

I-70 TRAFFIC & REVENUE STUDY ISSUES TASK FORCES

TRANSIT TASK FORCE MEETING MINUTES

▶ Meeting Date: *10-30-13* ▶ Time: *10:00 am to noon*

▶ Meeting Place: *CDOT, 425 Corporate Circle, Golden*

▶ Distribution / Attendees ('):

▶ Phil Hoffmann	Parsons	▶ Wendy Wallach	Parsons	▶ David Krutsinger	CDOT
▶ Margaret Bowes	I-70 Coalition	▶ Miller Hudson	Citizen representative	▶ Elena Wilken	CASTA

▶ Prepared By: *Phil Hoffmann/Wendy Wallach* Date: *Oct. 30, 2013*

1. Phil kicked off meeting and went over the agenda including project overview and purpose of Transit ITF and the project termini, C-470 to Silverthorne. Phil explained that there are 14 ITFs, and we are responding what the Project Leadership Team (PLT) directive to come up with assumptions regarding Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) and the Advanced Guideway System (AGS).
2. Margaret asked why the terminus was not set at Frisco when there is a major hub there. Wendy explained that the original proposal that Parsons submitted had C-470 to Silverthorne as the termini. At the beginning of the T&R project and during scoping, agreement was reached to use these termini for all of the alternative options being studied. Also, this group is exploring a shuttle to Silverthorne.
3. Miller has been working with maglev proponents on the corridor and stated that he was attending to learn what this group was doing.
4. Phil described the three basic issues to be addressed by the Transit ITF:
 - What are the costs and operational assumptions of the bus feeder system to connect AGS terminus in Breckenridge to the Intermodal Center at I-70 and Silverthorne? Is shuttle from Keystone AGS station to Silverthorne a better option?
 - Verify the assumptions and the costs for the BRT and AGS components.
 - What are the local transit systems that connect to the spine system? What are the costs and operational elements for Idaho Springs circulator/feeder systems?
5. Phil covered findings related to the first issue. The transit working group derived cost assumptions, for the feeder system from Breckenridge to Silverthorne, estimates are roughly \$4.95M capital, and O&M costs are estimated at \$105.00 per hour, which is the same cost as Summit Stage, and at \$125/hour which adds 20% contingency. Assumptions for service plan match the AGS operational plans (see Issue Responses dated 10/30/13). The vehicles would be similar to the transit coaches that Summit Stage uses. This is being analyzed as a standalone service, but ultimately, it could be provided under contract with Summit Stage.
6. Phil then covered the working group's assumptions regarding a Keystone to Silverthorne shuttle. The operations are very similar. The same assumptions for O&M are used. Capital costs are \$3.85M and do not include the costs for the AGS stations.
7. Phil indicated that either the Breckenridge/Silverthorne or the Keystone/Silverthorne option would make sense but not both.

I-70 TRAFFIC & REVENUE STUDY

ISSUES TASK FORCES

8. Miller asked if there is service from Frisco Center to Vail. Margaret said no but it ranked highly in the Statewide Plan for proposed bus service.
9. Phil compared the two systems: Keystone appeared more attractive because of shorter trip and lower capital cost. But maybe Breckenridge would make more sense because it includes the Frisco connections.
10. The group asked if the proposed AGS connections could accommodate BRT. David Krutsinger thinks the AGS stations can accommodate bus connections, but having the bus costs is helpful because the AGS study did not cost it out. Phil asked if we should take out the station cost. The group agreed the more conservative approach would be to leave it in.
11. Phil summarized findings related to Issue #2- Verify the assumptions for the AGS and BRT systems.

The working group looked at both the full corridor and the Minimal Operable Segment to Silverthorne. The proposed BRT system follows I-70. Phil asked if we should expand the map, to show a dotted line to show the AGS connection to Vail because we had referred to it several times; Wendy thought we should. David said the AGS goes due west from there.

