



**Project Leadership Team Meeting No. 1**  
**Advanced Guideway System Feasibility Study**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**September 15, 2011**  
**12:00 - 2:00 PM**  
**North Branch Library-Blue River Room**  
**651 Center Circle, Silverthorne, CO**

<b>PTL Members Present</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>PLT Members Present</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
Scott Weeks (Phone)	x		Tom Breslin	x	
Peter Runyon	x		Maria DeAndrea	x	
Eva Wilson	x		Mary Jane Loevlie	x	
Stephanie Thomas	x		Crissy Fanganello	x	
Flo Raitano	x		Kevin O'Malley	x	
Michael Penny	x		Cynthia Neely (Alternate)		x
Sara Cassidy	x		Bonnie Petersen		x

**CDOT Present**

DTR: Mark Imhoff, Wendy Wallach, Robin Foote  
 Region 1: Tony DeVito, Jim Bemelen, Belinda Arbogast  
 Region 3: Martha Miller

**FHWA Region 8 Present**

Melinda Urban (Phone)  
 Stephanie Gibson (Phone)  
 Kevin Wright (Phone)

**Others in Attendance:** Miller Hudson

**I. Call to order**

Wendy Wallach called to order the Project Leadership Team Meeting No. 1 at 12:05 pm on September 15, 2011, in the North Branch Library Blue River Room.

**II. Agenda items**

1. **Introductions:** Wendy opened the meeting with a brief discussion of the Request for Consultant Proposals and thanked those that submitted comments. Wendy reminded the group that as they work on the scope, the approach was to keep it at a high level. She welcomed new members and briefly went over background on approach to scope that occurred before this meeting. CDOT has met with the stakeholders twice before to define approach and the scope tries to capture that approach.
2. **Changes to Project Leadership Team:** Mary Jane Loevlie announced the passing of Doug Lehman, Rocky Mountain Rail Authority; Wendy announced that Michael Penny would be leaving in two weeks, but would be replaced by Kevin O' Malley. Members of the team felt that Doug should be replaced, and it may be helpful if this person could double as a representative for the Front Range Corridor (I-25) as well. . **Mary Jane will provide a list of possible replacement candidates to Wendy.**
3. **Brief Review of PLT Commitments:** The last meeting covered the PLT mission, roles, and responsibilities. Jim Bemelen reminded the PLT they were not the decision makers; however, the

group would help ensure that the I-70 Mountain Corridor Content Sensitive Solutions (CSS) was integrated into the program decision process and goals. Once the consultants are selected they will assist the PLT. The PLT will not make decisions but will enable and define the decision-making process while championing the CSS process. Wendy added this is the first formal PLT and all meetings are open to the public. However only those on the PLT will participate in the “formal” conversation. There will be open houses during the course of the study.

Wendy discussed PLT etiquette for communication regarding communication between PLT members and regarding the DRAFT Request for Consultant Proposals. She stated a preference to discuss topics face to face and be inclusive, however items discussed at the PLT should be vetted within the group first and should not be shared with outsiders until the group together decides it is appropriate. Tony DeVito reminded the PLT they are an extension of CDOT staff, and as such the procurement rules must apply. We must be very careful who we talk to or share information with; this will preclude any companies grieving the procurement and selection process. Kevin wanted to confirm that the PLT should not be discussing the proposal with possible consultants. Tony stated it would be okay to discuss the scope with consultants but do not provide technical details. If the scope gets released prematurely, it could jeopardize the project process. Mark Imhoff agreed that general information is fine but not technical information. Keep it at a high level and do not share the specific tasks. Once the RFP has been posted, all discussions with consultants should end.

Regarding the scope when redistributed should include language in email and on scope about confidentiality.

Stephanie Thomas asked if this was the DRAFT Request for Proposal; the answer is yes. Mary Jane wanted to make sure we are not missing anything relevant from the scope, she added there is a lot of institutional knowledge in this room and it should be included in scope. Mark agreed and reiterated that the intent is to keep the RFP scope more general until we get a Consultant “on-board”; the first task in this scope is to develop a detailed plan. The PLT will have the opportunity to assist with the detailed work plan. Eva Wilson stated she shares the PLT minutes with others and the group agreed this is appropriate.

4. **Review Draft Scope:** The group agreed to review scope section by section and discuss general comments. Following are overarching comments regarding the draft scope:

- It's too long, not clear, and not concise.
- Include addendum that references all studies in the scope.
  - Include language that the consultant *will* review all studies.
- Replace the Introduction with a short concise statement regarding Purpose and Intent of the AGS study.
- Include a paragraph to clarify in the scope the relationship between the Inter -regional Connectivity Study and AGS Study.
- Include a generalized schedule and duration for study within the scope.

## DISCUSSION:

- The group commented that the termini for the study are not adequate. The Mountain Corridor should extend to DIA. Mark noted we are bound to these termini as they were determined by the I-70 Mountain Corridor PEIS (March 2011). Mark said that no one is thinking about a rail line terminating at C470 – most envision it going to Denver and DIA. The termini of the Mountain Corridor will extend to DIA in the Colorado Regional Interconnectivity Study (ICS).
- Members also had a concern about technology and alignment being the primary considerations. The Rocky Mountain Rail Authority study looked at both in depth. They do not want to reinvent the wheel. Mark addressed the concern by stating that there are no systems in mountainous terrain (around world except China). There are concerns by others outside of the PLT about whether these are actual technologies that can be delivered. Determining feasibility will be a multi-step process; this is the first step in an iterative process.

