

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



Comment Number	Comment
1	<p>Kenneth W. Bennett 5487 Balsam Court Arvada, CO 80002-3571 August 11, 2008</p> <p>RTD Gold Line Team Dave Beckhouse, FTA Region 8 c/o GBS, Inc. 600 17th St. 2020-S Denver, CO 80202</p> <p>Dear Mr. Beckhouse: Your proposed solutions for placement of the Olde Town station and related parking facilities are doable, but contain some “fatal flaws” with regard to meeting legally mandated Americans with Disabilities Act requirements. These questionable aspects include issues of wheelchair/foot traffic distances, major grade changes, and the absence of temporary queuing shelter; all of which violate the true intent of ADA. The disregard of the “ease of access,” does not minimize, but actually imposes additional barriers on mobility impaired riders.</p> <p>For this reason, I've provided you with an alternative (see attached) that needs to be evaluated on the merits so graphically shown and described. My alternative provided for underground sheltered handicapped stalls with a level, direct, and safe access to the Olde Town RTD platform. As a wheelchair user, this solution would satisfy my specific desires to maintain my independence and keep me in the “mainstream” of society without secondary interference such as interfacing with shuttle bus transport from A to B. Not only individuals with disabilities would benefit from this configuration, but sizeable portion of the general public to include our aging population. I fully realize money and politics drive a significant part of the design process; however, one needs to continue to focus on how best to serve the public domain over the next 25 to 50 years, or for that matter, longer. If you have any questions, you may contact me at the above address of at 303-958-8274.</p> <p>Sincerely, Kenneth W. Bennett</p>
2	<p>Stan Edwards</p> <p>Gold Line Draft EIS Comments Sir,</p> <p>I have reviewed the Executive Summary of the Draft EIS for the Gold Line, and have some questions and/or comments.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the population in the Gold Line study area – current? – projected in 2030? 2. What is the population within 1/2 mile of proposed station locations – current? – projected in 2030? 3. What percentage of the population is expected to ride the Gold Line daily – of study area population? – of population within 1/2

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



	<p>mile of stations?</p> <p>4. What is the expected average length of a Gold Line ride in miles?</p> <p>5. You project 20,100 riders (average weekday) in 2030. In this number, are you considering one rider to be a round trip (to and from work) or would a round trip be counted as two riders?</p> <p>6. There seems to be a serious disconnect between daily riders on the Gold Line and reduction in VMT. If there are 20,000 daily riders, and a ride is a round trip, and the average rider rides half the length of the line each way, then daily "rider miles" would be $20,000 \times 11.2 = 224,000$ miles. Why then are VMT only reduced by 14,500 miles? It would seem that VMT should be reduced by some number close to daily "rider miles." Yet rider miles seems to be 15 times the reduction in VMT. Can you explain this?</p> <p>7. Was there any consideration for bus or van shuttles from neighborhoods to the stations – or from stations to and from local employers? Shuttles to and from neighborhoods would further reduce VMT, and reduce the number of parking spaces required at stations. Shuttles to and from employers would increase ridership.</p> <p>8. Why is there so much more parking at the 38th Ave station in 2030 than at stations further out the line? This seems like an area where a greater percentage of the residents might not have cars, and might walk to the station than, for instance, at the Ward Road station.</p> <p>9. By 2030, at all Gold Line stations combined you are providing 5,000 parking spaces, and expecting 20,000 riders. (Some will carpool, bike or walk to the station.) Does this ratio (4 riders per parking space) seem reasonable?</p> <p>10. What would be the effect of gas price on ridership? At first blush, you would think increasing gas price would cause increasing ridership. However, if gas prices rise before the Gold Line is built (and they will,) then some folks may move closer to work, or find a job closer to home, may start carpooling, or may trade in their SUV for a gas miser. If people make some of the adjustments above before the Gold Line goes into service, then they may have less incentive to ride the Gold Line. Any thoughts?</p> <p>A final thought on system wide transportation planning. Has there ever been a study to learn how far people in metro Denver commute to work, and where they commute from and to? Without that, you may know a lot about traffic volume on major arteries, but not how far or where they are going. If the state required each employer to report annually how many employees lived in each zip code, then you could easily determine metro area travel patterns, and plan your resources accordingly.</p> <p>Thank you for your time, Stan Edwards</p>
3	<p>Monique Elwell</p> <p>p2 of the EIS executive summary (See http://www.rtd-fastracks.com/media/uploads/gl/DEIS2_-_Exec_Summary.pdf) I prefer the 38th Ave. location. I moved to the urban core so public transportation would be easy. I prefer to go to work/see my friends, etc. via public transportation. I came to realize that access to the light rail is a 20 min. walk (Union Station.) The Highland bridge has helped tremendously in reducing that commute about 5 min. However, I would like more access, a 38th Ave. light rail stop would be great, but a 39th one, I would not use. It's just one block too far and 38th Ave. is dangerous.</p> <p>As an additional note, circulator buses like Boulder would be really helpful since the 32, 44 and other buses that come through all</p>