12. Miller asked if AGS was built as far as Breckenridge, could it be anticipated in a reasonable amount of time it would get extended to Vail. He thinks the demand would be short-lived if Breckenridge was the end of the line. He thinks the shuttle bus should be run by the Summit Stage. Phil agreed and noted that Summit Stage could be contracted to provide the service.
13. Phil provided a comparison of the operations between AGS and BRT (see *Issue Responses* dated 10/30/13 and the PowerPoint with the same date.) Speeds are definitely lower with the BRT. Elena asked about the maglev operating speed, because with the number of stations, she assumed AGS would be slowed down. The AGS has a maximum operating speed of 150mph, but travel time includes considerations of station dwell time and accel/decel time, as well as operating speeds. With BRT there is longer dwell time because the BRT has only one door. Elena noted that the previous FREX buses currently operated by Summit Stage only have one door.
14. Phil noted that the working group was struggling because we are comparing “apples to oranges”. For the AGS MOS, the cost is estimated at \$8-9 billion. BRT has a capital cost of \$70-80 million from Golden to Vail; it travels in a managed lane to Silverthorne and then mixed traffic to Vail.
15. O&M cost in the original proposal was very conservative. So Phil looked at peer systems compiled from available FTA information. Bus O&M is considerably lower than LRT O&M costs. These costs are not just for BRT, they include buses. Elena suggested we get information from RFTA because it is a rural BRT system; she suggested Ralph Trapani may have that information.
16. Miller asked for clarification regarding the capital cost, does the costs of BRT include the lane? Phil clarified that this estimate doesn’t include the lane as part of the cost. Elena said we should include asphalt cost as part of the BRT. Elena asked if we are running the buses with mixed traffic. The BRT would operate in the managed lanes in the peak direction and in mixed flow lanes in the non-peak direction. With each scenario the bus speed varies 45 to 65. A member of the group noted trucks can’t go 55 mph, but added that a bus can’t go that fast either. The buses are not restricted to the third lane; the buses would be able to weave around trucks as necessary. Margaret asked if trucks have to go to the right lane; Phil said they would be encouraged.
17. Elena asked if we are going to be able to “see” the operation plans associated with the different options. The short answer is “yes”.

I-70 TRAFFIC & REVENUE STUDY ISSUES TASK FORCES

18. Phil reminded the group we assumed a BRT O&M cost of \$200 to \$250 dollars per vehicle revenue hour; in reality, looking at peer systems it is much lower. The current BRT O&M estimate is \$12-15 million per year.

The range for AGS is broad, assuming the AGS is maglev the cost would be 63-89 M. Miller asked if previous estimates have been “normalized” to same year dollars, Phil answered they will be in the next draft of the issues response paper. If you adjusted for inflation the estimates would be similar. Parsons committed to adding a column showing this in the next draft paper.

19. Phil noted that the PLT didn’t explicitly ask about ridership but it will come up.

For the AGS MOS, ridership is 3.3 million per year with a 7-11 % mode share; the fare box revenue is aggressive because it shows a profit. David K. said the cost is based on 35 cents per mile, which he feels is conservative; Acela is 66 cents per mile. Miller supports AGS, but thinks if you can’t cover O&M costs with fare box revenue, AGS will not get built. He also suggested adding a column that shows estimated mode share at “peak period”. Right now showing 7 to 11% mode share for 365 days is not attractive. If you show peak period only and it’s closer to 25% mode share then it is easier to support. David K will get this from AGS consultant and get it to Phil.

Phil said to achieve the 3.3 million ridership, you would have 50% occupancy rate for every seat on the train. The train is more attractive than the bus. Elena asked why is the ridership is so much lower for the bus---the bus provides more opportunities with more trips. Phil referred her to page 12 of the *Issue Responses Paper*. Elena is not comfortable with such a big gap in BRT ridership as presented. Phil responded that the working group applied the same methodology for AGS, to get the projected number, however actual ridership may differ. The 50% seat occupancy for AGS is broken down from the 3.3 million annual riders and then the group worked backwards for the BRT. Elena feels cautious about the defensibility of the methodology and does not want to present it to the PLT. Phil said this was the best we could do using available information. Wendy agreed we should not present this number. We agreed to remove the ridership numbers.

20. Miller told the group that a previous bus to Vail failed. Wendy asked why. It was a “party bus” atmosphere so people stopped taking it. Elena did not think this was an accurate assessment and referred the group to talk to the resort communities who have successfully run “drunk buses”. She noted that she is skeptical because she has heard a lot about “the drunk bus” legend and doesn’t think it is applicable to the current environment.
21. Phil kicked off the discussion regarding Issue #3- What are the local transit systems that connect to the spine system? What are the costs and operational elements for Idaho Springs circulator/feeder systems?

The group asked if we should include Vail in these considerations? David and Wendy didn’t think so because it muddies the water since it is technically not in our T&R study. Elena said the Vail buses don’t add any additional ridership, it is a small service.

Phil described a potential Idaho Springs shuttle service, running back and forth along corridor, not a loop. The proposed Service Plan would match the BRT, 2.5 mile one way route with 8 stations. It would be \$2.1 million in capital costs; the cost for O&M would be \$1.1-1.3 million per year. David K. suggested that the Idaho Springs service should also serve Downieville-Dumont-Lawson area to connect those communities with the BRT station in Idaho Springs; Phil agreed that would be added to the analysis in the next draft.

Next Transit ITF Meeting: 10:00 AM to Noon, Nov. 20, 2013, Idaho Springs Elks Club