

Meeting Type & Number: PLT Meeting #10
Meeting Date: April 10, 2013
Meeting Time: 10:00 AM to 1:00 PM
Location: Jefferson County Administration and Courts Building, 100 Jefferson County Parkway, Golden, CO, Lower Level Lookout Mountain Room
Prepared by: Mike Riggs
Date published: April 22, 2013
Attendees:

Attendees (* - PLT Member, ** - PLT Alternate)		
Eva Wilson, Eagle County*	Mary Jane Loevlie, I-70 Coalition*	Flo Raitano, Summit County*
Maria D'Andrea, Jefferson County*	Peter Kozinski, CDOT*	Tom Breslin, Clear Creek County*
Cynthia Neely, Clear Creek County**	David Krutsinger, CDOT DTR*	Mike Riggs, AZTEC/TYPSA*
Tim Mauck, Clear Creek County*	Angie Drumm, CDOT*	Don Ulrich, CH2M Hill
Jim Bemelen, CDOT	Casey Tighe, Jefferson County	Mark Imhoff, CDOT DTR
Nick Farber, HPTE	Pamela Bailey-Campbell, Jacobs	Tracey MacDonald, CDOT DTR
Pamela Bailey-Campbell, Jacobs	Beth Vogelsang, OV Consulting	Craig Bannister, Colorado Ski County
Dick Marshall, NV5	Tom Underwood, Jacobs	Carol Kruse, USFS
Miller Hudson, CMG	Belinda Arbogast, CDOT	Andy Mountain, GBSM
Brad Doyle, Parsons		Henry Hollender, Representing Rep. Max Tyler

1. Introduction to the Meeting

David Krutsinger opened the meeting and welcomed the PLT. All attendees introduced themselves.

Andy Mountain reviewed the meeting agenda and outlined the meeting objectives, which included:

- Review Ridership Modeling Methodology
- Review Operating Scenarios
- Discuss Request for Financial Information (RFFI)
- Discuss Funding
- Update on Stations/Land Use Meetings
- Update on AGS/ICS/Co-Development Project Coordination

2. Public Comment

Miller Hudson with Colorado Maglev Group (CMG) informed the PLT that his team would have cost estimates done for the General Atomics technology by the end of April and invited the PLT and consultant team to come to Pittsburg to review the cost estimate with their team.

3. Preliminary Modeling Review

David presented an overview of the ridership modeling effort being conducted by Steer Davies Gleeve (SDG) who are the modeling experts working on the ICS team.

In the first slide, David presented the zonal structure the model is using and explained how it was assembled from 5 different travel demand models used within the project corridors.

In the second slide, David presented the auto operating cost assumptions used in the model. He pointed that gas prices will keep pace with inflation and that due to increasing fuel efficiency the increase in fuel costs is negated and costs per mile are virtually unchanged.

On the third slide, David showed that the model has good correlation with actual conditions (within 7% of CDOT Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) volumes) at all locations considered.

On the fourth slide, David explained how value of time differs by household income and by trip type. For instance, the values of local non-work trips are lower than all other trips.

On the fifth slide, David explained the stated preference survey and some key results. He stated that the team was originally hoping for 500 responses but got over a 1000. A PLT member asked how the survey was administered. David stated that it was done on the internet. The people surveyed were selected from a pool of people who had expressed interest in taking surveys.

On the sixth and seventh slides, David provided a summary of stated preference survey results. He pointed out that 61% of respondents had a favorable opinion of a new AGS/Train while only 25% favored adding tolls on I-25 and I-70. He provided a summary of reasons respondents liked or disliked the AGS/Train. The main reason (60%) that the AGS/Train option was not selected was that the fare is too high. A PLT member asked what the planned cost was. David stated that the fare assumed is \$0.35/mile. It was clarified that the cost was actually fare, not the cost of the system. In addition, 24% of respondents would not switch mode no matter what.

On the eighth slide, David presented a partial history of ridership, fares, fare per rider, annual O&M costs and farebox recovery assumptions for the various studies done since 1998. The fare assumed in the analysis is \$24 one-way per passenger to sustain O&M cost of AGS.

On the final slide, David outlined the next steps for the modeling effort. It was noted that the Technical Committee for the modeling effort is different group than the AGS Technical Committee. Additional ridership information should be available for the May PLT meeting.

4. Operating Scenarios

Mike Riggs presented the operating scenarios currently developed by Connetics Transportation Group for the ICS. The current scenarios assume 18 hour operation per day. There are six scenarios that have different routing through the Denver Metro area. Outside the Denver Metro area, the six scenarios are the same and are for the high speed rail alignment in the I-70 Mountain Corridor. Mike explained that there is a Basic Frequency Service Plan and a Capacity Based Frequency Service Plan. The latter was developed to recognize the need to have an AGS peak hour capacity of 4,900 passengers per hour by 2035.

Mike explained each of the six operating scenarios. For the operating scenario C-1, which shares track with RTD in the Denver Metro area, one PLT member objected to including it as it precluded a maglev system for the AGS. It was explained that this scenario was included to be able to compare it with the other scenarios and that when modeling it for AGS, there would need to be a transfer in Golden for maglev alternative.

Mike concluded by stating that operating scenarios still need to be developed for the maglev alignments. The scenarios would need to include a standalone AGS plus AGS with connection to DIA (but no I-25).

5. Request for Financial Information and Funding/Financing Workgroup Report Out

Pamela Bailey-Campbell explained that the Funding & Financial Workgroup met on April 8. PLT members Flo Raitano, Mary Jane Loevlie, Tim Mauck and Tom Breslin attended.