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



	<p>oddly stop within 10 min of each other!! So even though there are four bus lines, you still have to wait for an hour.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
4	<p>Marie Nadeu</p> <p>Train horns Hi, I just want to know when the loud, obnoxious, quality of life affect of the train horns is going to stop. I have had enough of getting woke up at 2:00 a.m., 3:00 a.m., 4:00 a.m. and so on and on and on and on. Prior to July of 2007 there were no train horns. I just would like to know if at some point hopefully in the near real near future they will be quieted. I await your timely response. Thank you. Marie Nadeau</p>
5	<p>Dave Brehm</p> <p>I am Dave Brehm and I live in the City and County of Denver. I am going to focus my comment on what you have said about selecting the station. And the question that I am going to have is what criteria did you use? Who makes that selection? And when you have mentioned that you will make the selection and invite us to tell you what color to make the fences and do the design for it, that charrette, that process really needs to be opened up for neighborhood input. It shouldn't just be based on engineering criteria, costs and the existing zoning, because there's a huge impact to what happens when that station goes there. And it should include the people that are going to be -- that do live there now, and use that. The most important thing I am interested in is the 38th and Inca station, because that's the one I want to use. I see the options -- and I haven't seen all of the options yet. I see that there's options that keep going further north to 44th and the further north that goes, the less likely that is something that the Highlands individual is going to use, and I am going to be able to use, because it just gets too far apart or too far away. So, the only other thing I was going to say is, if there's a way that you can, before you get to selecting it, before however it is you are selecting it, include the people around that neighborhood. I've already sat in the charrette about that one. I think that was very positive, very productive. That needs to be going through, not just to make it look good but where it is. Second thing, I understand the technical aspects. This feels like a real attorney-driven process. You are not going to comment on what I say. I am going to have to read your comments. I'm sure there was -- it would be nice to have a dialogue, to be able to talk to somebody, rather than a microphone, about how this goes, because I do some of this stuff, and, really, talking to people, you end up with a better solution. Not talking to a microphone and reading the hearing statements. So, that's just my commentary on that, kind of the attorney feeling of this very formal process. So, thank you.</p>
6	<p>Keith Dameron</p> <p>Good evening. My name is Keith Dameron. I'm a resident of Denver. And I live about six blocks north northwest of Union Station. And I will be able to see every Gold Line train going in and out, so I have a vested interest. The first comment has to do with the public, or the -- I'm sorry, Pecos East station. I believe that's much preferable to the Pecos West. Several reasons, is the potential for the northwest corridor connect there. And that, to me, is very important, is the connection. That makes transit work, so that's my -- ends that one.</p> <p>I prefer 41st Avenue, was my own opinion because I think 41st is better. It appears to be better, just from a bus standpoint. 39 -- or the 39 bus will be turning onto the curve, it looks like. Just from an engineering standpoint, 41st would seem to be much better for parking and bus technology and everything else. I'm a big fan of 41st Avenue, even though it's slightly farther away from where I live.</p>

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



	<p>The last one is, I'm not clear -- I know there's a connection between the Gold Line and east corridor, how they connect to Union Station. And I have been told that Union Station is being built for an eight-car platform, maximum length of a train to go to the airport or the Gold Line, and that the east corridor is proposed for an eight-car train. It was not going to be built that way originally, but it's going to be expanded. My understanding is the Gold Line will also be expandable to eight cars. My concern is, that I believe we're going to reach that capacity much sooner than what the EIS would propose. And I'm concerned that -- why single-level cars is the only thing that I hear talked about. I believe bi-level cars, which practically double the capacity per car, would save a whole ton of money for the number of cars needed and the length of station platforms that would be required, including, potentially, the number of blocked streets. A three-car light rail train downtown takes all of those long blocks. I am trying to picture an eight-car train and how many city streets you blocked if you have to go through, so that doesn't make sense to me, to use single-level cars when a bi-level car would save a whole ton of money and platform building and stuff. And I believe the technology is out there. It may be in Europe, but it's -- I believe the technology is out there. I believe an RFP should at least be tried, to find people to build those cars. And if you don't start with bi-level cars, please, build your catenary, for example, have the poles tall enough that if five years or 10 years after this opens, you go to bi-level cars, at least you won't have to redrill and put in new poles. All you have to do is raise the catenary on the existing pole. That could be planned in advance, for the future of using bi-level cars for additional capacity. Thank you for your time.</p>
7	<p>Keith Howard</p> <p>I am a resident of Denver. I also currently serve as the president of the Sunnyside United Neighbors, Inc. I'm sorry there's not more people to be here and to congratulate the entire Gold Line project team for moving the project to this point, a major effort. I have a few remarks about the 38th Avenue station and it's difficult for us to comment intelligently on the choices between the -- among the three alternatives, and until the bus part of the location issue is settled. I would like you to explain, in some form, whether there's any option of any extended comment period. And if not that, what is the possibility of reevaluating the station location after a bus barn decision is made, so -- the bus barn to the southwest, the bus maintenance facility. The other recommendation I want to raise, and I believe should be addressed in public, is the --I guess it's not part of the NEPA process here, but both the purpose, and Appendix H of the draft, that we've been seeing since last month, describe the public-private partnership -- or mentioned the public-private partnership arrangements and the Public-Private Partnership Pilot Program, which this is planned to be a principal financing and building mechanism for the Gold Line. I think that the public are not well-informed, at this point, as to how these mechanisms work, and what they cost the public, although this may be the only mechanism that such a project can be built, under the present circumstances. The public needs to understand that there are costs to the -- tax revenue costs to the public purse, both by the financing mechanisms of the private entities, applied to raising the money they are going to invest; and also their ability to depreciate the assets that they create over a quite short period of time costs the treasury a large amount of money. And then, additional questions, once they have depreciated it as much as they can, will they be allowed to sell the assets they have, which is the lease, and under that arrangement, to another entity, which will then carry out the entire process again? So, my real point is, here, in my 30 remaining seconds, that it's important for the public to understand what the whole costs of the project are. Public-private partnerships are not the cheapest way to fund infrastructure, and we need to be thinking about that. Thank you.</p>
8	<p>John Valerio</p> <p>I am a Sunnyside resident, so I am close to the Inca and 38th station. I would just generally like to say, you know, I support the alignment that you guys have come up with. I think it's been a good process of going through all of the different possible alignments</p>

