



6000 East Evans Avenue, Suite 1-428
 Denver, CO 80222
 (720) 708-4176

AGS Feasibility Study Meeting Notes

Meeting Type & Number: PLT Meeting #6
Meeting Date: September 12, 2012
Meeting Time: 10:00 AM to 11:30 AM
Location: Jefferson County Government Center
Prepared by: Mike Riggs
Date published: September 21, 2012
Attendees:

Attendees (* - PLT Member, ** - PLT Alternate)		
Eva Wilson, Eagle County**	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 Lombardi, CDOT R3* (Phone)
Tracey MacDonald, CDOT DTR	Angie Drumm, CDOT*	Mike Riggs, AZTEC/TYPESA*
Terri Binder, Club 20*	Peter Kozinski, CDOT R1*	Randy Jensen, FHWA *
Mark Imhoff, CDOT DTR	Tony Devito, CDOT R1	Sara Cassidy, Denver CofC*
Tom Underwood, Jacobs	Tim Mauck, Clear Creek County	Mike Spies, Town of Empire
Andy Mountain,GBSM	Beth Vogelsang, O&V Consulting	Heath Therrien, AZTEC/TYPESA
Anne Callison, Barbour Comm.	Carl Lawrence, Swift Tram	Danny Katz, CO PIRG
Gina McAfee, HDR	Randy Grauberger, PB	Thomas Gerber, ET3
Miller Hudson	Thomas Gerber, ET3	H.R. Dudik, PPRTC/PRT
Brenda Oster, ET3	Daryl Oster, ET3	Dan Oster, ET3
R. Jack Panter, ET3	Terry Stone	David Lehman, PPRTC
Jim Wieler, MagneMotion (Phone)	Robert Pulliam, Tubular Rail (Phone)	Max Schlienger, Flight Rail (Phone)
Debbie Reardan, Flight Rail (Phone)	Becky English, Swift Tran (Phone)	Christopher Perkins, SkyTran (Phone)
Julia Camacho, Talgo (Phone)	David Colling, Tubular Rail (Phone)	Kirston Henderson, MegaRail (Phone)

1. Introduction

Andy Mountain opened the meeting and welcomed all PLT. All attendees introduced themselves. Andy reviewed agenda, lead the introduction to the meeting and reviewed objectives, which included:

- Update on RFSOTI
- Update on Technology Forum
- Update on Land Use & Station Criteria
- Provide Update on AGS/ICS/Co-Development Project Coordination
- Discuss next PLT meeting

2. Public Comment

Mike Riggs opened it up for public comment.

Daryl Oster encouraged CDOT and the PLT to read message about how the RFSOTI points are awarded and weighted. There are many important areas to cover.

Mike read a statement from Robert Pulliam (Tubular Rail) which included these points:

AGS Feasibility Study
Meeting Notes
PLT Meeting #6
September 12, 2012

- Would like the communications restrictions re: technology removed
- Re: money to bidders, would like to see funding restored.
- There is an additional 25 miles with extension to DIA and it cannot include new innovative technologies if it must be tech ready.

Miller Hudson noted his agreement with comments about weighting the scoring system. Proper weight needs to be placed in appropriate categories.

Mike Riggs addressed the scoring issues and said the Technical group will review.

Anne Callison asked if there was a report from the finance committee.

David Krutsinger said both teams are working to pull more resources for funding and are checking to see what other states have done and are doing. He expects the report will be released in the spring.

Mike noted that there is no requirement for engineering alignments in the RFSOTI, since the consultant team would be doing that, and that was the primary rationale for removing the stipend.

Robert Pulliam asked why they would spend the money to find the alignment if the technology doesn't exist. Does the technology exist?

Mike said he believes one or more technologies exist that could work in the corridor.

That ended the public comment.

3. Update on RFSOTI

RFSOTI was posted on CDOT website and emailed to Industry Clearinghouse on September 7th – 5 days ahead of schedule. David will be receiving Statements of Technical Information which are due October 10th. There will be a webinar to discuss RFSOTI with Technology Providers on Sept. 19th at 10 AM. It will be like a pre-proposal meeting to answer questions. There are 25 criteria that Technology Providers must respond to. SOTI's will be reviewed. Looking for information for the feasibility study. The review committee is TBD. SOTI's will be scored based on the responses to criteria. It does not preclude those technologies that are not yet proven; if they are feasible they will be considered. Technologies will be grouped into three categories: those that can operate entirely in I-70 ROW, those that can never operate in I-70 ROW and a hybrid of both.

Peter Kozinski asked if the scoring will be shared. Will they know how they rank? He recommended that the webinar be mandatory and said that he worried one week was not enough time to review the responses. He also recommended that the project team develop an appeal process in the event that respondents take issue with their scoring.

Mike said the technical committee would address these issues in their meeting later.

