



Meeting Notes

Meeting: RMRA Feasibility Study Steering Committee

Date/Time: September 26, 2008/9:30a.m.

Location: Jefferson County Courts

Attendees:

Committee Members

Harry Dale, Clear Creek Co,
Chairman

Greg Schroeder, Eagle County

Peter Morlan, City of Trinidad

Terence Quinn, Douglas County

George Scheuemstuhl, Consultant to
DRCOG

Doug Lehnen, Castle Rock, Vice
Chairman

Janice Finch, Denver Public Works

Thad Noll, Summit County

Greg Hall, I-70 Coalition

David Averill, North Front Range
MPO

Diana Mitsch-Bush, Routt County

Gene Putman, City of Thornton

Tom Reed, DIA

Kirk Strand, RTD FasTracks

Others

Mark Boggs, PBS&J

Chip Krett, TEMS

Gail Drumm, Monument

Alex Metcalf, TEMS

Dave Evans, Bike JeffCo

Brad Lehl, Air Train

Andy Mountain, GBSM

Diane Kielty, CCWF

Bob Briggs, City of Westminster

Agenda Items:

5. Introductions & Roll Call
6. Corrections to Minutes
7. Chairman's Report
8. Feasibility Study Report – Alex Metcalf, TEMS team
 - a. Schedule
 - b. Document status
 - c. Public Involvement/Outreach
 - i. Scoping Workshop Results
 - ii. Other outreach activities
 - d. Technology Issues
 - e. Engineering Concepts
 - f. Market Analysis –
 - i. Station spacing guidelines
 - ii. Survey development and deployment
 - iii. Model validation
 - g. Alternatives Development and Analysis
 - h. Coordination with other studies
9. Peer Panel status
10. Upcoming Meetings and Presentations
 - a. Alternatives Workshop – Oct. 30, all day
 - b. Peer Panel #1 – date tbd (November)
11. Other Business
 - a. Web site
12. Next Steering Committee Meeting: October 24, 9:30 am, JeffCo

1. Introductions & Roll Call

Self-introductions were made. Attendees are noted above.

2. Corrections to Minutes

A few minor corrections were noted and the minutes were accepted on condition of the corrections being made.

3. Chairman's Report

Mr. Dale reported that he had met with the Eagle County Collaborative, and that RMRA needs to engage this group more fully.

4. Feasibility Study Report

Alex Metcalf led a presentation and discussion on Feasibility Study activities, using a PowerPoint presentation. Copies of the presentation were made available to all FSSC members, both those at the meeting and those calling in remotely.

- a. **Schedule:** Alex Metcalf provided an update of the study schedule, reporting that tasks are tracking on schedule. Comment was offered by a caller that the version provided was not readable to remote participants. It was also noted that the time bar for the surveys was not correct; Alex indicated that this would be corrected.
- b. **Document Status:** Alex reported that the schedule has been revised to reflect both date for submittal to the PMC for initial review, and for submittal to the FSSC. The Methodology Report is due on September 30, but Mark Boggs indicated that his review is lagging and that target will be missed. The Existing Conditions report is due on October 14 and the Scoping report is due to the FSSC by October 24.
- c. **Public Involvement:** Andy Mountain provided a summary of the results of the three scoping meetings held in September and described the early launch efforts for the Community Partnership Program. He provided a general description of the input received in the scoping meetings, and indicated that more detailed compilations will be provided in the scoping report. He reported that 20 written comments had been received. A summary of the preliminary scoping input in terms of technology, alignment, and station locations was included in the presentation slides. Andy requested that FSSC members provide additional names for the CPP distribution list.

Comments and discussion included the following points:

- Mailing lists for future Corridor Input Team meetings should be expanded beyond technical committees of the MPOs and regional planning agencies.
- When the study team is making presentations to groups such as DRCOG's TAC, it is very important from a perception and credibility perspective that any member of RMRA's board or the FSSC be given the opportunity to introduce the study team and to offer introductory comments that can provide others with needed perspective.
- When inviting MPO or other board members to RMRA meetings, it would be very beneficial to include administrative assistants of the members in distribution mailings.

Next steps for public involvement task are to complete compilation of all scoping input, prepare the Scoping report, and use that report to help inform the Alternatives Workshop.

- d. **Technology Issues:** Chip Kraft reported on technology considerations in developing alternatives. This included a comparison of the relative hill-climbing capability of electric and diesel-powered trains, discussion of FRA's equipment regulations, and the performance advantages of self-propelled electric equipment compared to locomotive-powered in handling steep grades due to improved wheel adhesion. Chip also provided a brief comparison of the two prevalent maglev technologies: German Transrapid and Japanese HSST, and indicated that

the study team has requested information from parties who have proposed “novel technology,” in order to properly compare these new technologies to existing production equipment.

