



# AGS Feasibility Study

PLT Meeting 2  
May 9, 2012

# Agenda

- ▶ Introduction to the Meeting
- ▶ Public Comment
- ▶ Review and Endorse Context Statement
- ▶ Review and Endorse Core Values
- ▶ Review and Endorse Critical Success Factors
- ▶ Review and Endorse Desired Outcomes and Actions
- ▶ Review and Endorse Chartering Agreement
- ▶ AGS/ICS Coordination
- ▶ Upcoming Meetings
- ▶ Conclusion, Final Remarks and Next Steps

# Introduction to the Meeting

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

# Introduction to the Meeting

- ▶ Review and Approve Meeting Minutes from Last Meeting
- ▶ Review Action Items from Last Meeting
- ▶ Website Update
  - Address for website:  
<http://www.coloradodot.info/projects/AGSstudy>
  - PLT comments welcomed, but it is work in progress
  - Does PLT want to be identified on website?

# Public Comment

- ▶ Invitation for any comments by the public

# What is a Context Statement?

“A context statement seeks to capture in words the special qualities and attributes that define a place as unique. A context statement should capture in words that which was true fifty years ago and that which must be considered during the development of improvements in order to sustain truth in those same words for fifty years to come.”

*Source: I-70 Mountain Corridor CSS Website*

# Review & Endorse Context Statement

The I-70 Mountain Corridor is a magnificent scenic place. Human elements are woven through breathtaking natural features **and ecosystems**. The integration of these diverse elements has occurred over the course of time.

This corridor is a recreational **and heritage tourism** destination for the world and a unique place to live. It is a route of national, regional and local economic importance as both an interstate highway and an intercommunity connection.

~~We are committed to continuing the collaboration that led to an historic agreement about the right solutions for the corridor. The technological and financial feasibility of an Advanced Guideway System must be determined to respond to the corridor's transportation challenges.~~

**Corridor stakeholders are active participants in transportation considerations. A historic collaborative agreement exists for solutions in the I-70 Mountain Corridor.**

~~The Advanced Guideway System must recognize the I-70 Mountain Corridor's unique engineering and operational challenges, including:~~

**The I-70 Mountain Corridor has unique engineering and operational challenges, including:**

- ▶ Challenging horizontal and vertical curvature of highway and steep and lengthy grades
- ▶ Sensitive environmental **and cultural** areas
- ▶ Areas of potential geotechnical challenges such as rock slides, mines, faults, etc.
- ▶ Weather conditions unique to high mountain elevations, including periods of severe winter conditions and potential avalanches
- ▶ Substantial congestion variation, both weekly and seasonally
- ▶ Significant variation in trip purposes and party sizes; ranging from individual work trips to recreational activity trips made by families and groups
- ▶ The need to accommodate various types of gear and equipment associated with recreation trips
- ▶ Large volumes of freight transport
- ▶ **Connecting to and through existing communities**

~~This study must foster and nurture new ideas while balancing the importance of individual communities, the natural environment and fiscal constraints with the need to provide safe and efficient travel.~~

ADVANCED GUIDEWAY SYSTEM (AGS) FEASIBILITY STUDY



# What is a Core Value?

“A Core Value describes something of significant importance to stakeholders -- something they respect and will work to protect and preserve.

Core Values must be honored and understood. Decisions and choices made along the I-70 Mountain Corridor should be influenced by and support the Core Values.”

*Source: I-70 Mountain Corridor CSS Website*

# Review & Endorse Core Values

- ▶ **Sustainability** is an overarching value that creates solutions for today without diminishing resources for future generations. Industry solutions proposed for the AGS should endeavor to generate long-term benefits to economic strength, scenic character, community vitality, ecosystem integrity, and energy considerations, **both conservation and potential energy production**.
- ▶ **Openness, honesty, collaboration and transparency** are critically important to the credibility and ultimate endorsement of the AGS Feasibility Study's results.
- ▶ **Safety** for passengers, motorists and the public must be built into the AGS.
- ▶ A **healthy environment** requires taking responsibility to preserve, restore and enhance community, cultural and natural resources.
- ▶ The corridor's broad **historic context** is foundational to its identity. As industry develops proposed AGS solutions for the corridor, it should always respect and protect what the past has contributed to the sense of ~~space~~ **place**.
- ▶ The individuality of **communities** must be respected in a manner that promotes their viability. The character of the corridor is realized in the differences and commonalities of its communities.
- ▶ **Mobility and accessibility** must address local, regional and national travel by providing reliability, efficiency and interconnectivity between systems and communities. A transfer-free connection between the corridor and Denver International Airport is paramount.
- ▶ **Aesthetics** of a successful AGS system should be inspired by the surroundings and incorporate the context of place. The system should protect viewsheds and scenic character while exhibiting timeless design that continues the corridor's legacy.
- ▶ ~~We Expect~~ The AGS Feasibility Study will be **industry-leading** and serve as a global model for excellence in the identification, evaluation and potential development of an AGS system that addresses the corridor's unique characteristics and challenges.



# Critical Success Factors

“Critical Success Factors should reflect the objectives of the team in terms of project success. They should include those things that indicate success for the project and for the PLT.”

