



Intercity and Regional Bus Network Study

I-70 Technical Advisory Group (TAG) Meeting #2

March 6, 2013
Meeting Minutes

Attendees:

Margaret Bowes, I-70 Coalition
Bill Efting, Town of Frisco
Tom Breslin, Clear Creek County
Maribeth Lewis-Baker, Town of Breckenridge
Tom Underwood, Jacobs Engineering
John Valerio, CDOT DTR
Thad Noll, Summit County
Susan Juergensmeier, NWCCOG
Michael Timlin, Greyhound
Kelley Collier, ECO Transit
Steve Stirling, Summit County
R.W. Rynerson, RTD
Darin Stavish, CDOT
Cindy Condon, Idaho Springs
Jack Morgan, Idaho Springs
Tom Hayden, Clear Creek County
David Johnson, RFTA
Mark Rogers, CDOT, on the phone
Chuck Murphy, GrayLine, on the phone
Tracey MacDonald, CDOT, on the phone
Suzanne O'Neill, TransitPlus, on the phone
Todd Hollenbeck, Mesa County, on the phone
Craig Bannister, CO Ski Country USA

Tom Underwood provided an overview of the project and a recap of the I-70 TAG meeting #1. John Valerio and Tom Underwood reiterated the goals for the I-70 corridor and briefly presented project developments, concerning CDOT DTR, the TRAC and the TAC, that had occurred since the last TAG meeting.

A majority of the meeting was spent discussing potential service gaps in the corridor. A series of spreadsheets, organized into four segments, were distributed to the TAG members. The I-70 segments included: Denver to Grand Junction, Denver to Vail, Frisco to Vail, and Gypsum to Glenwood Springs. Details discussed included:

- Existing/Connecting Services including proposed IRB & RCB service
- Service Markets/Demand



- Service Options (Daily, Peak, Weekend)
- Available Infrastructure (e.g., P&R's, Layover Lots, etc.)
- Fare Coordination Issues
- Operating Costs
- Challenges

For the Denver to Grand Junction Segment, the following issues were discussed:

- Human services, in particular Veteran services across seven counties, is a service needed in the corridor. While hospitals provide shuttle services, they don't serve all areas. Shuttle service to Greyhound might support this market. Riders of ADA Paratransit services must be registered riders, so it would be necessary to get people registered for the Grand Valley Transit Paratransit service. NWCCOG is currently working on an FTA Grant to provide services to Veterans.
- Potential stops along this segment may include Glenwood Springs, Eagle, Frisco, Georgetown, Idaho Springs and Denver. Grand Junction has been discussing a terminal to provide better service. RFTA's Glenwood Station would be a key stop for this segment.
- Tom Hayden mentioned the need for RTD service in Clear Creek County. R.W. Rynerson described what was involved for the county and RTD to provide service to Clear Creek. R.W. offered to make a presentation to the county describing the issues that have prevented RTD from service in the past...beyond the county not taxing for RTD services.

For the Denver to Vail Segment, the following issues were discussed:

- All agreed this segment would be better labeled as "Denver to Summit County" verses "Denver to Vail".
- All agreed there are three markets in this segment: commuter, recreational and human services markets. While Summit Stage serves a significant commuter market to employment centers in Summit County, there is a need for commuter service from Frisco to Vail, including hospitals and resorts.
- An issue concerning Greyhound running out of seats midway through the state was raised. Mike Timlin stated that Greyhound has now "locked down" their seats so that tickets are not sold unless seats are available. If additional seats are needed, Greyhound will but another bus on the route.
- Darin Stavish wanted to see "opportunities" as well as "challenges" discussed under each of the segments.

For the Frisco to Vail Segment, the following issues were discussed:

- Both Kelley Collier and Thad Noll claimed commuter service, especially to the Vail Hospital, was surprisingly high.
- Various routes for service were discussed. Kelley Collier reported that when Highway 24 was closed for repairs they found that service operating from Leadville to Vail on Highway 91 was only seven minutes longer than traveling via Highway 24 so configurations with service on Highway 91 and then traveling from Copper Mountain to Vail is a viable option.



- Transfers should include existing human services.

For the Gypsum to Glenwood Springs segment, the following issues were discussed:

- Kelley Collier stated that good data for ridership in this segment exists in earlier studies; specifically the ECO to RFTA Connectivity Study. The 2009 study has very good data that could be used for this study.
- Suzanne O'Neill stated the demand to Eagle Airport is an important part of a viable service.

The segment discussion concluded with the TAG agreeing that commuter, recreational and human service markets should be addressed in bridging service gaps in the I-70 corridor.

A spreadsheet illustrating I-70 provider fares was distributed and discussed. John Valerio stated CDOT will likely use one provider for regional service and multiple providers for intercity service. Various fare vending issues, IGAs were discussed among the providers.

Tom Underwood discussed options for establishing evaluation criteria once service options are identified. Tom stated that the project team will return to TAG meeting 3 with service options to discuss and evaluate. A date for TAG meeting 3 was not determined.