## QUESTION: What is the relation between the Interconnectivity Study (ICS) and the AGS study?

- As the RMRA Study concluded High Speed Rail is feasible along the Front Range Corridor (I-25) and the Mountain Corridor. The ICS will examine both of these corridors in conjunction with each other at a greater level of detail. The ICS will focus on the Front Range and ridership for both corridors. The focus of ridership is important to determine the ability to finance the project. As the AGS study progresses the information will be fed to the ICS to determine ridership for both corridors. This will provide us a better understanding of cost associated with getting a system to the mountains and the ability to recover that cost.
- Members expressed some concern that unless “cross-pollination” occurs between the two teams the efforts won’t be successful.

Wendy clarified that the two teams will be coordinated. Perhaps an ICS representative will attend these PLT’s. Mark suggested a joint PLT meeting and steering committee meeting to get “everything on the table”.

## RECOMMENDATION: Include a paragraph to clarify this approach in the scope

- DISCUSSION: Peter Runyon asked if there was any value to including criteria such as, for example, “direct service to Vail Valley”. Mark believes eventually that the system should go to Grand Junction and further (national system). We will not be precluding these types of considerations in the study.
- The PLT group suggested that the scope include timelines and schedule, at least at a general level; for example, 18 months. Mark answered that we want to hear what the consultants say regarding schedule. The DTR intends to fully engage the industry and

consultants to see what is entailed for completing the study deliverables. It would be hard for CDOT to gauge an accurate schedule just yet.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Include a general schedule and proposed duration in the scope.

- There was reluctance on behalf of some of the PLT members on being able to find such a specialized consultant team which has the qualifications and can remain objective. Mark responded that we think we can find that candidate, and noted that there is not a lack of people with a solution.
- Some members are worried about the format of the scope and too much emphasis on Technology and Alignment. It was suggested a consultant with financing background make the decision on whether the recommended technology and alignment would be attractive to financiers during this time period. Mark reminded people that almost every engineering project has phases, including, planning, development of project concept, and implementation. He also said CDOT needs to develop a better understanding of the I-70-corridor from an alignment perspective like how does it interface with a highway system? We need this information to coordinate with High Performance Transportation Enterprise (HPTE) to prepare or entice private entities.
- What if there were three technologies selected and what if they all work? Would we advocate the best of all three modes? Mark was thinking that we want to retain as many of the modes if they meet objectives, this gives us more flexibility moving forward.

#### COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA E-MAIL

Following are the comments we received by email from the team prior to this meeting.

- 1) Any AGS "System" that doesn't terminate at DIA is doomed to economic failure. Call me crazy, but no one flying in to Denver wants to get on a light rail and then transfer to an AGS with all of their ski equipment. It won't happen.
- 2) Don't forget that the negative "vote" on CIFGA was taken less than 2 months after 9/11. No one wanted to make such an investment with such an uncertain future
- 3) We at CEC wholeheartedly agree that the high speed AGS system needs to connect to DIA, as, in the real world, people are not going to want to transfer with all their gear and if they have to do this to ride the system, they will likely choose to drive. If we do not build a system that competes with the automobile and encourages people to get out of their cars and ride instead, we are making a big mistake.
- 4) The Coalition Land Use Study should be recognized. The other basic is that the CE recommendation of AGS was based on the performance criteria developed by the I 70 Coalition Technical Committee. Are those criteria being maintained?

Strengthen the section that indicates this is NOT an engineering study, strengthen the section that requires evaluation of funding possibilities, add language about Land Use study, clarify use of performance criteria referenced in the "preferred" alternative, acknowledge DIA termini issue as much as possible. Other general thoughts: discuss the challenge to the Department of Transit and Rail in funding and staff in relation to the rest of CDOT, request PLT individual assistance in the upward public process and engaging Don Hunt and Hickenlooper and legislators (Flo is good at this) And lastly, an RFP is only good if the chosen consultant really gets it (witness the CSS success, and the RMRA difficulties).The intangible will matter.

- 5) It is too long, not clear, certainly not concise and there doesn't appear to be a definitive statement about whether CDOT is looking for an individual consultant or a big engineering firm (references to "...certain tasks must be done by Licensed Professional Engineers or Professional Land Surveyors who are registered with the Colorado State Board of Registration for Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors.") Not sure what is being communicated with that. In addition, there is not even one mention of the Coalition's Land Use Transit Planning study which already had pretty decent public outreach on station location and a serious look at land use requirements. The PEIS and CE pretty much defined the performance standards. Agree with other commenters on the end points for this study. I have serious concerns that by passing it off to the Interconnectivity study that the corridor needs will be totally ignored and interoperability will be given lip service.

**5. Group Selection of PLT Member for Participation in Consultant Selection:**

- Two Tier Process
  - Solicitation considerations
  - Evaluation
- Recommend PLT help with draft scope
  - Yes, but only through track changes
  - Wendy has enough information and will reorganize by Friday, September 23
  - Flo, Eva, Cindy, Belinda will review and send edits
- PLT Reviews all proposals
- Consultant Selection
  - Division of Transit and Rail: Mark Imhoff (1)
  - Region 1: Tony DeVito (1)
  - Government Relations (1)
  - PLT: Flo Raitano and Michael Penny (2)
  - Create short list
  - Interview
  - Select

**6. Next Steps/Schedule:**

- Action Items
  - Wendy sends draft RFP to Flo, Eva, Cindy, and Belinda by Friday, September 23
  - Comments requested from Flo, Eva, Cindy, and Belinda by Friday, September 30

**III. Adjournment**

Wendy adjourned the meeting at 2:00 pm.

Minutes submitted by: Robin Foote

Minutes approved by: Wendy Wallach