*Source: I-70 Mountain Corridor CSS Website*

# Review & Endorse Critical Success Factors (CSF)

- ▶ Suggestion was made to organize CSFs into groups
  - A = Feasibility Proposals
  - B = PLT
  - C = Public
  - D = Trans and Rail/CDOT/PM
- ▶ They were also reworded to be active statements

# Critical Success Factors – A Group (Feasibility Proposals)

- ▶ A• Considering all technologies that meet criteria; remain open to any ideas in line with criteria.
- ▶ A• Determining the feasibility of an AGS.
- ▶ A• Developing a RFQ/RFP that gets responses and stays true to needs/desires.
- ▶ A• Identifying and pursuing alternate money sources – exploring all options.
- ▶ A• Insuring the I-70 Coalition Technical Committee is properly and effectively engaged.
- ▶ A• Insuring the results incorporate life cycle costs to build and maintain for 50 year life.
- ▶ A• Investigating all pertinent AGS technologies that meet the criteria.
- ▶ A• Receiving three responsive proposals with comprehensive technology and financial elements.
- ▶ **A• Providing a transfer-free connection between the corridor and Denver International Airport.**

# Critical Success Factors – B Group (PLT)

- ▶ ~~B • Avoiding the re-evaluation of the PEIS findings.~~
- ▶ B • Building on past work and accomplishments.
- ▶ B • Insuring all PLT members understand what we are doing and importance of historical work.
- ▶ B • Insuring close coordination and collaboration with ICS and Co-development project.
- ▶ B • Insuring coordinated, effective, consistent communication and messaging.
- ▶ B • Insuring the AGS is a Context Sensitive Solution (not just the process).
- ▶ B • Insuring the PLT continues to support and champion the process.
- ▶ B • Insuring the PLT formulates the right questions to be answered.
- ▶ B • Insuring the PLT identifies areas of concern, skepticism, lack of confidence in a timely fashion (cost estimate, funding strategies, etc.).
- ▶ B • Insuring the process is consistent with Collaborative Effort criteria.
- ▶ B • Keeping local governments and representatives informed on project, sooner rather than later.
- ▶ B • Managing the project to meet timelines and budget.
- ▶ **B • Understanding differences between wants and needs.??????????**

# Critical Success Factors – C Group (Public)

- ▶ C• Determining statewide benefits of an AGS.
- ▶ C• Developing broad public support.
- ▶ C• Insuring defendable, open, honest and transparent communication.
- ▶ C• Insuring the public has confidence that we have done a thorough job – confidence in process.
- ▶ C• Recognizing that the project is more than just a transportation project.
- ▶ C• Successfully engaging policy makers.

# Critical Success Factors – D Group (DTR/CDOT/PM)

- ▶ D• Culture of CDOT, legislature, etc. recognizes this is not a wholly funded CDOT project. **Should this also include local government? How can we reword this?**
- ▶ D• Developing alliances with other agencies.
- ▶ ~~D• Meeting CDOT's objectives.~~
- ▶ **D• Providing clarity for governance of AGS, early in process.**
- ▶ D• Providing the PLT with information prior to public (no surprises).

# Review and Endorse Desired Outcomes and Actions

- ▶ Identify technologies that can meet the system performance & operational criteria
- ▶ Complete AGS Feasibility Study & gain consensus on questions of feasibility, cost, ridership, land use & governance
- ▶ Identify technological & financial feasibility of AGS in relationship to I-70 Mountain Corridor Record of Decision
- ▶ Consistent and close coordination between AGS, ICS and Co-Development
- ▶ Support from the top down for conclusions of the study document

# Review and Endorse Chartering Agreement

- ▶ Based on template from the CSS Website
- ▶ Comments:

Much of this agreement appears to be modeled after the charter for the Collaborative Effort group. The CE is a policy and decision making body, a PLT is not. For instance some of the attendance and consensus building process considerations might be quite different.

General comments:

1. Membership and Attendance section repeats CDOT Division TR and Region 1 and 3. Did Idaho Springs have a seat in the initial gathering? **No, only county or higher level participation**

2. Membership and Attendance paragraph following the list: The CE did not permit any alternates because of the nature of the work. Alternates have been permitted on PLTs although we concur that member participation is of prime importance. We suggest leaving out the words “*rather than appoint alternate members*” in sentence 1 and leaving the rest of the discussion. **Agreed**

3. Roles and Responsibilities: PLT bullet 2 suggest adding after 6-Step process “*and implementation of the CSS guidance including Design Criteria and Aesthetic Guidelines where applicable.*”

4. Roles and Responsibilities: Is it important to delineate the roles of the Consultant PM and CDOT PM in the PLT? **Function of Project Work Plan**



# AGS/ICS/Co-Development Project Coordination

- ▶ ICS project has kicked off
- ▶ AGS/ICS Internal Technical Coordination Meeting will be May 14
- ▶ Through O&V Consulting, ICS and AGS are working together to define how public and stakeholders will be notified on collaboration
- ▶ Areas of commonality include: Stakeholder Outreach, Project Team Interface/Coordination, Scenario Development & Evaluation Process (Evaluation criteria), Travel Demand Forecasting, Capital Cost Estimation, O&M Cost Estimation, Revenue Estimation, Funding and Financing Strategies

# AGS/ICS/Co-Development Project Coordination

- ▶ Co-Development Project Statements of Interest were submitted April 23
- ▶ CDOT has shortlisted four teams; Parsons, CH2M Hill, HDR and HNTB
- ▶ RFP scheduled by end of May

# Conclusions, Final Remarks & Next Steps

- ▶ Next step is developing draft system performance and operation criteria
  - Discuss I-70 Coalition Technical Committee and PLT roles (are CE Criteria still valid?)
- ▶ High level schedule
- ▶ Next PLT meeting will be June 13
  - Endorse Project Work Plan (draft will be emailed to PLT)
  - Endorse Media Relations Plan (draft will be emailed to PLT)
  - Endorse Public & Stakeholder Involvement Plan (draft will be emailed to PLT)