



6000 E EVANS AVENUE, SUITE 1-428
 DENVER, CO 80222
 (720) 708-4176

AGS FEASIBILITY STUDY Meeting Notes

Meeting Type & Number: Project Leadership Team Meeting 1 (Kickoff)
Meeting Date: April 11, 2012
Meeting Time: 9:00 AM to 12:00 PM
Location: Silverthorne Town Hall – Schmidt Room
Purpose: Develop Context Statement, Core Values and Critical Success Factors
Prepared by: Mike Riggs
Date published: April 17, 2012

Attendees (* - PLT Member, ** - PLT Alternate)		
Andy Mountain, GBSM (AGS Team)	Flo Raitano, Summit County *	Peter Kozinski, CDOT Region 1 *
Angie Drumm, CDOT Office of Policy & Government Relations *	Jacob Riger, DRCOG *	Peter Runyon, Eagle County *
Anne Callison, America Maglev (Public)	James Bemelen, CDOT Region 1	Randy Jensen, FHWA (by phone)
Belinda Arbogast, CDOT Region 1	Kevin O'Malley, I-70 Coalition *	Sara Cassidy, Denver Chamber of Commerce * (by phone)
Beth Vogelsang, O&V Consulting (AGS Team)	Mark Imhoff, CDOT Division of Transit & Rail	Scott McKenzie, AZTEC/TYPESA USA (AGS Team)
Craig Gaskill, Jacobs (AGS Team)	Martha Miller, CDOT Region 3 *	Stephanie Thomas, Colorado Environmental Coalition * (by phone)
Cindy Neely, Clear Creek County **	Mary Jane Loevlie, I-70 Coalition *	Tom Breslin, Clear Creek County *
David Krutsinger, CDOT Division of Transit & Rail *	Mike Riggs, AZTEC/TYPESA USA (AGS Team Project Manager)*	Tom Underwood, Jacobs (AGS TEAM)
Eva Wilson, Eagle County **	Nick Farber, Colorado High Performance Transportation Enterprise	Tracey MacDonald, CDOT Division of Transit & Rail

I. Call to Order

Meeting began at approximately 9:15 AM. Andy Mountain noted that meeting materials including sign-in sheet, agenda, copy of PowerPoint (PP) presentation and handout on AZTEC/TYPESA team were provided and were being passed around. Mark Imhoff gave brief overview of CDOT makeup of PLT. Includes representatives from Region 1 (Peter Kozinski), Region 3 (Martha Miller), Division of Rail & Transit (David Krutsinger) and Office of Policy & Government Relations (Angie Drumm). Mark and Tony Devito (Region 1) are not PLT members. They are reserved for issue resolution through an escalation process.

David Krutsinger then welcomed the PLT.

II. Agenda

1. Welcome and Opening Remarks

David Krutsinger welcomed the PLT and made a brief opening statement.

2. Introductions

The PLT members present were asked to introduce themselves and give some historical context of their involvement with the I-70 Mountain Corridor. Non-PLT members provided more brief introductions.

Mike Riggs stated that AGS team technical experts will be at June PLT meetings.

3. Agenda Review and Meeting Objectives

Mike Riggs reviewed the agenda for the meeting and provided the meeting objectives, which included:

- Confirm PLT Roles and Responsibilities
- Develop Context Statement
- Initiate Core Values
- Initiate Critical Success Factors

4. PLT Roles & Responsibilities

David addressed PLT Roles & Responsibilities from PP slides. They included:

- Lead the Project
- Champion Context Sensitive Solutions
- Enable Decision Making

In addition, David urged the PLT for timely responses throughout the project to keep the study on-schedule and to maintain respect and trust.

5. Ground Rules

Andy addressed ground rules from PP slide.

Future meeting agendas will have an item for public comments (**Action Item**).

Discussion ensued as to inclusion of experts and alternates in meetings. Decision was that if warranted, they can provide input.

David mentioned that it is important to include Mike Riggs and himself in conversations and emails. If PLT has questions/comments, send them to Mike Riggs with a copy to David, unless it is a question specific to CDOT.

Mike also requested that PLT members try to limit ex parte communications about the AGS with individuals from AGS team who may be working on other I-70 Mountain Corridor projects.

6. Project Scope

Mike presented PP slide with a brief explanation of project scope.

- Approximately 18 month duration
- Use prior work like RMRA and PEIS as starting point - won't recreate the wheel
- Focus on Industry – includes technology providers, constructors, financiers, P3 developers, operation and maintenance providers
- Refine Performance & Operating Criteria – start with criteria established by CE Technical Team and refine/fill in to develop complete technical specifications
- Prepare RFQ – industry will respond with Statements of Qualifications
- Shortlist 3 proposers – based on criteria established as part of process. Stipends will be provided
- Prepare RFP and review Technical Proposals
- AGS Feasibility Study/Implementation Plan is final deliverable

AZTEC/TYPSA team's role is really to be a facilitator. They were selected in part due to their contacts with industry.

