

Meeting Type & Number: PLT Meeting #3
Meeting Date: June 13, 2012
Meeting Time: 9:00 AM to 12:00 PM
Location: Idaho Springs Elks Club
Prepared by: Mike Riggs/Andrea Cunningham
Date published: June 21, 2012
Attendees:

Attendees (* - PLT Member, ** - PLT Alternate)		
Pete Runyon, Eagle County*	Stephanie Thomas, Colorado Environmental Coalition*	Flo Raitano, Summit County*
Kevin O'Malley, I-70 Coalition*	Mary Jane Loevlie, I-70 Coalition*	Janice Finch, City and County of Denver, Mayor's Office**
Tom Breslin, Clear Creek County*	Maria D'Andrea, Jefferson County*	Peter Kozinski, CDOT R1*
Angie Drumm, CDOT OPGR*	David Krutsinger, CDOT DTR*	Mike Riggs, AZTEC/TYPSA USA*
Mark Imhoff, CDOT DTR	Tracey MacDonald, CDOT DTR	James Bemelen, CDOT R1
Scott McKenzie, AZTEC/TYPSA USA	Andy Mountain, GBSM	Beth Vogelsang, O&V Consulting
Miller Hudson, CIFGA	Tim Mauck, Clear Creek County	Anne Callison, American Maglev
Andrea Cunningham, GBSM	Jack Morgan, Mayor Idaho Springs	Rafael Moran, TYPSA
José Luis Arevalo, TYPSA	Don Ulrich, CH2M Hill	Helen Bushnell
R. Jack Panter, ET3	Thomas Gerber, ET3	Dan Oster, ET3
Brenda Oster, ET3	Daryl Oster, ET3	Danny Katz, COPIRG

1. Introduction to the Meeting

David Krutsinger opened the meeting and provided brief recap of the technical committee meetings occurring throughout the week. Mike Riggs welcomed the PLT and Andy Mountain began the PLT introductions. All attendees introduced themselves.

Mike reviewed the meeting agenda and outlined the meeting objectives, which included:

- Endorse Project Work Plan
- Endorse Stakeholder Involvement Plan
- Provide update on AGS/ICS/Co-Development project coordination
- Review recommended Draft System Performance & Operational Criteria
- Discuss Draft System Performance & Operational Criteria identified as needing PLT input
- Discuss next PLT meeting

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

2. Public Comment

Helen Bushnell expressed concern about the lack of stakeholder representation on the PLT and asked the PLT to pay attention to voters, especially as they look to public financing options for the AGS.

Daryl Oster from ET3 spoke to ask the PLT to consider a broader perspective for the RFQ than conventional maglev technology. Mike assured Daryl that the AGS team is not married to conventional maglev and aims consider all reasonable technology.

3. Review and Endorse Project Work Plan and Stakeholder Involvement Plan

Given that there were no comments, the PLT endorsed the Project Work Plan. The PLT also endorsed the Stakeholder Involvement Plan pending the deletion of the phrase “to the extent feasible” from a section referencing the AGS study’s incorporation of prior I-70 Mountain Corridor studies.

4. AGS/ICS/Co-Development Project Coordination

Don Ulrich presented an overview of the ICS goals, schedule, public process and coordination with AGS. Key areas of discussion and input from the PLT included:

- A high level of coordination between AGS and ICS
- AGS representation on the ICS PLT and vice-versa
- Assumptions for the ridership model
- Phased modeling process
- Public input

Additionally, Beth Vogelsang distributed a three-month schedule highlighting the coordination between ICS and AGS. She explained that the summer would be focused on criteria, shaping the RFQ, PLT meetings and public workshops. Mary Jane Lovelie and Flo Raitano were recommended and confirmed by the PLT to also sit on the ICS PLT.

5. Review Draft System Performance and Operational Criteria

Andy Mountain outlined the Draft System Performance & Operational Criteria review process and indicated that the CE Consensus Recommendations were used as a starting point.

Mike Riggs gave a brief overview of the technical committee meetings and outlined three tiers of criteria that were developed:

- **Tier 1:** Criteria that needed to be discussed at the PLT or CE level
- **Tier 2:** Criteria that has not been completed or where the technical committee requested PLT involvement
- **Tier 3:** Criteria that has been completed or will be completed when consultants gather more data.