4. Technology Forum

The forum is tentatively scheduled for late October. The WHSR conference is in Denver Oct. 22 & 23 so there is some desire to try and time it so technology providers could attend both. Daryl asked that the group please respect the schedules of others. The location is waiting to be confirmed. The procedures and rules are still being defined but generally:

- Each invited Technical Provider will be given the opportunity present about their technology.
- There will be a period for Technology Providers to respond to questions.

Flo Raitano asked in the presentations would be open to the public. Mike said that they would likely ask that Technology Providers not sit in on the other presentations but that, as with all AGS public meetings, they would be open to the public. Andy noted that the project team will be working with the PLT to ensure that the Technology Forum is structured in a manner that focuses on ensuring the PLT gets what it needs from the event.

5. Update on Land Use and Stations

Beth Vogelsang provided the update. Based on the change in the project scope, initial county meetings have been postponed. New scope includes two meeting per county, there is no definition on who should attend but should include elected officials and/or staff. The first meeting is to provide project overview, history and summary of station elements and site considerations in the county. It is intended to get everyone on the same page and should take place in the next month or so. The second meeting will be more specific based requirements of the technologies. There will be a presentation of the SOTI submittal information with regard to station requirements and site specific station discussions. What and where is being considered.

Held the first meeting with Summit County because it was already scheduled on September 10th in Keystone.

Scheduling round 1 meetings: Need to get in touch with Jefferson County, Clear Creek County and Eagle County and schedule the meetings for September/October. The goals for the first meeting are to get everyone on the same page and have the same understanding. Where we are, station elements and info for potential site considerations, though nothing will be nailed down. Flo Raitano mentioned that the City Planner and Town Manager were in attendance at the first meeting with Summit County and it was good because they offered insight as to where the stations can't go.

The second meetings will be held after the review of the information, possibly after the Technology Forum.

Beth said there are a lot of variables in regard to the station locations such as the shape of the county and number of stops. It was mentioned that technologies and station sizes should be weighted in the scoring process. Andy recommended that the project team develop a meeting plan including who the recommended attendees for each meeting.

Mike said there are opportunities for the proposers to clarify questions regarding the stations but asked that, per the requirements of the RFSOTI, questions be directed to him and David Krutsinger, not the PLT. Daryl Oster said he had left messages with Beth and didn't get a call back. Beth clarified that she received one message from him and didn't have any information to give him at the time of his call. She let him know that they were in the process of changing to RFSOTI and that the new process should cover the questions he had.

Peter asked what the station requirements are and Beth said it will vary based on technology. They will know more after the submittals. Anne Callison asked if they had considered elevated stations over I-70 as possible station locations. Mike said it is possible, Beth added that they are not far enough along, but Peter Kozinski and Randy Jensen both noted that there may be safety/terrorism issues that could make that a challenge.

6. AGS/ICS/Co-Development Coordination

David led this part of the presentation. He provided an update on the ICS progress, noting that the Level 1 Evaluation is completed with 100+ scenarios. They are looking at how best to analyze them with the most information. The Level 1 report will be posted to the website this month for the public to review.

The Level 2 Evaluation (Engineering) will start later this month and the environmental and cost evaluations will start in November. The ridership results will be available near the end of the year.

AGS Feasibility Study
Meeting Notes
PLT Meeting #6
September 12, 2012

Mary Jane Loevlie asked if the ridership report would include out to DIA and RTD corridors. David said there are three main concepts: RTD, New alignment and the Beltway alignment (C-470 and E-470) from Eagle County airport to DIA.

The AGS and ICS Project Managers regularly coordinate efforts. The ICS PLT meeting is planned for November/December and the public meeting in 2013. Mike said there are models being developed that can be used in many ways. The AGS staff is actively involved in the ICS ridership model development.

A decision on the Co-Development procurement will more than likely happen in October instead of September 17th. Tony said they had 2 finalists (Parsons and HDR) that presented and both proposals are in tune with the needs of the procurement.

Mary Jane asked if I-70/I-25 connectivity was addressed and David said it was. RMRA addressed freight and they are working on a non-freight alignment.

Mary Jane asked about the Denver Metro Chamber of Commerce's report on the economic impact of traffic on I-70. Sara Cassidy indicated that the report was a few years old. Mike indicated he had read it, but noted that a new, more detailed traffic study is part of the scope of this project and will be studied.

7. Conclusions, Final Remarks and Next Steps

There was discussion about when to schedule the next PLT meeting given that the original schedule called for October 10th (due date for the SOTIs). It was determined that the timing/focus of the PLT meeting would be determined as part of the technical committee meeting's discussion on timing/schedule of the SOTI review and Technology Forum, but that the project team would email the full team with the date, once it was set.

Mary Jane Loevlie and Cindy Neely both asked how elected officials are being kept informed of the study and encouraged CDOT to ensure that the elected officials and/or their designated transportation staff person are regularly updated.

It was concluded that the October PLT meeting would be canceled.