

Meeting Type & Number: PLT Meeting #5
Meeting Date: August 8, 2012
Meeting Time: 9:00 AM to 12:00 PM
Location: Summit County Community and Senior Center
Prepared by: Mike Riggs
Date published: August 21, 2012 (Revised)
Attendees:

Attendees (* - PLT Member, ** - PLT Alternate)		
Michael Bitner, Denver Metro Chamber	Kevin O'Malley, I-70 Coalition*	Flo Raitano, Summit County*
Maria D'Andrea, Jefferson County*	Mary Jane Loevlie, I-70 Coalition*	Tom Breslin, Clear Creek County*
Cynthia Neely, Clear Creek County**	David Krutsinger, CDOT DTR*	Peter Runyon, Eagle County*
Tracey MacDonald, CDOT DTR	Angie Drumm, CDOT*	Mike Riggs, AZTEC/TYPESA*
Terri Binder, Club 20*	Andrea Cunningham, GBSM	Beth Vogelsang, O&V Consulting
Mark Imhoff, CDOT DTR	Pamela Bailey-Campbell, Jacobs	Heath Therrien, AZTEC/TYPESA
Chris Primus, Jacobs	Tim Mauck, Clear Creek County	Anne Callison, American Maglev
Miller Hudson, CIFGA	R. Paul Williamson, SkyTran	H.R. Dudik, PPRTC/PRT
Brenda Oster, ET3	Daryl Oster, ET3	Dan Oster, ET3
Ralph Trapani, Parsons	Rick Pilgrim, HDR	David Lehman, PPRTC
R. Jack Panter, ET3		Theodore Bornhoeft, PRT Industries

1. Introduction to the Meeting

Mike Riggs opened the meeting and welcomed the PLT. All attendees introduced themselves.

Mike reviewed the meeting agenda and outlined the meeting objectives, which included:

- Feasibility Discussion
- Review & Endorse Revised Project Process
- Review & Endorse Changes to Draft System Performance & Operational Criteria
- Update on Land Use & Station Criteria
- Presentation on Local Transit System Planning
- AGS/ICS/Co-Development Project Coordination
- Discuss next PLT meeting

Andrea Cunningham gave a brief update on the project website, public launch and media outreach.

2. Public Comment

Anne Callison (American Maglev) expressed disappointment with the change in process and concern about the direction of the project.

Daryl Oster (ET3) said that his company views the change in direction as a positive step towards a more inclusive process that is less train-centric. He asked the PLT to also consider private ownership of the system as a possible alternative to CDOT/government ownership.

3. Feasibility Discussion

Mike outlined CDOT's proposed methodology to determine Feasibility. The information was previously sent to the PLT for review in the form of a Feasibility White Paper.

Mike explained that the project must have a positive cost/benefit ratio in order to be built. He also said that for purposes of the feasibility, the benefits must be measureable and defensible.

This led to a discussion of the types of benefits that should be included – those that can be quantifiable (e.g., reduced vehicle miles traveled, cost to citizens) and those that potentially may not be (e.g., quality of life, environment, etc.). Not all may understand the benefit, so need to identify all benefits and which ones will be used in the cost/benefit analysis because they are quantifiable and also show which ones aren't.

Mike indicated that indirect benefits would ultimately be considered but they need to look at cost first. Mike asked the PLT to refer to the Feasibility White Paper he sent out for a full list of the benefits the team is currently planning on measuring for analysis. The PLT asked that he also take it a step further to rank and identify which benefits are quantifiable and which are not. Mike noted that the Victoria Institute has methodology for quantifying many of the benefits being questioned and that he would share that methodology with the PLT. The PLT suggested that Patty Silverstein with the Denver Metro Chamber come and present an economic analysis she performed that captures/formulizes some of the benefits being discussed.

Mark Imhoff assured the PLT that CDOT would be thoughtful with the benefit analysis and be sure to capture all the benefits – understanding that they will ultimately need to convince decision makers, CDOT leadership, governments and the public of them. The PLT also asked that the project team account for future benefits in its analysis.

Mike then outlined other elements of the feasibility analysis including: technology analysis & alignment design and ridership & revenue.

Mark summarized this discussion by saying that CDOT is looking at feasibility in terms of three key criteria: alignment, technology and finance.

4. Review & Endorse Revised Process

Mike explained that based on a number of factors (industry feedback, long time frame and the PLT's desire to consider 21st century technologies), a revised process was endorsed by CDOT executive management on August 6. He emphasized that the process still involves industry input and collaboration but in a different format. Pamela Bailey-Campbell added that the process is not designed to make a decision on an exact technology – rather it will identify a feasible/rational set of technologies to determine if an AGS is feasible.