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



	<p>and coming down to this one. I am very pleased to see that you are choosing passenger rail in this corridor rather than, you know, more highway improvements. A question, really, about the quiet zones. I wonder if the yard there, at 38th and Inca, can you impose a quiet zone on the freight railroad operations? It's a switching yard in there. I just wondered if you even have a quiet zone in there. I would like to second Keith's comments about planning for the double decker trains. I know there is an issue around this route -- I guess it's the Boulder route that has bridge issues, but, you know, being able to accommodate more capacity, provide more capacity through double decker trains is important. So, I can see that included in the longer plan. Through movements at Denver Union Station. Again, it's a capacity issue with Denver Union Station. I understand that having a through station, compared to a stub station, which is what we're planning, will really cut the capacity in half, in the peak hour. And we're going to be hitting that peak at some point, probably sooner than later. And, so, I think, what's really needed is to look at how you get from Union Station south, whether it be on a train that would continue south, or switching to another train that would continue south, but the connection to Union Station to go south to Littleton or Castle Rock or Colorado Springs, it's not a good connection, and that should be looked at. Another comment about the 38th and Inca station. I would hope that we could shift the station a little bit north, so it's not right up against 38th but closer to the 39th, 40th, 41st, somewhere in there, in order to allow some room for DOT to happen. If you put the station right at 38th, you are kind of creating a zone that's close to busy roads and makes it a little more difficult to see good development happen. And one small design issue, which -- I've brought this issue up at a number of these types of meetings, and never seen anything being done about it, but I notice that all eight stations on light rail, throughout the Denver metro area, I can't think of one of them that has a clock. I would like to see the design part of this -- it's not such a foreign concept to have a clock at a station, train station. Everybody's got cell phones and watches now -- I just bought a watch yesterday. So, if RTD imposed a \$15 cost on me -- if we could have a clock at the station, it really facilitates passenger movement.</p>
9	<p>Constantin Nickonov</p> <p>All the stationary plans around 38th there is a lot of thought going into what is going on the east side of the platform but nothing on the west side. There will be buses at the least on the west side dropping people off and we need to make sure that is addressed.</p>
10	<p>Chris Cahal Wagner Rents</p> <p>When choosing the 38th Ave Station please consider the impact to the historical buildings and the local businesses. The 39th Ave East options would seem to remove the historical buildings and could possibly cause further traffic congestion. Either the 38th Ave or the 41st Ave would seem to be better choices.</p> <p>Thanks</p>
11	<p>Juan Jimenez Transformation Realty</p> <p>The station at Federal lies on the Flood Plain and Flood Way, what is RTD proposing for changes of Clear Creek to accommodate this concern?</p>
12	<p>Elia Fisher SUNI</p> <p>I feel that the 41st Avenue East Option for the planned 38th Avenue Station is the best choice for the neighborhood. Selecting a more northerly location would provide better access for the Sunnyside and Globeville neighborhoods.</p>

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



	<p>I agree with the selection of Electric Multiple Unit for the technology to be further considered. I appreciate Andy Mountain and Liz Telford's efforts to reach out to the residents for their input. The Gold Line Project Team is doing a very good job. Thank you.</p>
13	<p>Mike Salazar LAPITR First of all, thank you for letting me participate and I would like to be included in future focus groups.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noise-- Speaking from personal experience, the quiet zones are the most important to consider for noise mitigation. The noise from operation of the train pales in comparison to the whistle. I have become accustomed to the sounds of the train and can cope with the clickkity clack of the rails after living next to the tracks for 30 years, but the whistle will wake me up from a dead sleep in the wee hours of the morning especially in the summer when I keep the windows open. Sound walls are expensive and are not the answer. Please address the source and quiet the horns. 2. I want to keep my property intact and continue to access my garage from Ridge Road. Many of my neighbors have the same concerns so I would like to speak for them also. That is the main reason I got involved 2 years ago any I was very surprised that I could actually speak my mind and that people would listen. When we got legislation to gain RR indemnification it made it possible to share the ROW. Lets keep it inside and save the properties. 3. Continue Ridge Road westward to connect to the Ward Road Station and have more access and disperse traffic. <p>Thanks, Mike</p>
14	<p>Louis Silletto I prefer 38th and Inca Station.</p>
15	<p>Bruce Buck How will the 38th Ave. and Fox intersection change to accommodate traffic from I-25 and eastbound 38th Ave.</p>
16	<p>Holly Buck Provide analysis of the traffic impacts (and mitigation necessary) to Fox Street and 38th Avenue intersection. The large parking supply proposed along Fox Street will create long queues and delays at that intersection.</p>
17	<p>Bruce Buck Protect parking availability for local residents through a residential parking permit program or charge \$ for auto commuters using station for downtown parking at the 38th Ave. station.</p>
18	<p>Holly Buck We prefer the Railroad Alignment option for the 38th Avenue Station to better serve residents of the community who will be dealing with impacts of the station, and to spur development in the residential area.</p>
19	<p>Patrick Disner</p>

