TRANSIT TASK FORCE MEETING MINUTES

► **Meeting Date:** ***11-20-13*** ► **Time:** ***10:00 am to noon***

► **Meeting Place:** ***Idaho Springs Elks Club***

► **Distribution / Attendees:** Phil Hoffmann/Joe Kracum, Parsons; David Krutsinger/Ben Acimovic, CDOT; Margaret Bowes, I-70 Coalition; Mary Jane Loevlie, Idaho Springs; Elena Wilken, CASTA, Lisa McDonald, Louis Berger; Jim Andrew, Summit Stage

►*Prepared By:* *Phil Hoffmann/Joe Kracum* *Date:* *Nov. 20, 2013*

1. Phil kicked off meeting and went over the agenda which was essentially to respond to the issues raised at the Oct. 30 Transit ITF meeting and review the changes made to the Issues Technical Memorandum.

2. Phil reviewed the three issues addressed by the technical memo:

   - 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?

3. Phil mentioned that he had received the O&M costs from RFTA (as requested by the ITF at the Oct. 30 meeting) for their rural bus service which is $118.37 per hour, so within the previous range of $105-125 per hour that had been used to estimate the costs of the Breckenridge/Silverthorne service and the costs of the Idaho Springs circulator/feeder systems. He pointed out that this analysis is still using the much higher O&M estimate of $200-250 per hour for the BRT service analysis, in order to reflect a more conservative approach and the likely higher actual costs of that service.

4. Mary Jane requested that the cost per passenger or per passenger mile should be included in the technical memo since that cost would likely be lower for rail options than for bus options; Phil agreed to include those statistics from the other representative systems.

5. David K. noted that the corridor map showing the hybrid AGS and I-70 BRT alignments are correct, but that the map should be extended to show the alignments all the way to Vail/Eagle County airport; Phil indicated the map would be extended in the final technical memo.

6. Mary Jane Loevlie asked why the group had decided to drop the discussion about ridership and after further discussion, the group agreed the ridership information should be included in the paper going to the TT/PLT, with further analysis of the cost of BRT service required to match the AGS ridership. Phil agreed to provide that additional analysis.

7. A question was raised regarding why the cost of the managed lanes was not included in the BRT capital cost; Joe responded that the managed lanes represent several of the overall alternatives,

all of which might include either AGS or BRT, so it's appropriate to keep the managed lane costs in the highway alternatives and not assign them to the transit costs.

8. The group suggested that the BRT capital and O&M costs should be provided along with the AGS capital and O&M costs, but without comparing the two technologies or their costs since they are quite different; Phil agreed that is the better presentation method in the technical memo.

9. David K. indicated that the AGS capital and O&M costs are being updated and will provide those for inclusion in the final technical memo.

10. Phil described the expanded circulator/feeder bus service for Idaho Springs that would also connect with Downieville-Dumont-Lawson; the capital cost for the combined service would be $2.4 million and the O&M cost would be $1.1-1.3 million per year.

11. Mary Jane indicated that Clear Creek County is considering the need for circulator bus service between Idaho Springs and Black Hawk/Central City, and that those services should be estimated and included in the final technical memo; Phil agreed to provide that analysis.

12. Phil indicated that he would make all of the updates/refinements to the technical memo and send that to all of the Transit ITF members for review/comment before the final version is provided to the TT/PLT.

Next Transit ITF Meeting: none planned