Mike then outlined the revised process and preliminary schedule:

- CDOT will issue a Technology Request for Information (TRFI) in September that asks industry for information on performance characteristics including travel speed and how they will meet the performance and operational criteria. The TRFI also seeks info on operating parameters, proof of operation by 2017 and estimated costs.

- Technology providers who submit qualified TRFIs will be invited to a Technology Forum in October (potentially the week of October 21st in Golden). Screening criteria for this forum will be outlined in the TRFI. There, providers will have the opportunity to present their technologies to the project team, transportation commissioners, corridor stakeholders and interested public.
- The project team will review Technology Statements of Interests and assess them against the System Performance and Operational Criteria to generate a List of Candidate Technologies. Pamela reiterated that the List of Candidate Technologies is intended to help generate alignments, not necessarily exclude any one technology from ultimately submitting a proposal when it comes to implementation.
- The Candidate Technologies would then be grouped into three categories/technology types for purposes of alignment and cost development: in the I-70 ROW, outside the I-70 ROW and a hybrid that would go in and out of the ROW. The PLT suggested that the project team might need to add a fourth category to account for “express” technologies. Pamela reminded the group that the alignments need to be identified first (regardless of technology) because they will all have different costs associated with them.
- CDOT is also forming a financial task force to simultaneously develop funding strategies and assess the likelihood of raising the necessary capital for the system in preparation for a Financial RFI that will be issued in early 2013.
- All of this information would be analyzed to conduct the AGS Feasibility Analysis and prepare and release the study’s Final Report and Implementation Plan.

Mike then explained that a Tier 2 NEPA process to identify a preferred alternative/technology could be a potential next step at the conclusion of the AGS Feasibility Study. From there an RFP could be issued for a Development Agreement for the system.

Upon the conclusion of this discussion, the PLT endorsed the revised process.

5. Review & Endorse Changes to Draft System Performance and Operational Criteria

Mike highlighted the changes that were made to the Draft System and Operational Criteria based on PLT and industry feedback. He referred to a draft document he previously sent to the PLT for review.

Changes to the following criteria were discussed:

- Travel Time – re-state travel time as a positive, suggestion that this also be stated in terms of time in addition to speed, add a criteria for those technologies that are not scheduled
- Technology – must have a plan for proof of operation if they don’t already have it by 2017
- Noise
- Safety – must have a plan for safety certification by 2017
- Passenger Comfort – address restroom issue
- Reliability
- Headways
- Cost – add cost of power
- Alignment – re-write criteria in a way that solicits feedback but recognizes that AZTEC will determine alignments

Mike asked the PLT to consider these criteria as minimum requirements to elicit the most qualified and complete responses. Mike also indicated that he would re-send the draft System Performance

and Operational Criteria to the PLT as a word document so they could provide additional comments.

6. Update on Land Use & Station Criteria

Beth Vogelsang presented an update on county land use/station planning meetings. Beth indicated she would talk to each county rep to discuss their individual county's approach and schedule initial meetings. The first meeting is scheduled with Eagle County for September 4.

Beth also showed a few examples of comparable-sized high-speed rail stations in diverse terrain from previous TYPASA projects. She indicated that she would bring detailed station layouts to the September PLT meeting.

7. Presentation on Local Transit System Planning

Due to the time limitations of the meeting, Beth briefly outlined a presentation on Local Transit System Planning but suggested further discussion on it be moved to a future meeting. The overview focused on considerations for counties and current networks.

8. AGS/ICS/Co-Development Project Coordination

Mike gave a brief update on AGS/ICS/Co-Development coordination. Earlier in the meeting (during the Revised Process discussion) a question was asked about the Co-Development process. Cindy Neely expressed concern that the studies were parallel and potentially competitive. Mark took the opportunity to explain that it was not CDOT's intent to run competitive studies. He mentioned that CDOT is working vigilantly to mesh the two processes. He added that that Co-Development will have to coordinate with the AGS alignment/feasibility determinations and that Co-Development environmental work cannot start until AGS feasibility is determined. Mike added that the revised process is also bringing the project in closer coordination with the ICS. David Krutsinger added that the draft framework of the ridership models is expected from ICS later this month or early next month.

9. Conclusion, Final Remarks & Next Steps

Mike announced that the Draft Technical RFI would be sent to the PLT for review on August 22 and comments would be due by August 29.

Flo Raitano suggested that future meetings be held later in the day for purposes of travel. The PLT agreed to change the time of future meetings to 10:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.

It was noted that the next PLT meeting would be held at the Frisco Senior Center on September 12 from 10:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.

The objectives of that meeting include:

- Feedback from county Land Use & Station Criteria meetings
- Discuss TRFI review and scoring
- Endorse TRFI

Mike concluded the meeting and asked the PLT to email or call him with any additional comments on feasibility or draft system performance & operational criteria.