The proposers will be provided with all past work done, including alignments, through a data room.

7. Project Overview

Mike presented PP slide:

- 6-step CSS process is foundation for project tasks
- PLT will be actively engaged throughout project
 - Assist in refining and completing system performance & operational criteria
 - Assist in preparing RFQ and shortlist criteria
 - Assist in preparing RFP
 - Endorse process to get to final product
 - Serve as liaison between your constituents and this project

Cyndi Neely requested to add that we include "making sure that the solution is a Context Sensitive Solution".

Mike presented PP slide that showed linkage between 6-step CSS process and AGS project tasks, milestones and deliverables.

Mike indicated that full schedule will be developed within next week and forwarded to PLT (**Action Item**).

Mary Jane asked question about if meeting materials would be posted on website so call-in's could see what is being discussed. Response was that was underway and would be implemented soon (**Action Item**).

8. Desired Outcomes & Actions

Mike presented PP slide with desired outcomes and actions:

- Identify technologies that can meet the system performance & operational criteria
- Complete AGS Feasibility Study & gain consensus on questions of feasibility, cost, ridership, land use & governance
- Identify technological & financial feasibility of AGS in relationship to I-70 Mountain Corridor Record of Decision

This fits well with the triggers in the PEIS.

Flo pointed out that ridership was important for financial feasibility and that ridership was being done by ICS team.

Mike pointed out that there would be close coordination with the ICS team on ridership.

David offered further clarification that reason for ICS doing the modeling was to maximize budget by having one modeler and also because one outcome of RMRA was that I-70 HST needed I-25 HST to be viable.

Flo stated it will be important to have cross coordination between ICS and AGS PLT's. ICS will use steering committee meetings. Mike will attend some ICS steering committee meetings.

Flo wants AGS PLT to receive technical updates so PLT can provide comments and input. Beth is on both teams and can help with this.

Kevin had concern that both AGS and ICS have similar stakeholder involvement to ensure that final results are believable and supportable. Beth indicated that ICS will be following CSS process, even though they are not required to do so.

Suggestion is to add another desired outcome and action (**Action Item**):

- Consistent and close coordination between AGS, ICS and Co-Development Projects

Ridership study will not be an investment grade ridership and revenue study. Investment grade study would be done in next phase after the current AGS study. Mark pointed out that investment grade study is costly and also time sensitive. Needs to be done immediately prior to P3. The ICS/AGS will develop a model that can be used in future for investment grade study. The modeling staff is contractually on the ICS team and serves both corridors, ICS – Pueblo to Ft. Collins and AGS – DIA to Eagle.

Kevin indicated that there is confusion as to what outcome is. He understood that this AGS study would be last step to building AGS, if feasible. If more studies (e.g. investment grade study, Tier 2 NEPA) need to be completed, it needs to be made clear to CDOT transportation commission that money needs to be allocated to the completion of the AGS and it can't be forgotten, unfunded or have funding redirected to other highway improvements. We need to know feasibility, yes or no, at conclusion of study so if future studies (e.g. ridership/revenue, environmental) are needed they have been planned for and funded.

9. Outreach Overview

Andy presented PP slide covering industry engagement:

- Direct outreach in US and Abroad - Outreach will be not only to industry but also to state and federal rail organization and HSR/Maglev industry groups
- Industry Forum/Webinar - Industry forum will be held in June time-frame
- Conferences, advertisements, news releases
- Informal discussions with potential proposers prior to RFQ - Purpose is to tailor RFQ to what industry can provide and what they can't and to attract quality proposers

Mary Jane asked about needing to follow FRA guidelines. Mike responded that at this point, FRA is one of many potential funding agencies and that the AGS study is staying open to all technology and funding possibilities at this time. Mark reiterated that if a feasible technology would fall under FRA criteria, that could open the door for FRA funding and would need to be seriously considered in the next steps.

Peter R. indicated that we could encourage FRA to encompass whatever technology we come up with.

Flo asked if the Co-Development project would impact AGS industry outreach. Mike and Mark responded that the Co-Development may actually help encourage industry to propose as there is a tangible outcome through the Co-Development project.

