Meeting Notes

Meeting: RMRA Feasibility Study Steering Committee
Date/Time: February 27, 2008/9:00 a.m.
Location: Jefferson County Courts
Attendees:

Committee Members
Karla Harding, Town of Timnath  Doug Lehnen, Castle Rock  Tom Mauser, CDOT
Bill Moore, City of Pueblo  Richard Morton, Castle Rock  Gene Putman, City of Thornton
George Scheuernstuhl, DRCOG  Greg Schroeder, Eagle County  Kirk Strand, RTD Fastracks
Wayne Williams, Pikes Peak RTA  (phone)

Others
Harold Anderson, City of Lone Tree  Medill Barnes, Silver Dollar Metro District  Mark Boggs, PBS&J
Larry Brooks, Town of Avon  Dave Downing, City of Westminster  Gail Drumm, Monument
Dorothea Farris, Pitting County  Janice Finch, Denver  Randy Grauberger, PB
Roger Hoffman, Loveland  Chip Kraft, TEMS  Tammy Lang, CDOT
Mary Jane Loevlie, Idaho Springs  Bill Macy, Idaho Springs  Alex Metcalf, TEMS
Andy Mountain, GBSM  Charlie Quandell, Quandell Construction  Joe Siccardi, Figg Bridge Engineers
Anne Skinner, Town of Castle Rock  Russ Vassar, Air Train  Wayne Williams, Frii
Pepper Whittif, City of Pueblo

Agenda Items:
1. Introductions & Roll Call
   Self-introductions were made. Attendees are noted above.
2. Corrections to Minutes
   Minutes from the January 23, 2009 meeting were approved.
3. Chairman’s Report
   In the interest of time, Chairman Dale did not offer a report.
4. **R2C2 Report**
Tammy Lang provided an update of CDOT’s freight rail relocation study and recommendations. In discussion, Mr. Dale expressed concern that the R2C2 study may give the impression that Colorado high speed rail is dependent on relocation of the freight lines from Denver. The HSR study must clearly state whether or not that is the case.

5. **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. **Report of meetings with freight RRs:**

c. **Public Involvement Update:** Andy Mountain provided an update on recent and upcoming public involvement activities, including reporting on preliminary plans for April Corridor Input Team meetings to review results of FSSC’s Alternatives Evaluation workshop.

d. **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 minor alignment modifications are being made as analysis proceeds to both an unconstrained rail network and constrained rail and maglev networks, responsive to issues observed in the iterative analysis. Cost estimates are also being refined as analysis proceeds.

**Operations:** Chip reported that initial runs are continuing for the technology/route scenarios that will be reported at the workshop. 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.

Specific questions were asked of Chip and Charlie regarding how the alignment would proceed and operate through Colorado Springs. There was also concern expressed over the viability of 79 mph operations, and whether that should even remain under consideration. Alex reminded attendees that this option was being evaluated at the early direction of the FSSC. Responsive to Alex’s comments on meetings with BNSF, the question was asked whether TEMS was recommending any compromises with the railroads. Alex responded that it was too early in the project development process to be considering RR compromises, that the RRs pointed do not participate in these early feasibility studies.
Ridership/Revenue: Alex reported that ridership model development is continuing to advance satisfactorily. The second round of preference surveys has been completed and results are being added to the survey. The team is also working to define the baseline highway network, including planned and programmed highway system improvements, that must be part of the ridership model. TEMS will work with CDOT to develop this network and will report back to the FSSC on recommended assumptions. TEMS agreed to perform a sensitivity analysis of constrained and vision highway networks. It was also pointed out that the model must reflect the high number of days that I-70 is closed during the winter due to weather or incidents.

6. Upcoming Meetings and Presentations: The committee was advised of upcoming Alternatives Evaluation workshop on March 28, and that the regular FSSC meeting on Friday will serve as prologue to the workshop, so FSSC members are strongly encouraged to attend both meetings.

7. Other Business: None.

8. Next meeting: It was announced that the next meeting would be held on March 27 at the Jefferson County Administration Building, beginning at 9:00 a.m.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Deadline/Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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.