	
Bob Hoxie	Burlington Trailways	

Via
Phone





TAC Meeting #3

Sign-in Sheet

May 16, 2013

Name	Organization	Phone and Email
Margaret Rendon	First Ride	720-540-4553 Margaret.RENDON@firstgroup.com
SUSAN JUEGENSMAYER	NWCCOA	mobiltymanager@nwccog.org
Mutha Helfant	Douglas County	m.helfant@douglas.co.us
Angela Schreffler	DRMAC	303-861-3711 x100 executive director drmac-co.org
Tom Manser	CDOT	703-757-9768 TOM.MANSER@state.co.us
MILK RUDGE	FIRST TRANSIT	470-726-4163 MILK.RUDGE@FIRSTGROUP
Will Jones	GET	970-350-9751 will.jones@greeleygo.com
DAVID MENTER	City of Colo Spgs - Transit Mountain Metro	dmenter@springsgov.com 720-840-5995
SCOTT TRUEX	Gunnison RTA	STRUEX@GUNNISONVALLEYRTA.ORG 970-275-0111
CRAYTON RICHTER	ROAD RUNNER SUCAR	970-563-4545 CRICHTER@SUCAR.ORG
Peter Triggillus	SUCAP Road Runner	p.triggillus@sucap.org 970-403-0614

* Add to mailing list

Maribeth Lewis-Baker Town of Breckenridge Free Ride maribethL@Townofbreckenridge.com
970-547-3141



Statewide TAC Meeting #4 Minutes

Date: January 8, 2014
Time: 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM
Location: CDOT Headquarters, Shumate Building
Attendees: See attached sign in sheets

Meeting Summary

Purpose

The meeting purpose was to present the recommended network plan and solicit input.

Recap

Suzanne O'Neill and provided a recap of study activity since the TAC met last (May, 2013)

- CDOT has finalized plans for the inter-regional express service, with the Transportation Commission making a final decision January 15th.
- Public input on the services was solicited through the public meetings for the Regional Transit Plans, held in rural Transportation Planning Regions throughout the State. Key messages are that regional services are very much desired and there is significant interest in using FASTER funds for operation of these services.
- CDOT staff made presentations at both Transportation Planning Commission meetings and MPO meetings in the proposed IX Bus corridors. The Transportation Commission has held two work sessions on IX Bus services.
- A Draft I-70 Corridor Plan appendix has been developed, and the TAG will meet to review it soon.

There are three appendices that have been posted for review, with a link distributed to the TAC to access and review the files.

Suzanne and Fred presented information recapping the study, describing the recommended network, and covering the policies, service standards, and financial needs. The minutes present this information by topic.

Recommended Network

Fred Fravel began with a recap of the basic definitions of services, a description of existing services, and an explanation of the process of analyzing need and evaluating potential ICB routes. Suzanne described how regional services were defined (interregional express, regional, and essential service routes) and how the routes were identified, reviewing each of the service types. The network plan is spread between the near-term (2014-2020), mid-term (2021-20228) and long-term (2029-2040). Most services are developed in the near and mid-term, with only the expansion of the I-70 corridor services occurring in the long-term. She noted that the service levels for regional routes are generally capped at 16 one-way trips a day, although the high levels of service operated by RFTA and ECO Transit are reflected in the cost of existing services. It is also recognized that higher levels of service will be required in the I-70 corridor





and likely in the I-25 corridor as well. Capping of proposed services was included to identify costs for a base service level.

Comments on the proposed network included:

- Parker, one of the cities without ICB service, does have RTD access to Denver area.
- Consider adding a connection from Cortez to Dove Creek, CO and Monticello, UT
- The importance of the essential services and rural regional services was noted.

Goals and Policies

Suzanne summarized the four main policy areas, and identified policy issues. This included use of FASTER funds and consideration of funding only a limited number of trips in each corridor, the lack of viable operators in some areas, and CDOT's possible role in developing services in certain corridors.

A key policy recommendation is establishing performance measures for each class of service, and monitoring services to assure they meet standards, modifying them if needed, and eliminating subsidies if modifications are not sufficient to enable the service to meet standards. The TAC was supportive of instituting this policy and of having performance standards for all state-funded services.