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



	<p>My property at 2200 w. 60th Ave seems to be in the middle of the gold line project for at least two reasons. First the track almost certainly has to cut through the North west corner of my property to stay on the south side of The man made mountain that I-76 was built on. I want to know why we get so deep into this process before a land owner even gets to hear the extent to which his/her property will be affected. I don't have a clue other than common sense as to how much of my property will be affected. when will I know? Secondly, the Pecos West station option is shown in one picture as ending on my Eastern boundary and shown on a different picture on the goldline website as wiping out my buildings. Which is it and when will I know if my buildings are going to be under a new parking lot?</p>
20	<p>Martha Harvey Self RTD will needs to put in racks that scooters can be locked to. Bike racks are not heavy enough to protect scooters from being stolen and if they are not chained to something, it will be stolen. More and more people are riding scooters than ever and this would help more people ride RTD (buses and Lightrail).</p>
21	<p>Jerry Espinoza What's going to happen with the 38th and Jason Corner after the project starts?</p>
22	<p>Craig Kocian City of Arvada Surface parking around the stations is a very poor and inefficient land use, discouraging to great TOD development and, ultimately, a waste of taxpayer dollars, completely antithetical to all of the great thinking that went into FASTTRACKS and regional and local planning efforts. IGA's with local communities or land transfers could permit revenue financing of parking garages now, it would seem. There needs to be much more thought about how partnerships might help overcome the funding resource issue that we have allowed to handcuff us on this issue presently.</p>
23	<p>Oliver Wesley Opal Group, Inc. To Whom It May Concern: The western side of the proposed location of the Federal East station overlays a former sand and gravel quarry that may have been backfilled with uncompacted and waste materials. The landowner of 5900 Federal Boulevard to the immediate west of the proposed station location (between the western side of the station and Federal Boulevard), Cunningham Q-Tip, L.L.C., is interested in understanding how the construction may impact its property with respect to potential environmental remediation and/or foundation preparation issues at the proposed station location. Moreover, the landowner may have an interest in negotiating a mutually agreeable arrangement to enable station expansion onto the property if desired by Fastracks. As a local representative of Cunningham Q-Tip, L.L.C., please feel free to contact Oliver P. Wesley (Opal Group, Inc.) to discuss. Thank you for consideration of these comments. Regards, Oliver P. Wesley</p>
24	<p>Vincent Baldassano The Bridge on Sheridan, south near the Sheridan Station, needs to be specifically mentioned and indicated that this bridge may need to be replaced. Even though, it may be engineering feasible for the train under the bridge--it should be mentioned, if the layout changes. In addition the pedestrian paths on the bridge is extremely bad and does not allow pedestrian access, from the south, to</p>

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



	<p>the station. The access certainly does not meet safety standards for pedestrian or any sort of disability access, The map for the roads around the Sheridan Station does not show the completion of Ralston Road east to Tennyson, when the station is completed.</p>
25	<p>Jeff Bruce This is going to be very unpleasant for everyone, because I want to talk very briefly about a French invention which will make everything you are doing rather -- it's going to make it rather useless. Have you come across -- Jeff Bruce from Arvada. The French compressed air engine, which will make it very unpleasant here, or unpopular. The Indians are making it. It can be formed into trains, buses or on individual cars. It has no pollution, very little noise. And one little charge will take one air car 250 miles. When you collect the engineers together, to make the trains -- we have here an infinitely more flexible system. You can run on tracks, you can come off the track, you can go to town, you can go back onto the track. And I would rather suspect -- because all we're doing here is talking about a specific rail system. So, rather like a Henry Ford, not realizing maybe, that aircraft might take over and fly people this long distance. So, I am hoping RTD will start examining this system, in all seriousness, and also decide whether it might be a better way of doing things. That's all.</p>
26	<p>Harriet Hall My name is Harriet Hall. I live in Arvada. I live on Grandview Avenue, right across from where the train will go. And I live in a rather special part of Grandview Avenue, which is, really, is the historic entrance to Olde Town. I've talked before about the impacts on our neighborhood of the train and mitigating impact. And I want to thank you for all of the attention that's being paid to quiet zones, and urge RTD and the City of Arvada to continue working together, so that we can have a quiet zone, which will mean that our quality of life will actually be improved from what it is now. But I also want to look at the aesthetic impact a little bit, and I want to do it, not from the perspective of myself and my neighbors on Grandview, but a person from Denver, who decides, for the first time, to visit Olde Town Arvada and rides the train and comes into Olde Town Arvada. And before they get to the station, what are they going to come through? Are they going to see a chain link fence? Are they going to see something that's attractive, that is as attractive as the houses along the street, as the large trees and the vegetation? That, I think, is a very important thing for us to think about, for RTD to think about, and for the city to think about. As individuals come to Arvada, they will be coming basically through a gateway community that right now is at the threat of being redeveloped in ways that might not keep it as attractive and as much of a welcoming statement to people coming to Arvada for the first time, or coming to Arvada on a regular basis. Or not going to Arvada, going to the end of the line and going through Arvada and saying, hey, this looks great. This looks like a place I want to stop. So, I would urge RTD, I would urge the City of Arvada, both, to remember the importance, in terms of the Gold Line, as, at this point, an economic developer for the City of Arvada and keeping that gateway community attractive.</p>
27	<p>John Kiljan I live at 6185 Field Street in Arvada. This is about airport access, the impact on the airport access when the Gold Line opens. Right now, Arvada enjoys a very nice service called the, "A-Line," which is sponsored partly by RTD, partly by the city and I think local businesses as well. It will get you down to the airport in about 35 minutes. My understanding is that this will go out of existence on opening day, because it will be in competition with the A-Line. We don't want to see that. I think it's about 32,000 trips per year, up to date. And it's a wonderful service. But, when we start taking the Gold Line down to the airport, transferring to Denver Union Station, and then going out there, it's going to approximately, I think, double your trip time. Having worked that out, there's a delay down in Denver Union Station. I was hoping, what we came up with, the electric multiple units, with the EMU, that we could come in</p>

