



## Meeting Notes

**Meeting:** RMRA Feasibility Study Steering Committee

**Date/Time:** January 23, 2008/9:30a.m.

**Location:** Jefferson County Courts

**Attendees:**

### Committee Members

David Averill, North Front Range  
MPO

Janice Finch, Denver Public Works

Doug Lehnen, Castle Rock

Bill Moore, City of Pueblo

Terence Quinn, Douglas County

Kirk Strand, RTD FasTracks

Charles Choi, C.Y. Choi & Associates

Gregg Hall, Vail Public Works

Tom Mauser, CDOT

Richard Morton, Castle Rock

George Scheuermstuhl, DRCOG  
(phone)

Harry Dale, Clear Creek County

Karla Harding, Town of Timnath

Diane Mitch-Bush, Routt County  
(phone)

Thad Noll, Summit County (phone)

Greg Schroeder, Eagle County

### Others

Harold Anderson, City of Lone Tree

Bob Briggs, City of Westminster

John Firouzi, City of Arvada

David Johnson, Eagle County Transit

Samuel Knudson, Town of Colorado  
Springs

Andy Mountain, GBSM

Mik Saccomano, Brotherhood of  
Locomotive Engineering

Brian Vitulli, Pikes Peak Area COG

Mark Boggs, PBS&J

Gail Drumm, Monument

Steve Glueck, City of Golden

Chip Kraft, TEMS

Alex Metcalf, TEMS

Chris Primus, Jacobs Engineering

Joe Siccardi, Figg Bridge Engineers

James Wilmesher, Brotherhood of  
Locomotive Engineering

Larry Brooks, Town of Avon

Krista Ernst

John Hoffman, RFTA

Diane Kielty, Kielty Diversified

Don Moore

Charlie Quandel, Quandel  
Construction

James Thomas

### Others, By Phone

Juan Robles, CDOT

Piper Foster

Tom H\_\_\_, Glenwood Springs (phone)

### Agenda Items:

1. Introductions & Roll Call
2. Corrections to Minutes
3. Chairman's Report
4. Feasibility Study Report – Alex Metcalf, TEMS team
  - a. Work schedule update
  - b. Document status
  - c. Public Involvement Update
  - d. Final Alternatives Scenarios
  - e. Alternatives Analysis
    - i. Engineering Update: Alignments Development Status
    - ii. Operations Update
    - iii. Ridership Model Development
5. Document Availability Update
6. Peer Review Panel Update
7. Upcoming Meetings and Presentations
  - a. I-25 North EIS team – January 21
  - b. RTD/Planning – January 22

- c. R2C2 team – January 23
  - d. I-70 Coalition/USFS – January 29
  - e. Alternatives Workshop – March 28, all day (tentative)
8. Other Business
9. Next Steering Committee Meeting: February 27, **9:00 am**, JeffCo Admin. Bldg.
- 

### 1. Introductions & Roll Call

Self-introductions were made. Attendees are noted above.

### 2. Corrections to Minutes

Minutes from the November 21, 2008 meeting were approved subject to corrections noted by Diane Mitsch-Bush regarding stations on the Steamboat Springs spur. (Corrections have been made and posted to web site.)

### 3. Chairman's Report

Chairman Dale provided a general update of recent activities on behalf of RMRA.

### 4. Feasibility Study Report

Alex Metcalf led the TEMS team in an update on study progress, using a PowerPoint presentation. Copies of the presentation were made available to FSSC members prior to the meeting.

- a. **Work Schedule Update:** Alex provided an update of the study schedule, reporting that the overall schedule has slipped by about one month due to the need to evaluate more alternatives than were originally anticipated, and the addition of a second alternatives workshop and a third peer panel review, of the travel demand model. He announced that an Alternatives Analysis workshop has been tentatively scheduled for March 28 in the Jefferson County Administration Building.
- b. **Document Status:** Alex reported that the following reports have been posted to the web site: Existing Conditions, Methodology, Scoping, and Peer Review Panel Session 1. The Alternatives Development technical report, which had been provided to the FSSC for comment, is under final review, awaiting final FSSC acceptance of the alternatives.
- c. **Public Involvement/Outreach:** Andy Mountain provided an update on recent and upcoming public involvement activities. He reported that the team was pleased with the participation and input received at the three Corridor Input Team meetings held in December, in Frisco, Denver, and Ft. Collins/Pueblo. At all meetings, there was good general support of the range of alternatives under consideration. At the I-70 Corridor meeting, a suggestion was made that a workshop to review the evaluation of the preliminary alternative scenarios could be very helpful; the TEMS team has modified its schedule to include this workshop. Additional information specific to each meeting was presented in the PowerPoint presentation. Andy reported that the study and the corridor meetings were getting good media coverage, both print and TV.
- d. **Final Alternatives Scenarios:** As the last element of his PI update, Andy presented the final version of the preliminary alternative scenarios that are to be screened by the TEMS team. He indicated the study team's confidence that final scenarios reflect input received from the FSSC's Alternatives workshop, Peer Review Panel input, Corridor Input Teams input, consultant and RMRA management team deliberations, and coordination with multiple ongoing