Other policy recommendations include:

- Supporting mechanisms for rural services to serve passengers en-route to regional destinations;
- Build level of human service program funding for essential transit service routes
- Using FASTER funds for interregional express routes
- Using State and Federal capital funds for infrastructure development

Financing

The financial requirements of the recommended plan were reviewed, and it was noted that a new source of funding will be needed for the development of the plan. Near-term improvements would require \$12.4 million annually over existing revenue sources.

Other Discussion

- The importance of marketing the whole network, using current IT tools.
- How regional routes are cross-subsidized in California; extensions can be treated as net contributions.
- If it is feasible to collect data on passenger miles. It was noted that Colorado has a little-known "unincorporated area passenger mile tax" that requires this, although many systems do not know about it.

Next meeting: A draft final report will be sent out in February, and the TAC will have two weeks to review prior to a final meeting.





ICB and Regional Bus Network Plan

January 8, 2014 Meeting

Name	Organization	E-mail	Telephone
Margaret Bowes	I-70 Coalition		
Nate	NFRMPO		
Janice Johnson			
Adam Krom	Amtrak		
Kelley Collier	ECC		
Clayton Richter	SUCAP		
David Johnson	RFTA		
Fred Fravel	KFIT		
Jim Andrew	Summit Stage		
Connie Cole	Neighbor Network- Chaffee		
Jeff Dunning	RTD		



ICB and Regional Bus Network Plan

January 8, 2014 Meeting

Name	Organization	E-mail	Telephone
MIKE TIMLIN	CDOT DTR	Michael.TimLin@State.CO.US	303-757-9648
Ann Bayewski	CASTA	Ann.r@ColoradoTransit.com	303-839-5197
ROB ANDRESEN	CDOT DTR	---	---
MARK IMHOFF	CDOT DTR	MARK.IMHOFF@STATE.CO.US	303 757 9007
Tracy Mahmud	CDOT DTR		(3)757-9753
Lisa Streisfeld	CDOT-RA	lisa.streisfeld@state.co.us	719-227-8248
R.W. Ryerson	RTD-SP&S	robert.ryerson@rt-denver.com	303.299.2480
DRAIG BUENITT	MOUNTAIN METRO-C.SP&S	cbuenitt@springsgov.com	719-385-5428
TOM MAUSER	CDOT DTR	Tom.Mauser@state.co.us	3/757-9768



Statewide TAC Meeting #5 Minutes

Date: March 14, 2014
Time: 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM
Location: CDOT Shumate Building
Pikes Peak Conference Room

Attendees: Telephone Access: Peter Tregillus and Clayton Richter (SUCAP); Margaret Bowes (I-70 Corridor Coalition); Adam Kron (Amtrak); Connie Cole, (Chaffee Shuttle); Jim Andrews (Summit Stage); Brad Chatterton (Greyhound); and Fred Fravel (KFH). At meeting: Michael Timlin, John Valerio, Tom Mauser, and Tracey McDonald (CDOT); Robert Rynerson (RTD); Elena Wilken (CASTA); Matthew Helfant (DRCOG); Craig Blewitt (Mountain Metropolitan Transit); and Suzanne O’Neill (TransitPlus).

Meeting Overview

Suzanne O’Neill presented a recap of the report with an emphasis on service and other recommendations, the I-70 Corridor Analysis, and the Interregional Express (IX) Bus Plan. The meeting also covered edits to the document, priorities for network development, and approaches to network development

I-70 Corridor Analysis

Key issues in the I-70 Corridor are how to begin to develop a transit option and leverage the existing investments in transit in the corridor? Additionally, supporting the private sector investment in the corridor is important.