Andy presented PP slide on PLT engagement:

- 11 meetings (centered around milestones and deliverables)
- Key areas of focus:
 - CSS Process
 - Stakeholder Representation
 - RFQ/RFP Development
 - Final Plan
- Areas for possible technical team input
 - System Operational and Performance Criteria
 - Financial and Institutional Criteria – Institutional can include governance, land use, interface with local transportation network, etc.

Kevin suggested that I-70 Coalition's technical team be involved in the project (**Action Item**).

Andy presented PP slide on public engagement:

- Website Updates – CDOT hosted
- I-70 Coalition Updates – two planned updates
- Elected Official Outreach
- Media Outreach
- Public meetings excluded from scope due to nature of project – use other mediums to provide information

Mary Jane suggested we need to put information out about how AGS and ICS are working together. Beth will develop a plan to make sure this happens (**Action Item**).

Cyndi asked question as to whether the plan should include agencies like FRA, FTA, etc. Andy indicated that they are included throughout.

Kevin talked about the need to do a summary at the end of the meeting, so that there is agreement on what was agreed on at meeting.

10. Critical Success Factors (CSF)

Original agenda had a breakout into two groups. Due to time issues and size of group, it was decided that we would develop critical success factors as a single group.

Andy passed out a list of example CSFs to build on.

Craig facilitated the development of CSFs. He reminded the group that CSFs should not predetermine the outcome of the project. They have nothing to do with criteria.

Group suggestions for CSFs:

- Three responsive RFPs that have viable technology and financial plan
- Long term implementation of the AGS in the I-70 Mountain Corridor and Statewide
- Maintain project budget and schedule
- Affordable or financially feasible solution
- Significant policy level support to move forward
- Investigate all AGS or pertinent technologies
- Garner broad public support
- Public has confidence that we have done a thorough job – confidence in process
- Consider all proposers who can meet criteria
- Show that AGS can contribute to the state's bottom line
- Reduction in travel time
- No re-evaluation of EIS
- Consistent with CE recommendations
- Results should incorporate life cycle costs
- Solution is Context Sensitive
- Very close coordination with ICS and Co-Development projects
- Everyone on PLT understanding the project and what it took to get here
- Recognize that project is not just a transportation project, but includes land use, development, aesthetics, economic development, and protecting environment
- PLT identifies areas of concern, skepticism, lack of confidence in a timely fashion (cost estimate, funding strategies, etc.)
- That PLT continues to support and champion the process
- Defendable, open, honest and transparent
- Clarity in governance (early in process)
- Culture of CDOT, legislature, etc. recognizes this is not a wholly funded CDOT project

CSFs will be revised and emailed to PLT for further review and endorsement (**Action Item**).

11. Context Statement

Craig presented PP slides for Context Statement. It is important to recognize that this is for whole corridor, so Context Statement for corridor is good starting point.

Comments from PLT include:

- The Context Statement needs to include recognition of the unique challenges and aspects of this corridor.
- Include something about the corridor has national importance.
- Include “technological and financial” feasibility

Context Statement will be revised and emailed to PLT for further review and endorsement (**Action Item**).

David will supply a list of commonalities/coordination between AGS and ICS (**Action Item**).

12. Core Values

Craig presented PP slides for Core Values. Like the Context Statement, the Core Values for the AGS match those of the corridor. Behind each of the main core values are second levels that explain the core values.

Comments from PLT:

- Do mobility and accessibility also cover connectivity? Specifically, no transfers between I-70 and DIA.
- Include “openness, honesty, confidence and transparency” as core value.
- Include “excellence – global model/example” as core value.

Core Values will be revised and emailed to PLT for further review and endorsement (**Action Item**).

13. AGS, ICS and Co-Development Project Coordination

Mike presented PP slide highlighting coordination:

- ICS project will start this month (Notice to Proceed was issued 4/13/2012)
- Tentative initial AGS/ICS meeting in early May
- Co-Development project Statements of Interest due April 23
- High-level consolidated schedule shows relationship between projects

It was suggested and discussed that the AGS PLT needs to be open about their position on the Co-Development project. The CE is involved but not to a large degree (due to confidentiality).

AGS, ICS and Co-Development Project Coordination will be permanent agenda item and meaningful info will be presented (**Action Item**).

14. Conclusions, Final Remarks and Next Steps

Andy provided a wrap-up of accomplishments of meeting (see Action Items).

Next PLT meeting will be May 9. It will have following purposes:

- Endorse Context Statement, Core Values and Critical Success Factors
- Endorse Charter
- Endorse Project Work Plan

AGS Feasibility Study Meeting Notes
PLT Meeting 1 (Kickoff)
April 17, 2012

It was suggested that a new venue be considered. CDOT will check availability of locations in Silverthorne
(Action Item).

Meeting adjourned at approximately 12:15 PM.