Comments and discussion included the following points:

- The representative equipment slides are misleading in only reporting maximum speeds; material should give an idea of typical average speeds and maximum typical operating speeds within the Colorado operating environment. There should also be an indication as to whether the equipment is FRA-compliant.
- It would also be helpful if average travel times between major trip ends could be provided for the different technology; however, concern was expressed that this might be premature, until actual alignments and alternative operating plans can be developed.
- It was observed that the slide showing hill climbing capability of different equipment was incorrectly labeled, and it was also suggested that a similar slide demonstrating deceleration capability might be equally important, as this is a major concern of FRA.

e. Engineering Concepts: This discussion was deferred until more specific discussions of alternative alignments are held.

f. Market Analysis: Alex reported that survey activity was to begin on the coming weekend, with pilots on the first weekend, and then full surveys beginning on October 2. The goal is to obtain 2550 valid surveys.

Comments and discussion included the following points:

- At DIA, it will be important to conduct surveys at the commuter gates, as well as at the rental car desks and van desks.
- Concern was expressed that there is no survey activity south of Colorado Springs and north of Denver. Some data collection should occur in Pueblo and Ft. Collins. Alex indicated that TEMS would review survey locations or provide better rationale for validity of more limited application. There was also concern about only surveying DIA and not other corridor airports.
- FSSC members expressed strong interest in reviewing methodology and date. Alex responded that methodology would be contained in the methodology report.
- Concern was voiced that the winter survey period would not allow enough time to incorporate the new data into the model. Alex expressed confidence that there would be sufficient time, and that there will also be an opportunity to adjust the winter survey to fill apparent gaps in the data following the fall survey.
- It was noted that survey data collected by transit agencies in the corridor could be very informative to the model development. Ann Skinner in Castle Rock has on-board survey information from FREX; other agencies may have similar data.
- Generally, there is concern that the survey is not being conducted broadly enough, and the consultants will have to demonstrate the validity of their results.

Discussion of the travel demand model validation process was deferred due to lack of time.

g. Alternative Development: Alex discussed station spacing guidelines and how those will be used in the development of alternatives. Generally, station spacing increases as the speed offered by the equipment increases, to take advantage of equipment speed and to avoid time delay caused by frequent deceleration, stopping, and acceleration. Alex then presented the

consultant's preliminary concepts for station locations, based on input from the I-70 Coalition Land-Use study and preliminary assessment of potential intercity travel markets in the two primary corridors and secondary corridors. In response to a question, he noted that all potential stations would not necessarily be served by all trains; skip-stop service was likely.

Comments and discussion included the following points:

- Noting that Winter Park was not on the station concept exhibit, one member noted that clear explanation for this decision will be needed, in light of Winter Park interest in receiving service.
- Comparing coordination that has occurred in I-70 corridor to that in the I-25 corridor, the importance of getting more engagement from local planners in the I-25 corridor was noted.
- For continuity and coordination purposes, it was pointed out that north-south lines should be shown as extending into New Mexico, as they do in Wyoming. However, it was pointed out that RMRA is not allowed to use its Senate Bill 1 moneys in evaluating service in New Mexico.

h. Coordination w. Other Studies: Discussion of coordination with other studies was deferred due to lack of time.

5. Peer Panel Status

Mark Boggs reported that he is working with a Steering Committee working group to develop the panel roster. A single, multi-dimensional panel is being developed, and recruiting is underway. The working group is meeting again on September 29. Mid-November is targeted for the first, two-day session, at a location still to be determined.

6. Upcoming Meetings and Presentations

Following discussion, it was decided to reschedule the full-day Alternatives Workshop from October 30 to Saturday, November 1 to allow better participation by the FSSC. Mark Boggs is to send out calendar updates.

Mark Boggs reported that scheduling of a Denver-area alternatives workshop with RTD, DRCOG, and CDOT staff is underway. The workshop is intended to provide a focused discussion prior to the November workshop on issues for defining alternative alignments within the Denver metro region. Doug Lehnen, George Scheuernstuhl, and Gene Putman indicated interest in participating. FSSC members

7. Other Business

Mark Boggs reported that the RMRA Board had approved a supplemental agreement allowing PBS&J to expand the Feasibility Study web site. Development is underway, and the expanded site should be available by the October meeting.

8. Next Steering Committee Meeting

The Committee agreed that future meetings should begin at 9:30 to allow sufficient time to work through the agendas.

Action Item	Responsibility	Deadline/Status
Provide schedule updates as part of pre-meeting information distribution, ensuring that it is in a format readable to reviewers.	PBS&J	
Send calendar updates to FSSC for Alternatives Workshop.	PBS&J	Done
Schedule Denver-area alternatives workshop	PBS&J	Done; scheduled for Oct. 16 at DRCOG

S:\Tranproj\100000222-RMRA PMC\Steering Comm\092608\RMRA FSSC min 092608.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.