- The “mid-range” plan, for the purposes of the Intercity and Regional Bus Network Plan, one that is programmed for the out-years of the plan; what is referred to as the long-range plan in other planning activities is the Alternative Guideway System.
- The complete corridor plan is divided into segments so services can be adjusted based on demand levels. The projected levels of service range from 30 to 120-minute frequencies, and two levels of service are identified, a regular level of service for lower traffic days (262 days) and an extended level of service for busy traffic days (103 days).
- The net cost of the system is estimated at \$6.3 million annually for service operation (including vehicles). This covers operation of 2.3 million miles of service and includes services already operated by Eagle County Transit and Roaring Fort Transportation Authority.
- Recommendations cover infrastructure (including those facilities that CDOT is constructing that support managed lanes, park-and-rides (especially in the Metro area where it is estimated 1,250 spaces would be needed), unified customer information for I-70 services and local connecting services; and a range of policy issues.
- The I-70 Corridor Analysis represents high-level planning, with a need for more detailed service level work when the development of services is more imminent. A park-and-ride study is also recommended.





Interregional Express Bus

Suzanne O’Neill provided a similar summary of the Interregional Express Bus appendix, noting that this is an implementation plan rather than a long-range plan. Services will begin in late 2014 or early 2015. The purposes of the IX bus are to provide inter-regional peak-hour commuter services and connections between existing transit systems. Ancillary activities are important for success:

- Comprehensive customer information
- Ticket sharing agreements
- Service standards
- Statewide vanpool options

The budget and schedule were reviewed, and someone noted that more than \$1,000 would be needed for fare media. The project is funded with up to \$3 million in the annual FASTER allocation to the State.

Adam Kron shared information on the mobile application that was built first in the UK, and then for MBTA, and identified how quickly such an application can be developed.

Intercity and Regional Bus Network Plan

The service recommendations were reviewed for intercity, regular regional, and essential regional services. Changes already identified, such as strengthening the Amtrak Thruway description, were noted. Fred Fravel noted that all Thruway service is interlined with Greyhound and that MAP-21 removed the 50% limitation of in-kind mileage value. If FTA picks up the 100% level allowed in MAP-21, there will be more in-kind match available in Colorado. Adam Kron noted that while the *Network Plan* is focused on intra-state connections, but Amtrak’s focus is on national connections.

Requests were made to put Raton, NM on the map for Amtrak Thruway service and to change references from I-40 to US 40.

Other activities noted as important in the plan are:

- Trail blazer signage
- Customer information and marketing (to improve productivity)
- Facility development in key locations

Specific considerations and approaches to developing each type of service were discussed.

Financing

The financial requirements of the *Network Plan* were identified, with a \$12 m annual shortfall for those services designated as appropriate for near-term development, \$18 m for mid-term development, and \$24 m for long-term development. As limited services are included in the ICB category, using 15% of the projected FTA Section 5311 funds will largely meet these needs. The greatest needs are for services identified as regular regional services. The fairly limited “essential” regional services have a price tag of about \$1.25 m annually. These are of high value and are probably the most likely to be able to be funded through use of largely existing revenue sources. If there is another effort for a statewide ballot initiative for transportation, the *Network Plan* provides a foundation of services that are in need of funding. A participant noted that SB 228 has the potential of providing some additional funding for transit in the 5-year timeframe. (The Transportation Commission would need to designate services as 7th Pot projects, for strategic corridors, to be eligible for funding.) It was also noted that local use of HUTF funds for transit is allowed.





Recommendations and Approach

The near-term and other recommendations were discussed, along with approaches to developing services. Only limited expansion to coverage is recommended until new funding is available. With limited funding, the importance of developing priorities was noted.

Peter Tregillus said he believes that local support is critical. In his meetings with Southwest Colorado stakeholders, he has had a great deal of interest from many parties, including Tribes.

It was noted that something is needed to get to the next level, understanding that it likely will not be possible to make major improvements until people begin to see the potential and the value of growing services. The IX bus in the I-70 corridor provides a small first step; success with this and a good deal of service development work will be needed to continue growth of services in the I-70 corridor.

Two approaches that were identified were to (1) do pilot projects in corridors with good potential (examples are in South Central / Southeast Colorado and Northeast Colorado) and (2) send out a specific call for projects for such a corridor in order to solicit projects to develop services in a priority area. Tom Mauser said he preferred to leave those decisions to local entities and not to put out a specific call for projects.

Wrap-up

The participants were thanked for their time serving on the TAC and their comments throughout the project. Final comments were requested in two weeks. The final report will be available on the CDOT website once it is completed in the next few weeks.