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



	<p>at the same platform or adjacent platform down in Denver Union Station, and it would be a quick transfer for people carrying baggage, and so forth. So it doesn't look like -- that we're going to be at the opposite side of the platform, have to come up, cross over several lines, drop down and then wait for an unscheduled trip to go out on the east corridor, if I got that right, and then go the full run on the east corridor out to DIA. That's unfortunate. If we came into the same platform, or we coordinate the trains, or we had through trains that came in and went out on the other line, that could reduce that. I am hoping -- this will be my issue --there will be mitigation. I will be writing a comment on the e-mail, whatever it is, in regards to that. Thanks.</p>
28	<p>Carol Zinanti</p> <p>I heartily endorse what Jeff said about the French train system. I have two things that I would like to ask questions about. One is the proposed schedule of operations. Is that still from 4:30 a.m. until 1:30 in the morning? Is that the proposed schedule of operation? Oh, it's not. If it's still that long, as that still seems unnecessarily long to run the train. But I do thank you for increasing the time limit to one hour in the early morning and late evenings rather than every 15 minutes. My second question is also -- my second comment is also a question. And I'm just along the L-train, so it -- so that I am hoping Arvada and the Gold Line people are working positively to negotiate the quiet zone on Grandview Avenue, both the quiet zone and the vibration reduction. Thank you.</p>
29	<p>Martha Harvey</p> <p>I was going to take light rail to Littleton and the website had no information about where the closest station Bus connection would be. The website doesn't have any information about what exit to take and there is no signage on the roads either for Light Rail stations. The people coming for the Democratic convention won't be able find their way to the stations!</p>
30	<p>Charles Boling homeowner</p> <p>With the increased population of the Water Tower Project, west of Olde Wadsworth and south of the BNSF tracks the number of elementary students crossing the tracks at Allison St has greatly increased. Consideration of a pedestrian crossover should be evaluated to insure the safety of the children.</p>
31	<p>Richard Norris Bliss Cafe'</p> <p>Regarding the future planned (2030) parking garage at the Olde Town Arvada stop, I would suggest limiting the height to two stories to preserve the spectacular view from the aptly named GRANDVIEW AVE. All aspects of the Olde Town part of the project should strive to preserve the great view from street level on Grandview.</p>
32	<p>Georg Ek</p> <p>The orientation of FasTracks has concentrated the activity to the south of Denver, What will happen in Boulder and Ft. Collins. We need to have wide track at the juncture of UP &BN that leads to Boulder, Longmont and places to the north. The population in Arvada may be oriented to northern Colorado just as much as they are to south of Denver.</p> <p>The attraction of Arvada retaining it's historical character will draw folk to the city. The Arvada center has grown in significance since it's construction. It draws people from all over the state. That growth seems assured. therefore it is logical that special trains coming from the north would serve Olde Town for passenger transfer even in the future by street railway to the Arvada Center. Barring that I'm in error, I do not see that the present plans and designs address themselves to a northern exposure.</p> <p>As rapidly as we can, we need to put FasTracks into operation. that may necessitate our postponing the desired outcomes. What</p>

