



## Gunnison Valley Transportation Planning Region Meeting

August 10, 2023

In Person at Region 10 Office

145 S Cascade Ave, Montrose CO 81401

or Via Zoom Video Conference

1. **CALL TO ORDER and INTRODUCTIONS** – Meeting was called to order at: 10:06am
  - a. Michelle Haynes (Region 10), Vince Rogalski (GVTPR & STAC), Courtney Tribble (Region 10), Collen Hannon (Alternate TPR appointed by Gunnison County), Michael Snow (CDOT Division of Transportation), Kevin Curry (CDOT Region 5 Program Engineer), Kris Holstrom (San Miguel County), Robert Hurd (Hinsdale County), Cody Tusing (City of Gunnison Engineer), Josh Smith (Ouray Mayor Pro Tem), Tony Cady (CDOT Region 5 Planning & Environmental Manager), Rob Johnson, David Hood (City of Delta), Angie Hainer (CDOT Region 3 Transit Project Manager), Michael Bacani (Mount Crested Butte), Kevin Collins (), David Averill (SMART), Mike Bordogna (San Miguel County), Martin Schmidt (Gunnison County Public works), Jason Smith (CDOT Region 3), Dave Cesark (CDOT Region 3 Planning & Environmental Manager), TJ Burr, Alyssa Lewin (APT Transit & Mobility Manager), Jessie Spencer (CDOT Region 3), Mark Rogers (CDOT Region 3 Planning Manager), Nathan Jean (CDOT Region 3 Montrose Resident Engineer), Preston Neill (Town of Ridgway), Leia Morrison (Gunnison Valley RTA), Melissa Lewis (CDOT), Herman Stockinger (CDOT Transportation Commission Secretary) entered the meeting at 10:31am.
2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES for May 11, 2023, GVTPR Meeting**

**Motion to approve minutes as with corrections: M/S: Kris Holstrom/Robert Hurd.** None opposed.  
Corrections: Page 2, blank under item 5, DTD, last page item 8, Ohio Avenue not High Avenue.
3. **Funds Expiring: MMOF Federal Funds**
  - a. ARPA Funds that the state got from COVID must be encumbered by December 31, 2024 and expended by December 31, 2026. There is not a process to get those extended at this point in time and so the state is taking the expiration dates of the funding seriously.
  - b. On the spreadsheet in the packet, the projects not highlighted in grey do not yet have their awarded funds encumbered.
    - i. For the Gunnison Valley TPR, we are looking at the funds for Delta County and the risk for losing those funds, \$1.4 million if they are not incumbered. We are working with them and that should go out to ad this fall, so there may not be an issue going forward. It is the job of the local agency to maintain the schedule.
    - ii. The local agency is for example, Delta County, City of Gunnison and so it is on them to stay on schedule.
      1. If the funds were to expire, they just go away, back to the federal government.
      2. Local agencies need to be moving their projects forward on their own.
  - c. Everything has a time limit with the funding especially with the Federal Funding \$ from ARPA.
  - d. Region 5 funding does not have any concerns about encumbering/expending the funding on their projects.
  - e. Questions/Comments:
    - i. For the Delta project are there any potential risks? What may cause a delay for the project? To clarify, when the project goes out to ad before we can incumber the funds we have to clear it for ad. Which means that we have to have the ROW and access.
4. **Other Funding Opportunities:**
  - a. Region 10 has been sending out notices of funding through IJJA and you can reach out to Trish (trish@region10.net) or Colleen (channon@region10.net) in our office to get more information.
  - b. Grants and Grub is a meeting Region 10 is hosting where we have different agencies for funding opportunities and how to access them.
    - i. Colleen: Quick 1 hr. convo a month for member jurisdictions, agencies and special districts.
    - ii. August 31, 12-1Pm Hotchkiss Fire Department Doug Fritz and they will be talking about FEMA Funding. September, October and November we will be looking at "how to address

Justice 40”, “Benefit Cost analysis for USDOT and CDOT”, “how to craft language to address labor force impacts”.

- c. It was mentioned to be cautious of all the grants; it has become a business to obtain them and so just know who you are working with and if what they are putting in your grant applications are in line with your project needs, capacity and ability to manage the grant.
  - i. Michelle: The larger communities tend to have the capacity to manage the funds, so we are working to help the smaller communities access the funds and manage them well.