Pamela presented the goals of the RFFI. She clarified that it is intended to require a low effort for financiers and concessionaires to respond. It is not a request for any concessionaires to propose to build the system but will help the AGS team determine what needs to be done to determine financial feasibility. She provided a schedule for development of the RFFI. The goal is to get the responses back by July 1, 2013.

She noted that the AGS team will be notifying financier and concessionaires about the impending RFFI in mid-April. A PLT member asked who we would be sending it out to. Pamela responded that we developed a pretty comprehensive list when we were starting the project and had made contact with most of them through the industry webinars

Pamela explained that the RFFI would provide the responders with information about the AGS including information on ridership, alignments, cost estimates, preliminary funding assumptions, level of local government support and level of recreation and business industry support. Mike suggested it would be good to get a letter of support from USFS and individual members of I-70 Coalition. Carol Kruse of USFS said that it was possible. She also stated that the current thinking is that legislative action may be required for permitting in both roadless area and wilderness area, even if the alignment was in a tunnel. She also stated that Bureau of Land Management (BLM) would have jurisdiction over any tunnels across federal lands. It was also decided that David Krutsinger or Mike Riggs would attend I-70 Coalition meeting on April 11 and request a letter of support from the I-70 Coalition. Ideally, letters of support are needed by May 17.

Pamela then shared the possible questions that will be asked in the RFFI. She then requested input from the PLT as to additional questions or which questions they thought were most important.

One PLT member thought the question related to what the delivery structure (DBFMO, DBF + M&O separated) was most important. Another key question is whether concessionaires would be interested in joint investment in AGS and ICS. Another PLT member thought that the question related to what conditions under which the concessionaire would take on farebox risk to cover O&M was important. A member of the public suggested that freight be included in the question about what additional types and levels of revenue could be generated to fund the project. The same person also suggested we ask a question as to who should set the fares and how the fares should be controlled.

David Krutsinger then discussed possible funding options. He began by explaining that like federal gas tax revenues, state gas tax revenues are also shrinking. He informed the PLT about MPACT 64 that has been formed to investigate a vote to raise the state sales tax by 0.7%. It would have a 10 to 15 year horizon and would generate about \$600 million a year. Of that, \$200 million would go to transit with \$120 million to RTD and the remaining \$80 million to CDOT and all other transit agencies. This is insufficient for the AGS, which needs \$300 to \$400 million per year for the MOS. Also, a sunset in 10 to 15 years would not work for AGS which would need to be funded over a longer time frame.

David then asked the question of whether the three counties (Jefferson, Clear Creek and Summit) within the MOS would be willing to commit 10% of the project costs. He noted that Eagle County is not within the MOS as it only goes from Golden/Jeff Co to Summit County. A representative of Jefferson County pointed out that much of the county has no ties to I-70 so that may be problematic. Discussion ensued as to what the commitment would need to be and it was suggested that right-of-way, development of stations, earmarking of developer fees or special use taxes, etc. related to TOD around stations could be used towards the 10%.

David then provided some input made by the ICS PLT regarding the AGS funding. In particular, the metro Denver counties feel that RTD must be completed first and that they have mixed opinions about value capture and local taxes used to fund AGS (or even ICS). Some revenue sharing might be possible if new TOD creates additional dollars. A key element of funding any HST project is that the eight metro Denver counties are needed to generate sufficient revenue.

One PLT member pointed out that population in mountain communities is much greater than full time residents and that majority of population is visitors from Front Range. They also pointed out that mountain real estate is prime real estate.

6. Land Use/Station Meeting Update

Beth Vogelsang presented an update on the land use/station meetings. Since the last PLT, the AGS team met with Eagle County on March 25, 2013.

Beth summarized the station locations still being considered for each county. Several new locations have been identified including the Lake Hill site in Summit County adjacent to I-70 between Silverthorne and Frisco and the Trader Creek site, adjacent to I-70 in Avon.

Beth closed by stating the next steps which includes determining ridership for various station locations, estimating parking needs at stations and the third round of county meetings in June.

7. AGS/ICS/Co-Development Project Coordination

Don Ulrich gave an update on the ICS project. He stated:

- PLT Meeting #5 is scheduled for April 17
- Service Plans have been completed for HSR alternative (in mountains)
- Initial O&M costs determined
- Initial modeling runs have been completed and will be presented at 4/17 ICS PLT
- A first cut at benefit/cost analysis has been completed

AGS Feasibility Study
Meeting Notes
PLT Meeting #10
April 10, 2013

Don talked about how the benefit/cost analysis includes the effect of stations on revenue/economy. He stated that the PLT will need to be able to define what benefit stations would have on land value.

Mike Riggs mentioned that the AGS team modeler's have reviewed ICS modeling and made some comments.

Jim Bemelen talked about the I-70 Traffic & Revenue Study. Six proposals were received on April 5. Shortlisting is expected on April 22. The first PLT meeting will be held on April 24 at 9:00 AM at the Idaho Springs Elks Club.

Jim also updated the PLT on the I-70 Peak Period Shoulder Lanes project. The proposals are due April 11, 2013. CDOT expects to receive 4 to 5 proposals. Selection is scheduled for April 24. The first PLT meeting will be held on April 18 at 9:00 AM at CDOT Region 1 office in Golden.

Finally, Jim mentioned that the groundbreaking for the Twin Tunnels project is scheduled for 12:30 PM on April 16, 2013.

8. Conclusion, Final Remarks & Next Steps

Next PLT Meeting will be May 8, 2013 in Eagle County. Exact location to be determined. Topics will include ridership estimates and preliminary cost estimates.

The next Funding/Financing Workgroup meeting will be May 2, 2013 at CDOT Headquarters.