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



	<p>we would like to do can be incorporated in to the engineering designs and plans so that retrofitting to what is desired cost but nickels, dimes and quarters against major changes that without that forward perspective would cost thousands, maybe millions.</p> <p>This process has been quite exciting. The public involvement has been one of unified direction with courteous disagreements. For my part it has been one of the happier things that has happened in this chaotic chronological catastrophe called the 21st century.</p> <p>All of the staff, RTD and those in the private sector who have worked to submit this DEIS are to be commended. Their courtesy to the public is outstanding. My impression is that they believe in what they have done and what they are doing and are working for the common good of the public. Congratulations!</p> <p>It's very significant that this has been an activity that has strong people out of the capsules that run on rubber tires. Not addressed is the physiological benefit of people coming in contact with others. Rail traffic make people interface. Automobiles among all the other problems they cause include significant costs to governments at all levels precludes a common association with other citizens. There exists within public transportation an equalitive condition that is one of the fine and remarkable aspects of the democratic process.</p>
33	<p>Georg EK</p> <p>Good plans have gone into the Gold Line DEIS and are praiseworthy from other points of view. Only casual mention is made of Denver Union Station. The DUS may be the Achilles heel for the Gold Line and the other FastTracks projects. Adequate passenger friendly transfers for the infirmed children, bicycles, packages, etc. will be a challenge. The early vision of taking a train from Old Town Golden to Englewood of course is precluded by need for Gold Line to be commuter rail. As the DUS group has planned it the uncomfortable transfer or even riding a walkway probably can be likened to taking a flying carpet. Easy cross platform exchanges to intercity and other modes of transportation are precluded by separating our commuter rail from the light rail system. Even transferring from commuter rail to Amtrack is a little better gives no consideration to the need of having sufficient Amtrack track to meet current and future use. Further expansion of commuter rail south to hookup with Colorado Springs, Pueblo and Raton and the New Mexico commuter rail system has hardly been considered.</p>
34	<p>Gary & Lanna Gosage</p> <p>We think the Gold Line is a good thing, but we have a few concerns about the visual impact of fencing, poles and catenary along Grandview from Olde Wadsworth to Lamar. Visually, the catenary is going to be an impact in historic Olde Town, particularly to the residences east of the Wadsworth Bypass. However, the chain link fencing depicted in the visual simulations is an even bigger concern as it will be a greater visual impact, very unattractive and not fit the context of the community. In addition, chain link fence has numerous problems with trash and other debris getting stuck in it. Who is responsible for cleaning and maintaining the property on both sides of the fence? How often will that cleaning and maintenance occur? The design of the fence needs to be visually sensitive to the surrounding community and fit the historic look of the neighborhood.</p> <p>We support the EMU technology for the Gold Line.</p>
35	<p>Carol Zinanti</p> <p>Thank you for not taking any homes. I appreciate the new schedule of train on the Gold Line but still resist the hours of 4:30 am to !:30 at night as I don't believe the ridership warrants the use of energy it takes to keep it functioning on a daily basis.</p>

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



36	<p>Bill DeGroot Urban Drainage & Flood Control District FTA Region 8</p> <p>David Beckhouse Team Leader for Planning and Programs c/o Gold Line Team, GBSM 600 17th Street, Suite 2020 South RE: Gold Line Corridor Draft Environmental Impact Statement</p> <p>Dear: Mr. Beckhouse: This letter contains the comments of the Urban Drainage and Flood Control District regarding the above referenced DEIS. The comments are all addresses to Section 3.10.4 Floodplains/Drainage/Hydrology contained in Volume 1. Our comments follow:</p> <p>Ralston Creek Bridge The text indicates that a new structure over Ralston Creek would require six bridge piers, and that the placement of the piers would replicate the current pier locations of the adjacent railroad bridge. We would rather see new bridges put fewer piers in the waterway so that the obstruction of the original bridge is not perpetuated when that bridge is inevitably replaced.</p> <p>Bates Lake Floodplain In 1975 the District, City of Arvada and Adams County completed a master plan and floodplain delineation for Hidden Lake and Bates Lake. We are currently revising and updating that master plan. Included in the recommended plan is an enlarged pipe under the existing railroad embankment between Ralston Creek and Sheridan Boulevard. A second conveyance facility is proposed immediately west of Sheridan Boulevard passing under the existing railroad bridge. Construction of these two facilities should be coordinated between the City of Arvada and the Gold Line.</p> <p>Sheridan Station Location Both the original Bates Lake master planning study and the on-going update identify a 100-year floodplain along the north side of the existing railroad from Sheridan Boulevard to Tennyson Street. It appears as though both the new tracks and at least a portion of the Sheridan Station would be encroaching into that floodplain. The proposed conveyance facilities discussed in the above paragraph west of Sheridan Boulevard would eliminate the floodplain east of Sheridan.</p> <p>Lake Sangraco Spillway and Channel This facility is located immediately north of the existing railroad embankment west of Federal Boulevard. It is the outlet for the Hidden Lake watershed. Please recognize this facility and confirm that the proposed extension of the railroad embankment to the north, as depicted in Figure 3.10-11, will not impact this facility.</p> <p>Clear Creek Bridge As with the Ralston Creek Bridge we question the intent to replicate the number of piers in the waterway.</p> <p>Federal Station The District, Adams County and several other entities are in the process of updating the Clear Creek master plan. The</p>
----	---

