



6000 E EVANS AVENUE, SUITE 1-428
 DENVER, CO 80222
 (720) 708-4176

AGS FEASIBILITY STUDY Meeting Notes

Meeting Type & Number: Project Leadership Team Meeting 1 (Kickoff)
Meeting Date: May 9, 2011
Meeting Time: 9:00 AM to 12:00 PM
Location: Frisco Senior Center
Purpose: Endorse Context Statement, Core Values and Critical Success Factors
Prepared by: Mike Riggs
Date published: May 14, 2012

Attendees (* - PLT Member, ** - PLT Alternate)		
Mike Riggs, AZTEC/TYPESA USA (AGS Team Project Manager)*	Beth Vogelsang, O&V Consulting (AGS Team)	Peter Kozinski, CDOT Region 1 *
Angie Drumm, CDOT Office of Policy & Government Relations*	Jacob Riger, DRCOG *	Peter Runyon, Eagle County *
Anne Callison, America Maglev (Public)	James Bemelen, CDOT Region 1	Randy Jensen, FHWA
Mark Imhoff, CDOT Division of Transit & Rail	Kevin O'Malley, I-70 Coalition*	Sara Cassidy, Denver Chamber of Commerce * (by phone)
David Krutsinger, CDOT Division of Transit & Rail *	Martha Miller, CDOT Region 3*	Maria D'Andrea, Jefferson Country Board of Commissioners*
Cindy Neely, Clear Creek County **	Mary Jane Loevlie, I-70 Coalition*	Tom Breslin, Clear Creek County *
Eva Wilson, Eagle County **	Andrea Cunningham, GBSM	

I. Call to Order

Meeting began at approximately 9:15 AM. Mike Riggs welcomed the PLT.

II. Agenda

1. Welcome and Opening Remarks

Mike Riggs welcomed the PLT and made a brief opening statement.

2. Introductions

The attendees (see list above) introduced themselves.

Mike Riggs stated that AGS team technical experts will be at June PLT meetings.

3. Agenda Review and Meeting Objectives

Mike Riggs reviewed the agenda for the meeting and provided the meeting objectives, which included:

- Endorsing Context Statement, Core Values, Critical Success Factors and Chartering Agreement
- Discuss Schedule
- Provide Update on AGS/ICS/Co-Development Project Coordination
- Discuss Next PLT Meeting

4. Introduction to the Meeting

Mike began by asking if anyone had comments on the meeting minutes from the April 11 PLT Kickoff Meeting, beyond the request from Maria D'Andrea to include her on the attendance list. Hearing none, the minutes are considered final.

Mike then asked David to review the Action Items from the April 11 meeting. Upon review, it was determined that all items had been completed or would be completed in today's meeting.

Mike then outlined that the AGS website was up and operating. The handout includes the web address for the site, which is within CDOT's Projects webpage. He asked that the PLT review and comment, but to realize that the site is a work in progress.

Mike then asked the PLT if they had any objections. The PLT stated that they had no objection to being listed on the website. Mike asked that the PLT members who were present check with those who had not that were not in attendance if they would have any objections otherwise be PLT members will be posted on the website.

5. Public Comment

Mike asked for any comments from the public and there were none.

6. Endorsement of Context Statements

Beth reviewed the definition of a context statement. The context statement developed by the PLT with comments from Clear Creek County included was then discussed. Discussion then ensued to change corridor stakeholders to communities in the third paragraph. Also, the bullet point titled "the need to accommodate various types of gear and equipment associated with recreation trips" should be stricken from the context statement. The PLT then endorsed the context statement.

7. Endorsement of Core Values

Beth reviewed the definition of core values. The core values were then discussed. These included comments from Clear Creek County.

For sustainability it was suggested that "energy considerations" be removed and that "both energy conservation and production" be inserted.

For openness honesty, collaboration and transparency it was suggested that process be added after AGS feasibility studies.

Under individuality of communities it was suggested that viability be replaced by livability.

Under mobility and accessibility it was agreed that "a transfer free connection between the corridor and Denver international Airport is Paramount the removed.

On the last core value it was suggested to reword to say "The AGS will serve as a global model for innovation and excellence."

The PLT then endorsed the core values.

