

**EXECUTIVE TRANSPORTATION AND ENVIRONMENT COUNCIL  
MEETING SUMMARY**

Monday, April 2, 2007

Environmental Protection Agency  
Region 8 Offices, Sagebrush Room  
1959 Wynkoop Street  
Denver, Colorado

**PRESENT:** Jason Gipson, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
Larry Svoboda, Environmental Protection Agency  
Susan Martin, Federal Transit Administration  
Larry Crist, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service  
Butch Waidelich, Federal Highway Administration  
Greg Punske, Federal Highway Administration  
Wilson Martin, Utah State Historic Preservation Office  
Dianne Nielson, Utah Department of Environmental Quality  
John Njord, Utah Department of Transportation  
Carlos Braceras, Utah Department of Transportation  
Jim McMinimee, Utah Department of Transportation  
Shane Marshall, Utah Department of Transportation  
Diane Josie, Utah Department of Transportation

**I. CHAIR AND HOST WELCOME**

John Njord and Robbie Roberts, EPA Region Director, welcomed everyone to the meeting at 11:15 a.m. Self-introductions were conducted. Robbie spoke about EPA's new building, which uses 50% less water and 40% less energy. The atrium is nine stories high with sails that catch light and direct it downward. Metal grids are outside and under the windows to bounce light into the windows. Materials that were in the building formerly in this site were recycled. The vehicles used during the construction of the building used bio-fuels.

**II. HOST PRESENTATION**

Larry Svoboda took the group on a tour of the building and pointed out many of the items that Robbie had mentioned during the introduction. He pointed out the various materials and components of the building.

**III. SAFETEA-LU COORDINATION PLAN**

Greg Punske from FHWA distributed a handout and discussed the SAFETEA-LU Coordination Plan. He discussed the requirements for the 6002 Process including designating joint leads on federal aid projects, setting up a new class of participation with the EIS, coordination of plans, and public input.

Greg discussed which agencies are designated as joint leads and their roles and responsibilities. FHWA and the recipient of the funds must be joint leads. FHWA is the federal joint lead. In most cases, UDOT would be the other agency participating as a joint lead. Local sponsors could be invited to be a joint lead under certain conditions with the approval of both FHWA and UDOT.

Greg talked about the roles and responsibilities of the participating agencies. He said the process is set up to go beyond the cooperating agencies to the local governments and other state agencies to identify issues and provide comments early in the process. Larry Crist asked about the difference between a cooperating agency and a participating agency. Greg said that a cooperating agency is one that has jurisdiction or special expertise. A participating agency is one that is participating but doesn't have jurisdiction.

The coordination plan was discussed. UDOT and FHWA feel the Project Schedule is an important part of the coordination plan in the NEPA process. Greg mentioned that the lead agency is responsible for the preparation of the coordination plan. He said that UDOT and FHWA need the assistance of the resource agencies to develop a comprehensive list of participating agencies and staff. Carlos asked if the schedule is for the projects that are just starting or all projects. Greg said that every project should have a schedule now. He said that all coordination plans would incorporate the schedule.

Greg distributed a copy of a coordination plan that Shane Marshall drafted. Carlos asked if every project would have a project specific Coordination Plan developed from a Programmatic Coordination Plan. Several members liked the idea of a master schedule to be able to see the bigger picture.

**ACTION ITEM:** Greg asked all agencies to contact Shane regarding who the designated agency contact will be for this process.

**ACTION ITEM:** Shane and Greg will work with the identified agency contact to develop a programmatic coordination plan.

**ACTION ITEM:** Shane will develop a master schedule to be able to see the bigger picture.

The issue of UDOT assisting other federal agencies with SAFETEA-LU compliance was discussed. John mentioned that he believed other federal agencies would need assistance with SAFETEA-LU. Carlos said that UDOT has helped the Army Corp of Engineers in the past. He said it was difficult to justify funding for a position in the past, but possibly the issue needs to be reviewed.

#### **IV. Utah Legislative Update**

Carlos discussed the legislation that passed during the Utah 2007 General Session. He said that HB301 authorizes UDOT to enter into agreements with FHWA to approve categorical exclusions passed. HB 108 4<sup>th</sup> sub allocated \$3.5 million to UDOT for urban planning functions, \$1.5 million for an east/west mobility study in Salt Lake County and \$2 million to plan for counties in the second class which include Davis, Weber, Utah and Washington Counties. Also, a litigation fund of \$5 million was created. If the Department is sued over Mountain View Corridor, the money will be used to defend the suit. If a suit is not filed, the money will be used to purchase open space.

Carlos distributed the UDOT Transportation Funding FY08 chart. The chart illustrates UDOT's funding categories and the funding received for the categories including Federal Aid, On-Going Federal Fund, State Transportation Funds and One-Time General Fund. This chart explains how UDOT uses the monies received.

Carlos mentioned there are a lot of projects coming in, most of which are not through the regular process. The projects will be funded and UDOT will need to figure out how to get the work started. John said the legislature expects that with the money given to UDOT this year, the work on the roads will be finished by next year.

Larry asked about how this comes into account for new projects for air quality conformity. Dianne Neilson said that DEQ has received one-time funding for \$500, 000 to purchase air monitors to try to identify sources of violations. She said one problem is getting the protocols from EPA and remodeling them to use information when it's been collected.

#### **V. OTHER AGENDA ITEMS**

Shane discussed a programmatic agreement to streamline the Section 106 process. Shane brought the programmatic agreement for execution to the meeting. Wilson pointed out that this group has produced a tangible product because of these meetings. He thanked Shane and his staff, FHWA, and the SHPO staff. The agreement was signed at the end of the meeting.

#### **VI. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS AND SCHEDULE NEXT MEETING**

It was mentioned that it would be useful to have an update on the Mountain View Corridor, Southern Corridor, and some of the other bigger projects. It was also suggested that the projects recommended for funding could be discussed.

It was also mentioned that the group could review the coordination plan that Greg Punske had discussed earlier in the meeting.

Those at the meeting agreed that the next meeting would be scheduled for Wednesday, June 27

at 11:00 a.m. FHWA will host the meeting at their offices, 2520 West 4700 South, Suite 9A in Salt Lake City.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 1:30 p.m.