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



	<p>recommended plan in this vicinity is a 100-year bridge at Federal Boulevard with downstream channelization to match into the downstream channel. This project might impact access to the station from 61st Avenue and Federal. Additionally, unless or until this project is constructed, the DEIS correctly notes that the entire Federal Station location is within the 100-year floodplain, but says nothing about public safety. Cars float and cars carry hazardous materials. The Final EIS should address potential hazards resulting from the construction of such a large parking lot in known flood hazard area.</p> <p>If you have questions concerning any of the above comments, please call me.</p> <p>Sincerely, Bill DeGroot, P.E. Manager, Floodplain Management Program</p>
37	<p>Georg Ek</p> <p>The Gold Line EIS vaguely addresses how and where DUS will service passengers and the necessary train station maintenance at DUS of Commuter Rail movements in and out of DUS.</p> <p>Just where does the Gold Line and companion Commuter Line trackage enter and depart DUS?</p> <p>How adequate will the trackage be or will it resemble and avoid the current trackage and snarling switching and delays that Amtrak endures?</p> <p>Northern service on the Commuter Lines begs for addressing southern service on current Light Rail Lines as well as future Commuter Rail and Amtrak expansions.</p> <p>The trail or 'choke' track parallel to Wewatta Street has been removed. That choke held promise of resumption of southern rail service to connect with what is now called the Consolidated Main Line (CML).</p> <p>For DUS station trackage to once again enjoy southern access to the CML past the Pepsi Center is feasible. Such connections serves public needs and is an advantage to the Gold Line and its northern Commuter line partners. Has the south-west Wawatta St. railway trail trackage been temporarily removed or abandoned just for development?</p> <p>Another option for southern rail connections from DUS is to construct a mirror image of the wye that the California Zephyr now uses in its reversing to enter DUS at Prospect Junction.</p> <p>The California Zephyr trains serving passengers must snake through the labyrinth of switches at the southwest corner of Prospect Junction to enter DUS. This time consuming process is accomplished while arriving and departing passengers wait. (During freezing snow blowing nights waiting on the platform to board the California Zephyr is misery. Will it be less painful for Gold Line and northern Commuter Rail passengers?)</p> <p>These reverse directional movements to enter DUS – as presently configured – adds time to the public timetable scheduling. Far more damaging is the unfriendly delays and inconvenience visited upon both arriving and departing passengers.</p> <p>As future passenger needs pressure both Commuter Rail and Amtrak to expand trackage, conflicting requirements of both Amtrak and Commuter Rail to gain quick and efficient entry and departure from DUS fails to be addressed by the proposed DUS EIS.</p>

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



	<p>Can the efficient service needs of intracity and intercity trains be considered oblivious of the common and different requirements of each mode?</p>
<p>38</p>	<p>Georg Ek The NORTHERN EXPOSURE Job opportunities and attractions to Boulder and other cities north of Arvada promises to be more significant than it is in 2008. Does the EIS in all of its 600 plus pages address the daily work force, population and transportation needs oriented to the North? Is the Pecos Street station, especially the optional Pecos St. station to the East, serving the interchange of passengers – particularly those commuting north to work daily – from the Gold Line to transfer to the Northwest and North Metro Corridors on the same or adjacent platforms adequately addressed? If the east Pecos St. option is chosen those ticketed to stations on the Gold Line from the northern corridors can transfer easily. The attraction for folk living north to attend performances at the Arvada Center can with a minimum of steps detrain from an inward bound train to the Gold Line. A focus on attraction of those living north to the facilities off the Gold Line deserves attention. A wye off the northern lines to directly head into the Gold Line in the Pecos area offers direct service and interchange not only of passengers but of equipment. The popularity of the Arvada Center continues to grow. The quality of its choice of performances and the professional actors and musicians have a wide state attraction currently and even more so in the future. Isn't it reasonable to foresee the needs of special trains routed into Denver over a wye from the north switching into the Gold Line Corridor? Intermodal Connections How very necessary it is for passengers to step off of one mode on to another! Bus Stops need to be as close as space permits for passengers to transfer from or two rail or bus. Walking any distance beyond a few steps, especially anything even as short as a long block, is unacceptable – often impossible for those with strollers, carrying children, bearing shopping baggage or luggage and for the elderly and infirmed. Busses are an adjunct to rails service, feeders that are next to not distant. Fairs Commuter Rail ticketing calls for the identical tariffs adopted for Light Rail service. Ticketing for bus and rail must be the same and fair zones integrated. Shorter trips on any mode need to be the same -not confusingly or unreasonably unlike. Passengers boarding an express bus, for example, should not be tempted to select a local because of differences in cost. (Some passengers select RED line 52 over 72X and 76X because it's cheaper. This dichotomy must be thoughtfully address to attract ridership.)</p>

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



	<p>Esthetic and Historical Considerations</p> <p>The Gold Line draft EIS has addressed these issues well and is to be commended. In final preparation, acute focus on both is necessary and must be an on going part of planning long after the Gold Line is in operation.</p> <p>Cooperation and Coordination</p> <p>The process of public involvement that has marked all the phases of preparation up to the development of this GOLD LINE CORRIDOR Draft Environmental Impact Statement has been one of the more uplifting actions of the 21st. Century. So much of this chaotic period has been depressing. Nothing seems to have gone well.</p> <p>Choices were made to repudiate George Washington's admonishment to avoid foreign entanglements. FasTracks has suffered with escalating cost of copper and construction because of those decisions.</p> <p>With the storm clouds of a malicious campaign to rescind FasTracks ominously gathering on the horizon, delay of the Gold Line is unthinkable.</p> <p>Any costly changes can be designed by engineers for nickels, dimes and quarters for easy retrofitting that will be far less expensive than if wise thoughtful planning to meet our future needs is not incorporated in their current designs and current track and facility drawings.</p> <p>The beautify of FasTracks is that it has involved the folk at the grass roots level in an equality of condition when nothing else has offered what FasTracks has offered: HOPE!</p>
39	<p>Bob Gailer Gold Line Preferred Alternative Graphic too small? I went to http://www.rtd-fastracks.com/gallery.php?section=gl and clicked on the Preferred Alternative link hoping to see a much larger map (one that I could read). The link took me to: http://www.rtd-fastracks.com/gallery.php?category=49&ion=gl There the map was the same size! Can you provide a larger picture? Bob Gailer Chapel Hill NC 919-636-4239</p>