## 5. Regional Construction Updates

### a. Region 3 Construction Updates | Nathan Jean

- i. Little Blue: Most common question is, will it be finished this fall?
  - 1. Contractor is bringing on Subtractor to help with Wall 3. That needs to be completed so they can backfill and pave before winter. The hope is that bringing on the contractor will help to speed them along to finish by November. With current production it would not get done and they do have a plan in place to hope to finish it.
  - 2. Plan is to get as much paving done while it is warm. And they are paving sections up to the wall in the case that they leave that small section for paving.
- ii. Passing Lanes, 70% done, hope to start paving Aug 21/28. Projecting to be done about a week early, earthwork is going well. The traffic impacts are not as great on that.
- iii. SH 114, first 8 miles in R3 and then the rest in R5. Projecting on schedule finish early October. Will have some shoulders in that area where they are available.
- iv. US 550: Box culvert expansion where the passing lane will be and they are pouring this week. Earthwork has been slower than normal, and they are behind on that. They are going to present us with a plan to get back on schedule. Want to start paving later this month. There is a concern with Traffic delays.
- v. SH 133 Culvert Failure: Bridge is in and we executed a change order with Wadsworth to install the permanent solution and work on that started today. There may be some minor one-way flagging. Completion date of November 17 and they think that they will finish earlier.
- vi. Chips Seal on Hwy 92, that project is finished on road.
- vii. SH 133 we are mitigating Rocks with some soil nail installation with a mid-Nov Completion date.
- viii. SH 92 Rogers Mesa: Add with the project on 9/21. That will be a reconstruction from MP 15 to 17.21. There are a lot of culvert installations and there will be impacts to irrigation ditches. That should start mid-December, with irrigation impacts first to minimize impacts. 230 days of work.
- ix. Resurfacing on US 50 ad date 10/19, construction mid May- Sept. Paving will be happening and going through the town of Olathe main street.
- x. Questions:
  - 1. Vince: The area on Hwy 50 where it continues to fall is there anything planned for that? There are no future plans for it, or money slated for that project. The cost to make the large improvement is substantial and so we are just looking at the maintenance fixes for now.
  - 2. Colleen: Read about Bustang getting ready to go through in November, does that seem in concert with the information in here. Will they still be starting in the Fall? No, the transit division will not put Bustang on it until the project is finished. The major roadway should be completed this year and so CDOT will be working with Bustang on the coordination to get that route up and running.

### b. Region 5 Construction Updates | Kevin Curry

- i. Completed 2 season 550 Ouray to Colona, it finished in June
- ii. Red Mountain Pass: The Ruby Walls near the summit on blue point, installing fixed avalanche controls to take care of there. They got a late start but expected to be done in September.

- iii. Billy Creek: large animal underpass with associated deer fencing and a small passing lane, ad in September for work in fall and spring
- iv. 145: Crib wall repair, cost kept going up and had to shelve a couple of other projects
- v. Chain Stations: advertised once already and bids came in too high and so we repackaged it.

#### 6. TPR Study | Herman Stockinger:

- a. Guessing that most folks are familiar with the TPR Study
- b. The Advisory Committee is intended to:
- c. IGAs we talked about the importance of them, it is important that they follow the open meeting process of “public bodies”. A lot of the work that we have done up to this point is looking at IGAs, bylaws and websites.
- d. For the GVTPR, you are one of the TPR’s that have a good set of IGAs and bylaws and the website, there are some small improvements to make there. CDOT needs to be better at indicating what are the “best practices”.
- e. Region observations:
  - i. The left is the TRP Regions, and the right is the CO Planning Regions. We are comparing how the boundaries match up. The COGs match the boundaries for the most part and some of them also provide the administration. 6 of the 15 TPRs match the COG boundaries and the COG provides the administration.
  - ii. Specific to the Gunnison Valley, it is a TPR that is in 2 different CDOT regions. None of the data or mapping suggests that we need to split the TPR in half.
  - iii. When we look at the boundaries we look at:
    - 1. Commute patterns: The western counties of the Intermountain are headed to Grand Junction the Eastern go to Denver and then there is a lot of travel through.
    - 2. Vehicle Crashes:
    - 3. The Grand Valley MPO, it does make sense to keep that single county.
    - 4. The West Area, because the GVTPR is in two regions it is good to note that in the SW TPR there are tribal nations and they do have a vote on the STAC.
    - 5. Chaffee County: There are some conversations happening surrounding it.
      - a. The Chaffee County Shuttle does leave Chaffee County and it does go through the San Luis Valley.
    - 6. La Plata and Montrose County:
      - a. They keep getting called up because of their populations.
      - b. VMT & Truck VMT, those counties do have more VMT than any of the other counties in their region.
      - c. They have a higher degree of commuters into the counties from outside of the counties in their Region.
      - d. They also have a higher rate of vehicle crashes which is to be expected.
- f. Next Steps;
  - i. All 5 of the CDOT Region public meetings are completed. Survey is out until Aug 31 and went out to 5,000. Went to TPR members and elected officials. You can watch the public meetings.
  - ii. And starting in September we will start to make some recommendations.
  - iii. What we see on paper may reveal recommendations but we want to talk through all those items with people who know the regions.
- g. Questions/Comments:
  - i. David Averill: This is the second time I have seen this presentation, and I think the focus needs to be on the TPR boundaries. As a member of the Transit & Rail Advisory Committee (TRAC) and as part of this process you all are looking at that the TRAC and so I am wondering if you could shine a light on that? The legislation that went through required that a member of a transit agency be a voting member of the each TPR and so then we started looking at the interface from TRAC to STAC and vice versa. We are wondering if there should be more transit representation on STAC that comes from TRAC and so that is what we are hoping to gain. We are looking to present at the next TRAC meeting in September.

