



Transportation Sector Working Group  
Meeting #5  
January 11, 2023  
9-10:30 a.m.  
Brinkman Conference Room, Integrated Community

### MEETING SUMMARY

1. Call to order and roll call
  - a. Present
    - i. Diane Mitsch Bush (Chair)
    - ii. Sarah Jones (Co-chair)
    - iii. John Spezia
    - iv. Mike Beyer
    - v. Mike Mordi
    - vi. Tom Erps
    - vii. Jonathan Flint
    - viii. Matthew Rochon
    - ix. Kevin Booth
    - x. Winnie DelliQuadri
    - xi. Paul Bony (YVSC technical assistant)
  - b. Not present
    - i. Ralph Eppard Jr.
2. CAP Transportation Working Group (WG) Meeting Summaries
  - a. Process: Meeting summaries to be shared with Working Group for edits/comments before posting to CAP Board agenda. After CAP Board meeting, meeting summaries will be posted on the CAP website.
3. Update from the Board meeting
  - a. Steve Johnson, President of the Yampa Valley Electric Association (YVEA), reappointed to the CAP Board for a 3-year term upon approval from all governing bodies of the CAP IGA.
  - b. CAP Waste and Energy Working Groups weighing in on CAP-related policies: Pay as you Throw (PAYT) and Construction & Demolition (C&D) of City Hall (Waste); letter to City staff regarding future energy decisions at new City Hall and Fire Station Complex and Board request to the CAP Energy group to weigh in on YVEA net metering changes (Energy)
4. Discussion on criteria for ranking recommendations - What are the key criteria?

- a. Sarah J. shared a tiered criteria spreadsheet: threshold (go/no go), primary balancing criteria (refine design to meet these) and modifying criteria (bonus)
- b. Need to be clear what's a tactic and what's an action.
  - i. Action - develop sustainable transit funding
- c. If an action needs to be voted on, it needs to include community sentiment.
- d. What is measurable? Assessable, quantifiable and calculable. Need to be able to count it everytime, but measurement could be costly. Maybe better to focus more on modeling.
  - i. How to quantify the expansion of bike usage (still need to come up with a system to do that)?
- e. How do we rank infrastructure improvements?
  - i. For ranking projects, need to be generic - results in greenhouse gas reduction
- f. Funding considerations: Need community support (50% of vote) for big upfront costs and continued source of income for proposed projects
- g. Feasibility: Is technology available?
- h. More than one primary balancing criteria - include things that have greater impact, but long-term costs, difficulty finding funding
  - i. Implementability - education more implementable than an actual project, who or what group can implement?
- i. GHG reduction could be low or high, feasibility could be low and high
- j. Do we get more results on people on e-bikes on Core trail or people riding buses? More bang for buck or bang for action? We know where the most CO2 emissions are.
  - i. You would need to model that out
- k. Summary of key points:
  - i. Threshold - feasibility (low to high) and results in GHG reduction (carbon impact)
  - ii. Primary balancing criteria
    - 1. First costs
    - 2. Long-term operation and maintenance (O&M costs) - how much does it cost and can we foot it to carbon reduction?
    - 3. Meets state/federal climate goals (Is it part of the state roadmap for implementation?)
    - 4. Ease of implementation (low to high - who would do this? What agency, group, business is responsible for doing it? Can it be done?)
    - 5. Likelihood of success - low to high
    - 6. Return on investment for carbon reduction
      - a. ROI is factoring costs and reduction, should separate carbon reduction from costs - does it reduce carbon (lots, little, medium)?
    - 7. Supports CAP identified strategy
    - 8. Timeframe of implementation may be critical to implementation (core expansion critical to e-bike usage)
    - 9. Critical sequencing - evaluating sequencing for success of overall strategy (something lowly ranked might be a critical node), project management, may require certain legislation to happen first
  - iii. Modifying criteria
    - 1. Community support/acceptance - low to high
    - 2. Opportunities for funding

3. Co-benefits - climate adaptability, equity, drought tolerance, electric grid security
5. Refine “Big Wins” via the CAP Transportation Working Group “Big Win” Tracker
  - a. Homework - work on well-defined, specific “Big Wins” and associated actions/initiatives
6. Next meeting and proposed agenda:
  - a. Wednesday, February 8 - 9:00-10:30 a.m. - Virtual option only to be considered