



## Meeting Notes

**Meeting:** RMRA Feasibility Study Steering Committee

**Date/Time:** November 21, 2008/9:30a.m.

**Location:** Jefferson County Courts

**Attendees:**

### Committee Members

David Averill, North Front Range  
MPO

Janice Finch, Denver Public Works

Dave Evans, Bike Jeffco

Gene Putman, City of Thornton

Karla Harding, Town of Timnath

Ann Skinner, Town of Castle Rock

Charles Choi, C.Y. Choi & Assoc.

Doug Lehnen, Castle Rock

Diane Mitsch-Bush, Routt County (by  
phone)

Terence Quinn, Douglas County

George Scheuernstuhl, DRCOG  
Consultant

Gregg Hall, I-70 Coalition

Harry Dale, Clear Creek County

Tom Mauser, CDOT

Peter Morlan, City of Trinidad (by  
phone)

Flo Raitano, I-70 Coalition

Greg Schroeder, Eagle County

Wayne Williams, PP RTA (by phone)

### Others

Tom Reed, DIA

Bob Briggs, City of Westminster

Mary Jane Loevlie, Idaho Springs

John Hoffmann, RFTA

Anne Callison, American Maglev

David Johnson, ECO Transit

Dave Sturgess, Glenwood Spgs (by  
phone)

Andy Mountain, GBSM

Gail Drumm, Monument

Steve Glueck, City of Golden

Brad Lehl, AirTrain (by phone)

Allen Best, Colorado Biz

Pepper Whittlef, City of Pueblo

Mark Boggs, PBS&J

Edwin "Chip" Kraft, TEMS

Tammy Lang, CDOT

Lorraine Anderson, City of Arvada

Robert Larsen, City of Thornton

Piper Foster, Sopris Foundation

Jennifer Brockman, USAFA

Alex Metcalf, TEMS

Charlie Quandell, Quandell & Assoc.

### Agenda Items:

1. Introductions & Roll Call
  2. Corrections to Minutes
  3. Chairman's Report
  4. Peer Panel Report
  5. Feasibility Study Report – Alex Metcalf, TEMS team
    - a. Schedule update
    - b. Document status
    - c. Public Involvement/Outreach
      - i. December Corridor Input Team meetings
      - ii. Other outreach activities
    - d. Alternatives Development: Alternatives Report
  6. Upcoming Meetings and Presentations
    - a. Alternatives Corridor Input Workshops – dates tentative
      - i. Dec. 11, I-70 - Silverthorne or Frisco
      - ii. Dec. 17, Denver area - DRCOG
      - iii. Dec. 18, I-25 – Pueblo and Ft. Collins
  7. Other Business
  8. Next Steering Committee Meeting: January 23, **9:30 am**, JeffCo Admin. Bldg.
-

### 1. Introductions & Roll Call

Self-introductions were made. Attendees are noted above.

### 2. Corrections to Minutes

Minutes were approved as presented.

### 3. Chairman's Report

Mr. Dale reported that he was very pleased with attendance and participation at the Alternatives Workshop that was held on November 1, and that the first Peer Review Panel held on November 19 and 20 was also very beneficial to the study.

### 4. Peer Panel Report

Mark Boggs provided a brief summary of the first Peer Review Panel session. He described the membership of the panel as representing agencies, academia, and consultants, and as bringing both national and regional experience and expertise. The agenda for the two-day session focused on study approach and methodology, and provided for presentations by the TEMS team and discussion between the study consultants and the panel in four broad areas: the study consultant's business plan approach, market analysis/ridership methodology, technology selection and operating cost analysis, and alignment and capital cost estimation.

Mr. Boggs reminded the committee that the panel would be issuing a report of its findings in December. He summarized the panel's initial conclusions as follows:

- The panel was impressed by the overall process and felt that the study approach being followed by TEMS was solid and consistent with FRA expectations for such feasibility studies
- Most of the panel's attention focused on the market analysis/ridership forecasting process being used by TEMS. The panel stressed the need to make maximum possible use of data from previous ridership forecasting efforts, and expressed some concern over TEMS's approach to developing some elements of their ridership models. The panel expressed interest in reviewing the calibrated model prior to its full deployment.

### 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. **Schedule:** Alex Metcalf provided an update of the study schedule, reporting that tasks are tracking on schedule.
- b. **Document Status:** Mr. Metcalf reported that the next document for distribution will be the Alternatives Development technical report, which will reflect input received from the Corridor Input Team meetings, the Peer Review Panel, and the FSSC.
- c. **Public Involvement/Outreach:** Andy Mountain reported on the Corridor Input Team meetings that are scheduled for mid-December and other public involvement activities. The TEMS team has been managing the invitation process more actively than the first round of meetings, and early RSVPs indicate strong interest in participation. Mr. Mountain also reported that the study team will also be distributing a statewide news release in early December, and that updates of public outreach materials are underway.

**d. Alternatives Development:** Mr. Metcalf recapped the alternatives development process and results to date, including input received at the FSSC workshop of Nov. 1. During discussion, the following comments/suggestions were made:

**i) Proposed Station Concepts map (slide 10):**

- (1) This map should be more generic and should not try to combine potential stations with alternative alignments
- (2) It would be helpful if a scale was provided
- (3) For Steamboat Springs spur, show a Yampa Valley Regional Airport/Hayden station and change Yampa to Phippsburg
- (4) For the Aspen spur, change Basalt station to Mid-Valley
- (5) In North I-25 corridor, a more generic “North Front Range” station between Longmont and Loveland/Greeley would recognize the dramatic development expected to occur in that area.
- (6) In the Denver metro area, consideration should be given to being more specific in naming the North and South Suburban stations, similar to the naming of Golden.
- (7) The committee stressed that making these revisions needed to happen prior to the Corridor Input Team meetings.

**ii) Technology slides 11-16):** indications of speed ranges for each technology are needed, to link the slides to the speed/technology matrix provided on slide 11.

**iii) Proposed Preliminary Scenarios (slides 19-21).**

- (1) The lack of consideration of an E-470 alignment in the Denver metro area as an alternative to the Consolidated Mainline, and to provide more direct service to DIA from the I-25 corridor is a concern; it should either be considered, or a good rationale for why it is not should be provided.
- (2) Concern was expressed over lack of service to the Denver Tech Center, which is the region’s second largest employment center. It was recognized that such service might have to be provided via effective transfer from HSR to regional LRT.
- (3) The Preliminary Scenario matrix needs to provide a clear definition of what is meant by “I-70 footprint”; discussion resolved that this means an alignment within the Interstate right-of-way.

**6. Upcoming Meetings and Presentations**

The committee was reminded that three Corridor Input Team meetings are scheduled and that participation by the FSSC was important.

**7. Other Business**

Action Item	Responsibility	Deadline/Status
Provide Alternatives Development report to Dave Sturgess, Glenwood Springs	Boggs	

S:\Tranproj\100000222-RMRA PMC\Steering Comm\112108\RMRA FSSC min 112108.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.