8. Endorsement of Critical Success Factors

Beth reviewed the definition of critical success factors. A suggestion was made by Clear Creek County to organize the critical success factors into four groups. The four groups are feasibility proposals, PLT, public and transit and rail/CDOT/PM.

Under the A group (feasibility proposals), it was decided that the first critical success factor be deleted at the second success factor be reworded assess the economic environmental, technical and financial

feasibility of an AGS. The third and fifth critical success factors were deleted the seventh critical success factor was revised to read reseeding responsive proposals.

Under group B (PLT) the 1st, 5th, 8th, 9th, 12th, and 13th critical success factors were deleted.

For the C group (public) all critical success factors were deleted.

For group D (DTR/CBOT/PM), all critical success factors were deleted.

It was decided that because of consolidation of critical success factors, the groupings would be removed and a single list of critical success factors carried forward. The PLT then endorsed the critical success factors.

9. Endorsement of Desired Outcomes and Actions

Beth presented the desired outcomes and actions. The only change was to add after top-down in the last bullet local, state and federal.

The PLT then endorsed the desired outcomes and actions.

10. Endorsement of Chartering Agreement

Beth presented the chartering agreement. It was stated that the chartering agreement was based on a template from that CSS website. In reference to general comment #1, Mike explained that only County or higher-level participation is assumed for the PLT. Angie mentioned that we need to take out HPTE as a PLT member. Also, change AZTEC/TYPSA to consultant.

In addition, in the first sentence of Section 2, remove the word conclusively as it relates to feasibility. The issue was that it is not possible to determine that an AGS would never be feasible on the Mountain Corridor.

Sara Cassidy had questions related to the section of the chartering agreement facts related to the PLT enabling decision-making. Beth and Mike explained that the PLT is not a decision-making body however they would engage decision-makers from their respective organizations to make decisions as necessary.

Finally, the PLT directed that the chartering agreement be written to be consistent with the other endorsed items. Based on this, the PLT endorsed the chartering agreement. AZTEC will re-send out the chartering agreement and make any other changes that PLT may have.

11. AGS/ICS/Co-development Project Coordination

Mike presented current coordination efforts between the three projects. Mike highlighted the internal technical coordination meeting that will occur between ICS and AGS on May 14 and that this meeting that will determine how interfaces will happen.

In relation to bullet point for Beth stated that she will be working on developing a schedule to identify where and when we coordinate on these areas of commonality.

Cindy asked the question when we would see the public and stakeholder involvement, media relations and public outreach plans. Mike stated that that would happen before the next meeting.

The question was asked and how does all this relate to the co-development plan? Jim explained that the co-developer has to come up with a solution that recognizes the AGS is a fork in the road. Also the co-developer has to come up with a solution that is attractive to concessionaire and will have to include AGS if feasible. Cindy stated that whether AGS the study shows is feasible or not affects what proposals the co-developers would put on the table.

Mark Imhoff indicated that CDOT did not want to be prescriptive wants to make sure the proposers understand all that out there. CDOT is writing a white paper on the AGS project for inclusion in the RFP.

Kevin O'Malley is concerned that the co-development project may be a year or two early. He also pointed out that the concessionaire for the managed lanes would be in competition with a concessionaire for the AGS. Jim indicated that down the road, concessionaire for the co-development would want to do both roadway and rail for them to work together.

The first big step of the co-development project will be to do a traffic and revenue study that also recognizes the AGS and its impact on traffic. Four teams were shortlisted and one will be selected. The other three will get a stipend. It is anticipated that the co-developer will be under contract by September.

12. Conclusions, Final Remarks and Next Steps

Beth and Mike stated that everything endorsed today will be posted on the AGS website.

Next step will be developing draft system performance and operation criteria. For this we would like to use the I-70 coalition technical committee. We would use the technical committee as decision-makers on technical and operational criteria and then bring the decisions back to the PLT for endorsement. Kevin suggested that our first step would be to talk to Margaret regarding reforming of the technical committee.

In addition, the performance and operational criteria would be discussed with industry and suggestions would be brought back to the technical committee and the PLT for review.

Mike also presented the high-level schedule developed from the complete schedule submitted to CDOT. PLT would like to see the more detailed schedule. Mike will review with David and submit it for next meeting

Meeting adjourned at 12:15 PM.