- ii. Cody Tusing: Does it look at potential changes to how the funding is allocated for each TPRs and is there criteria being developed to determine that? It depends on the type of funding. One is the small amount of money for TRPs administrative support and we are looking at that funding as we see that as an underutilized fund as we have been doing lots of virtual meetings. Do we need to look at what else that money can be utilized for, ie websites, etc. Potential funding changes with the TPRs, at the beginning of the process we were saying that we were just looking at boundaries and that the study was not related to funding. Now that we have been in the process of the study we are seeing that there potentially could be changes to MMOF and RPP funding. The other sources of funding that go to the CDOT regions and prioritizing projects are not potentially impacted. The formula for the MMOF could change the dollar amount that goes to each TPR. The bigger question is the RPP and we have had multiple conversations about what could be impacted. IF the TPRs change in the Region, headquarters is not involved in what the distribution is within the region and so you would work that out in each Region. The Region can work with the TPRs and determine whether there is a change in the formula that is necessary. It is true that if there are changes in the boundaries it could potentially impact how much money is spent in each TPR.
    - 1. Colleen: For full transparency include a slide that talks about this. We are evaluating the admin \$ and that it could affect MMOF and RPP.
  - h. Vince: Region 3 Chairs have considered putting a letter that states that we are in opposition of modifying the TPR and MPO boundaries that are in CDOT Region3, and I need to know if it is feasible for Vince to sign it. An example of the letter is:
    - i. "The current configuration of the TPR boundaries in Region 3 work for the participating agencies. Similar transportation challenges for each TPR make them able to relate, correlate and determine transportation priorities and help each other solve infrastructure or transit service problems. Over the years these relationships have grown and through respect and understanding of the TPR participating agencies needs and a synergy and supportive team has been formed, even when competing needs exist."
      - 1. What we are saying is that we do not want our boundaries changed because we all work together nicely now in Region 3.
      - 2. There is a suggestion that each TPR or MPO put together an individual letter themselves for the opposition to modifying the boundary.
    - ii. Do you have your documents together and are you operating as you should be. Do you have your IGAs, do you have your bylaws, do you notify the public, do you invite the public, are you operating the meetings as you should be.
      - 1. Should we oppose the boundaries of the 1101 or not do anything.
      - 2. From my perspective, Region 3 & 5 and myself have worked very well together.
      - 3. Does the committee want you to sign the Region 3 letter with the other TPRs?
      - 4. Does the committee want you to submit an individual letter in support of keeping the current boundaries.
    - iii. Colleen: I would like to see the results of the study first and then have our TPR consider our position on signing the letters.
    - iv. Kris: We could make a letter and state that we appreciate the process and we will likely have some comments and we will make those once the process is complete.
    - v. Vince: For now I will sign the group letter for Region 3 and hold on an individual letter from out TPR.
7. **Next Meeting:** November 9<sup>th</sup>, 2023 10am-12noon. SLV TPR is that day as well. Northwest is choosing a different month than we are. We will plan on Hybrid.

Meeting adjourned at 11:40 am