highway corridor studies. Results of the initial screening are to be reported back to the FSSC at the March 28 Alternatives Analysis workshop. Mark Boggs noted that the matrix is intended to establish a framework within which the effectiveness of the range of alternative technology and route alternatives can be tested, and from which a smaller number of alternatives can be retained and revised for more detailed evaluation. Alex Metcalf reminded the committee that an E-470 route from south Denver to DIA would be evaluated. While no formal vote was taken, no dissent was expressed regarding the final scenarios.

- e. **Alternative Analysis:** Charlie Quandel, Chip Kraft, and Alex provided an update on ongoing alternatives analysis, reporting on engineering, operating plans, and ridership/revenue, respectively.

**Engineering:** Charlie reported that geometry has been prepared for the greenfield/unconstrained routes along both I-25 and I-70, but indicated that additional field investigations were being conducted in several sections of the corridors. He confirmed that the team is looking at an E-470 route to DIA. Responsive to a question, Charlie reminded the committee that in the South I-25 corridor, there is not a I-25 ROW route, due to geometric constraints in that corridor and the opportunity for “greenfield” routes that would ease the geometric constraints.

**Operations:** Chip reported that initial runs have been conducted for several of the technology/route scenarios. This is providing initial travel time comparisons and has allowed coordination between engineering and operations to make adjustments to routes to smooth the operating speeds.

Following Chip’s report of preliminary I-25 operating results, there were questions regarding some of the costing assumptions being used regarding R2C2. Harry Dale emphasized that importance of reflecting any R2C2 costs that might be allocated to the HSR program, as this could have significant impacts on the overall financial feasibility of the program.

It was observed that in the I-70 corridor, the travel times reported by Chip resulted in average speeds of less than 90 mph, and the question was asked as to how this would affect efforts to reach High Speed Rail designation with FRA. Alex responded that FRA would not require average speeds in excess of 90 mph, only indications that the technology being used would allow these speeds in some sections of the routes.

**Ridership/Revenue:** Alex reported that ridership model development is advancing satisfactorily. The traffic analysis zone structure has been developed, and the team is preparing forecasts of socioeconomic factors that will drive total trip-making forecasts. He indicated that in importing zone data from other studies, the team intends to give priority to data developed by DRCOG, then other MPOs, and finally the ongoing corridor studies.

With regard to the trip tables upon which rail ridership will be based, Alex indicated that the I-70 PEIS trip table will be the basis, but that the team sees opportunity to reduce the size of the matrix approximately six trip purposes. He indicated that the second round of Stated Preference Surveys will be conducted in early February, and that the survey results will be combined with results of the fall surveys to calibrate the mode split module of the model. Concern was

expressed by committee members that opportunities for parcel express should be considered, as well as accurately assessing the impact of trip time delays due to station access and transfers that could result. Alex indicated that these concerns were being taken into account. He also indicated that the impact of oil prices on trip-making and mode selection would be considered at the next meeting.

5. **Document Availability Update:** (this item was reported on by Alex earlier in his presentation.
6. **Peer Review Panel Update:** Mark Boggs reported that there has been no recent panel activity. The next panel session will focus on the ridership model, and will likely occur in late March.
7. **Upcoming Meetings and Presentations:** The committee was advised of upcoming meetings and invited to participate as available and interested.
8. **Other Business:** Harry Dale advised that the I-70 Coalition has invited a parallel technology analysis by a party that is pursuing development of a new fixed guideway technology that is intended to allow higher performance within the constraints of existing highway corridors. The initiative, known as Guideway 21, is working with other states in an effort to build a broad coalition for pursuing this technology.
9. **Next meeting:** It was announced that the next meeting would be held on February 27 at the Jefferson County Administration Building, beginning at 9:00 a.m.

Action Item	Responsibility	Deadline/Status
None		

S:\Tranproj\100000222-RMRA PMC\Steering Comm\012309\RMRA FSSC min 012309.doc

Please contact **Mark Boggs** with **PBS&J** at **303-221-7275** if there are any changes or questions with these meeting notes. These notes will be considered final unless comments are received within seven days of distribution. Although comments will be incorporated, as appropriate, only major revisions will be redistributed.