In Tier 1, the following criteria were discussed:

- **Alignment:** The PLT indicated that the stations locations are the driving factors for alignment. They concluded that the station locations were the most important criterion, not where the AGS sits in relation to I-70.
- **Triggers in the ROD:** The PLT indicated that 2025 was meant to be a guide, not a drop-dead date. The PLT explained that the CE did not intend for the maximum program of highway improvements to be triggered if the AGS was deemed feasible before 2025, but

not fully constructed and operational. They agreed that the Consultant team should challenge the industry to complete the AGS by 2025. If an industry team could not meet that goal, they should propose when and how they could expect to complete the AGS.

- **Termini:** The PLT agreed that incremental development of the AGS would be acceptable and commented that industry should determine where the first phase should go. The PLT also said that the market should determine when the remainder of the system would be constructed.
- **Station Locations:** The PLT agreed that the AGS must serve the four corridor counties – Jeffco, Clear Creek, Summit and Eagle – and that the industry should propose the best solutions to do that. The PLT suggested that the Consultant team go back to the past studies and bring a recommendation to the PLT about station locations in order to offer industry a starting point. Noting that Summit County has different considerations because it is a circular county while the others are linear, it was suggested and agreed upon that a separate facilitated meeting of Summit County decision makers be convened to determine the county’s preferred station location(s).
- **Land Use Considerations:** The PLT agreed that TOD and development rights would be allowed or encouraged around stations depending on the unique needs/situation of each community. The PLT also indicated that rezoning most likely would need to occur. The local communities were also encouraged to begin crafting land use plans for potential station locations if they have not already done so.
- **Right of Way:** The group agreed that the RFP should assume that CDOT and the local governments would commit to obtaining all necessary ROW prior to the close of the P3 agreement in order to mitigate risk to the concessionaire, noting that ROW is an important asset the local communities can bring to the table.
- **Interface with Existing and Future Transit Systems:** The PLT acknowledged that it would be a responsibility of the local agencies to provide transit systems that would connect from the AGS station to local destinations. They also agreed that the local communities would be responsible for identifying solutions for connecting AGS passengers to other destinations such as trail heads and campgrounds that are not typically served by conventional transit.
- **AGS Governance Authority:** The PLT agreed that the AGS would need to have some level of public oversight asked the AGS team to look into the governance options for further discussion of the details of this. Mary Jane Lovelie noted that the I-70 Coalition was about to become as Transportation Management Organization and that should be considered during the evaluations.
- **Potential System Owner/Operator:** The PLT indicated that they would not support a wholly-owned private system. Rather, they prefer a level of public ownership, like that of a transit authority.

Additional criteria that were discussed included:

- Travel time – it was suggested that this be based on time and not speed. A suggestion was 45 minutes to Frisco and one hour to Vail.

- Giving favorable consideration to a concessionaire that would lease out the proprietary technology to eventually become part of public domain, increasing the capability of the AGS to become part of a national system
- Requiring that proprietary technology be built in Colorado, though there was strong recognition that this could be a severely limiting factor in garnering private-sector interest

At that point, Andy indicated that the PLT covered all the Tier 1 criteria it planned to discuss at this meeting. The full draft criteria would be summarized after the next meeting of the technical committee on June 14 and emailed out to the PLT for comment.

6. Conclusion, Final Remarks and Next Steps

Mike Riggs announced that he would be hosting an Industry Forum/Webinar on June 27 from 9:00 AM to 10:30 AM. Mike also referenced the Industry White Paper and explained the project's informal industry outreach approach.

It was noted that the next PLT meeting would be held at the Frisco Senior Center on July 11.

The objectives of that meeting include:

- Feasibility
- Funding sources, strategies and scenarios
- Industry input
- Endorsement of the Draft System Performance & Operational Criteria

Andy Mountain concluded the meeting by saying that the PLT would receive the Industry White Paper and revised criteria by email after the next technical committee meeting on June 14. He also asked if any PLT members had additional comments or suggestions on criteria that they email Mike.

AGS Feasibility Study
Meeting Notes
PLT Meeting #3
June 13, 2012