

Memorandum



To: All Board Members/Staff
From: Paula Perdue, Executive Manager to the Board
Date: January 26, 2010
Subject: Minutes of the Study Session Meeting held on Tuesday January 26,
2010 at 5:30 p.m. in Rooms T & D

Board

Members Present: Chair Kemp; Vice-Chair Martinez; Directors Bagley, Brohl, Busck, Christopher, Cohen (left at 7:00), Daly, McMullen, O'Boyle, Pulliam, Tayer and Tobiassen.

Board Member

Absent: Directors Chacon (resigned) and James

Staff Present:

Bruce Abel, Rick Clarke, Chuck Culig, Kevin Diviness, Carol Duecker, Sherry Ellebracht, David Genova, Mike Gil, Terry Howerter, Marla Lien, Caitlin Magee, Andy Mutz, Paula Perdue, Scott Reed, Teresa Sedmak, Daria Serna, Cal Shankster, John Shonsey, Bill Sirois, Julie Skeen, Greg Straight, John Tarbert, Liz Telford, Pauletta Tonilas, Bill Van Meter, Phil Washington, Susan Wood

Others Present:

Juliann Pulliam, Mac Callison, Bob Wilson, Bruce Johnson, Brian Middleton, Roger Sherman, Maria Garcia-Berry, Robin Kniech (FRESC), Daryl Kinton, Edie Bryan, Jason Longsdorf, Jeff Leib (*The Denver Post*), Bill Mosher (Trammell-Crowe), Joe Sallard, Mari Lipponen, Tom Acre, Hunter Sydnor (Kiewit), Darren Roue (Kiewit), Ed Bush, Doug Gragg, Kristopher Takaus, Jerry Glick

* * *

Call to Order: Chair Kemp called the meeting to order at 5:46 p.m.

I. Denver Union Station

Marla Lien provided an update and indicated we were cautiously optimistic that things are moving forward. Some of her updates included:

- Resolved some issues pertaining to maintenance, etc.
- Completed 2 MOU's with Amtrak
- Denver City Council votes to back up federal loan for DUS
- RTD has approved the \$360M which is \$12M per year that is

authorized without coming back to the Board for approval.

Bill Mosher introduced the team and turned it over to Kristopher Takaus who walked through a design presentation including the moving walkways. He talked about some of the architectural challenges and opportunities of the design which included meeting the primary requirement for open, light, accessible and friendly space. He also discussed the change to include two relatively short travelators which represented approximately 27% of the concourse length and 25% of the concourse width. He described the length of the travelators as approximately 20' total with an 11' width each. The recommendations by DUSPA is these travelators would serve little value and if taken out, could accommodate a better exposure overall and improve circulation. He also talked about the use of circulators within the bus terminal space to help mitigate the distance.

Board members had several questions related to this design:

- Director Brohl was interested in the size of the moving walkways in relation to the walking size of the concourse. Kristopher responded about 43' for the concourse and approximately 20' total for the moving walkways. Director Brohl also expressed the need for the Board to re-evaluate the staging area reserved for buses in the area of prime real estate.
- Several of the Directors expressed concern over the narrow space for walking or waiting for public transit & the lack of capacity for growth. Director Bagley noted that the size being discussed for the projected 1800 users per peak hour was no greater than the space in the Board room at RTD.
- Director Martinez was uncomfortable with the 1800 projection and asked staff to take a closer look at the derivation of these numbers and how it vetted with what we are seeing for Market Street today. He expressed the concern that the number 1 focus has to be transportation and we may be compromising that for the expressed priority of environmental needs—open, light, accessible and friendly design. He also questioned the assumption that less than 10% of the riders would be making the connection from LRT to commuter line to DIA and commented we are an aging population (i.e. Baby Boomers aging) so we need to be concerned about the distance they may be asked to walk while carrying luggage.
- Director O'Boyle inquired about what the original plan had called for which included side x side which have now been replaced by these travelators. He offered up several options to consider including acquiring sub-terrain rights for the future and 30' of vertical section outside.
- Director Pulliam expressed great disappointment and likened this experience to a "bait and switch." He expressed strongly that short of a redesign he could not approve such a design.
- Director Christopher concurred with Director Pulliam perspective and expressed that public transit has gotten slighted. He expressed that there is a balancing act between the development needs and public

transportation and his reason (tradeoff) for approving in 2004 was the movable walkways. He felt the Board was the last ones to hear which puts them in a corner. The process was not good.

- Several questions were asked about the circulators and the options for moving users of the multimodal facility (i.e. LRT, bus, CRT) quickly and efficiently.
- The Board expressed general feelings that the proposed travelators offer no value and in most cases would serve as interference for the traveling public. It is a no brainer to vote against the travelators. However, the process that was used to get to this point is questionable.

Chair Kemp reiterated some of the concerns expressed by the Board members and requested this item for further discussion at the next FasTracks meeting. The Board needs to understand what are the items that may be coming up for approval and the impact to schedule if revisions are made.

III. 2010 Annual Program Evaluation-Followup

Interim General Manager Phil Washington introduced this item and turned it over to the team of Bill VanMeter and Julie Skeen to walk through the details. For a copy of this presentation please refer to the Study Session minutes located in the Board office. Bill Van Meter provided the followup updates to questions asked around the APE financial analysis. Julie Skeen presented the follow-up questions on the potential critical adjustments (PCA) and presented next steps.

Maria Garcia Berry provided a brief outline of the polling information they hope to have before the March Board meeting including the ability to finance a campaign.

Questions raised by Board members included:

- What is additional interest cost on 35 year bonds versus 30 years? (Christopher)
- Wants to see a workplan for going to the ballot in 2012 that provides similar analysis of the 2010 plan (Tayer)
- Wants some insight into why Sounder in Washington ridership predictions were so far off (Christopher)
- Would like to go over the corridor x corridor numbers in more detail (Daly)

There was general consensus by the Board that the projected potential critical adjustments did not buy them anything nor is there enough cost savings plus it runs a real risk of antagonizing the people in the North and other corridors.

General Manager Phil Washington asked clarity in if he should pursue the PCA's or move ahead with the Financial Plan without the PCA. The general nod of the head was to pursue in the analysis without the PCA.

V. Other Matters

Director McMullen indicated he will be attending the February 25 Longmont Chamber event and invited fellow Board members to attend these events in other districts.

VI. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 8:22 p.m.