



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

AGS Feasibility Study Meeting Notes

Meeting Type & Number: PLT Meeting #4
Meeting Date: July 18, 2012
Meeting Time: 9:00 AM to 12:00 PM
Location: Idaho Springs Elks Club
Prepared by: Mike Riggs
Date published: July 27, 2012 (Revised)
Attendees:

Attendees (* - PLT Member, ** - PLT Alternate)		
Jacob Riger, DRCOG* (Phone)	Kevin O'Malley, I-70 Coalition*	Flo Raitano, Summit County*
Maria D'Andrea, Jefferson County*	Mary Jane Loevlie, I-70 Coalition*	Janice Finch, City and County of Denver, Mayor's Office**
Cynthia Neely, Clear Creek County**	David Krutsinger, CDOT DTR*	Peter Kozinski, CDOT R1*
Tracey MacDonald, CDOT DTR	Belinda Arbogast, CDOT R1	Mike Riggs, AZTEC/TYPASA USA*
Tom Underwood, Jacobs	Andy Mountain, GBSM	Beth Vogelsang, O&V Consulting
Miller Hudson, CIFGA	Tim Mauck, Clear Creek County	Anne Callison, American Maglev
Brenda Oster, ET3	Pamela Bailey-Campbell, Jacobs	Dan Oster, ET3
Danny Katz, COPIRG	Daryl Oster, ET3	Jerry Mugg, HNTB
R. Jack Panter, ET3	Andrew Matusak, Baker	Dick Marshall, NV66
Scott Brown, ET3	Ralph Trapani, Parsons	Steve Smith, Parsons

1. Introduction

Mike Riggs opened by presenting the agenda for the meeting. The members of the PLT and others in attendance introduced themselves.

Mike reviewed the meeting agenda and outlined the meeting objectives:

- Review and discuss Land Use and Station Criteria
- Review and discuss Industry Comments on Draft System Performance and Operational Criteria
- Review and discuss Draft RFQ
- Provide update on AGS/ICS/Co-Development Project Coordination
- Discuss next PLT meeting

Andy Mountain provided an update on the project website, media outreach and public launch.

2. Public Comment

Daryl Oster (ET3) urged the PLT to not limit technology discussion to a narrow focus of only high-speed rail and reminded the PLT that this process is public.

Kevin O'Malley asked the PLT if there was anything in the ROD that precludes anyone from responding to the RFP that will be sent out. Mike said that some criteria may limit some technology discussions and the PLT may want to rethink this language to be more inclusive of emerging technologies.

Mary Jane Lovelie commented that the CDOT press release was too focused on high-speed rail and neglected to mention 21st century technologies. Mary Jane said the PLT should be talking about all technologies not just FRA compliant ones.

AGS Feasibility Study
Meeting Notes
PLT Meeting #4
July 18, 2012

Jack Panter (ET3) asked if the PLT accepted Harry Dale's Rocky Mountain Rail Authority study as legitimate or just another study. Though it had some useful information, Mike said there were flaws and inaccuracies in it. Mr. Panter also asked if there were plans to connect more of the I-70 corridor than just Eagle County Airport and Denver. Mike said the project could eventually connect through Grand Junction, but there isn't a strong demand for travel from Grand Junction to Eagle County.

Anne Callison (America Maglev) noted that in an American Public Transportation Association study, neither Denver nor Colorado was mentioned as being the 11th state applying to the high-speed rail corridor. David said CDOT is working on it, but FRA has indicated that CDOT needs to have a clear definition of feasibility and financing before they are ready to put Colorado or the Rocky Mountain region on the national map. CDOT will conclude the ICS and AGS Feasibility studies before action is taken.

3. Debrief from the HSR Conference attendees

Attendees of the HSR Conference:

- David Krutsinger
- Mark Imhoff
- Kevin O'Malley
- Tom Breslin
- Tim Mauck

David Krutsinger gave a brief overview of the conference. He said the conference, held every two years, featured a broad program and was not technology specific. David said he attended financing sessions and was able to talk to the Japanese maglev team, concessionaires and car manufacturers.

Countries around the world are looking at transit, air and car travel between major destinations, and see high-speed transit as a 20-40 percent mode share in successful corridors. Station development is an important component of the financing package in many countries. In Hong Kong, 50 percent of the costs are being paid for by development rights.

Concerns have arisen that the RFQ and RFP process currently in place may not elicit the amount or proper quality of responses from industry. Kevin O'Malley reported there is some concern from concessionaires about getting involved in a program they are not confident Colorado will pursue. They are concerned that CDOT may not have enough "skin in the game" to be taken seriously. Builders have concerns about not having a defined route or preferred technology.

Tim Mauck pointed out that the I-70 corridor is not an existing rail corridor (at least east on Minturn) and is therefore not a retrofit, but a new corridor. This may be critical when dealing with FRA.

Discussion also ensued about termini of the AGS. It needs to be clearly stated that while the project is looking at C-470 to Eagle County Regional Airport, the AGS need to originate at Denver International Airport.

David said the process currently asks for industry to form teams to address technology, alignment and financing. He suggested breaking out technology or alignment as the first RFQ/RFP, and then use those responses to move the project forward.

Mike Riggs suggested the PLT gather necessary information to group technology, alignment and financing options together to increase responses.

Peter Kozinski recommended the formation of an appropriate technical team to look at the current structure of the RFQ and RFP process and investigate any alternatives to increase responses from industry. No changes will be made to the RFQ or RFP process until the technical team has been formed and addresses the issue.

4. Land Use and Station Criteria

Beth Vogelsang presented a framework for the criteria that should be used to inform local agencies about the location of potential AGS stations. She showed examples of stations and land requirements to fit them. Parking requirements for stations and the differences between surface parking and parking garages were also discussed.

Because each station community will be able to provide input in the design and customization of its station, it is difficult to estimate size requirements and cost per station. Land requirements for power stations, substations and maintenance facilities were also presented to the PLT.

Questions pertaining to connectivity with Denver and DIA along with potential freight capabilities were addressed by Beth. Beth will develop a range of station alternatives and related visual illustrations to use in discussion with the PLT and future jurisdictional meetings..

5. Conclusions, Final Remarks and Next Steps

Because of time constraints, all other agenda items were pushed to the next meeting. Mike Riggs asked the PLT to review the White Paper and provide feedback to him.

The next PLT meeting is scheduled for August 8.