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



40	<p>Tom Dufficy 38th Avenue Station Dear Andy,</p> <p>I am a property owner of the land between 42nd and 43rd on Fox Street. I want to take a moment to provide my opinion on what would be the most advantageous location for the 38th Ave station. Of the three options being considered, I feel that the 41st East location would provide the easiest access to the station and the greatest benefits to the community. My reasons for holding this opinion may be summarized thus:</p> <p>The Brannan Sand and Gravel Company, which occupies the entire area on which the station would be located, is a heavy industrial enterprise which dominates the character of the surrounding area. It generates a very high volume of heavy truck traffic as well as smoke, and its tall hoppers and heaps of gravel will remain an unsightly feature after the station is in operation. If the station is located further south, then the placement of Brannan will likely choke-off desirable development to the north, and probably limit such development to the south as well.</p> <p>Since RTD will likely locate their Bus Maintenance Facility on the old Denver Post property, then those of us north of Brannan will be bracketed by these heavy industrial operations. Traffic in buses and dump trucks will affect the entire length of Fox Street and probably eliminate any chance of meaningful renewal for the area.</p> <p>Locating the station on this option would serve the Quigg Newton and Globeville neighborhoods better than the other options, allow for a shorter pedestrian bridge straight across 41st from Inca, and allow for a very uniform configuration of the station. It would eliminate the heavy traffic generated by Brannan now, and so make the addition of new traffic produced by the station less significant. It would also require the condemnation of only one property.</p> <p>Placement of the station on the 41st East option will encourage development to the north and minimize the effect of the Maintenance Facility. Replacing Brannan with an attractive station placed essentially in the center of the Fox strip will encourage renewal on both sides. If this option were chosen, then my company would look seriously at developing our property with mixed-use retail and residential units along the lines of the Englewood Town Center. Additionally, if the station is located next to our property, we would also be interested in talking with RTD about a possible PPP involvement with the station.</p> <p>Please feel free to contact me for any further information.</p> <p>Sincerely, Tom Dufficy, President, CDI Tom Dufficy Central Denver Iron Works, Inc., 303.433.3180 (Phone) ext. 304, 303.433.3002 (Fax), tomdufficy@CDIronworks.com</p>
----	--

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



41	<p>Alicia Phillips (Bruggeman)</p> <p>Goldline Hi,</p> <p>My husband and I just moved to the Old Town Arvada area. We live on Grandview Ave just east of Wadsworth. At this point in time our neighborhood does not appear to be in a Quiet Zone so that is my main concern with the additional gold line. We don't mind the trains running in front of our house but the horns for the train are blown frequently and right in front of our house. Since comments are being solicited at this time I'd encourage whatever measures are possible to keep the noise level to an absolute minimum. I've also been told there will be cables exposed to run the light rail. We just moved here from San Francisco. Many neighborhoods there were having cables run underground instead of above ground. Those areas of the city looked so much nicer then one's that ran above ground. If at all possible I think it would be great to have the cables run underground, at least in our neighborhood, to keep the Old Town Arvada feel. Finally, I think that the location of the station should be in Old Town Arvada and should fit the "feel" of old town Arvada to lure people out of the train and have them come and explore our neighborhood for a bit.</p> <p>Thank you for asking for our opinion, Alicia and Greg Bruggeman</p>
42	<p>Barney Brewer</p> <p>Comments: Goldline DEIS Attn: Dave Beckhouse Subject: Gold Line Draft Environmental Impact Statement Reference: (3.5,pp.18-20)(Figure 3.5-9)(ES-47)</p> <p>Following a review of the Arvada Section of the Gold Line DEIS, please find enclosed my concerns and comments along with exhibit "A" &"B", attached hereto and made a part hereof. Please include my comments in the Final EIS.</p> <p>Respectfully, Barney Brewer</p> <p>Comments RTD DEIS, Barney Brewer</p> <p>3.5.2 Affected Environment</p> <p>...“Generally, viewers in parks and residential areas are assumed to be the most sensitive to visual and aesthetic impacts”...</p> <p>The Stocke/Walter Addition is the location of the most significant historical residential dwellings in Arvada. This district located on Grandview Avenue between Wadsworth Bypass and Lamar Street is the gateway neighborhood to Historic Old Town. Therefore; it would be valuable to uphold the historical nature of the area when erecting new structures.</p> <p>All of the historic homes along this section of Grandview face directly toward the Gold Line right-of-way. Potentially, 20K riders per day will be able to view at eye level, the activities of the residents causing a visual and privacy impact.</p> <p>Suggested Mitigation: (1) Replace the chain link type fence with a fence similar to that used on the new Grandview Bridge. This would make an attractive transition from the bridge along the right-of-way through the neighborhood. The fence should be of sufficient height to support vines and plantings above the level of the train car windows. This would substantially reduce the visual impact. (2) Use architectural catenary poles throughout the area.</p>

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



43	<p>Alicia Bruggeman</p> <p>Hi,</p> <p>We live on Grandview Ave facing the tracks. Our concerns are that we keep noise levels to an absolute minimum and that it's aesthetically pleasing to keep our privacy. We'd be absolutely opposed to a chain fence of any sort. A wood fence would be appropriate and should cover the majority of the view from the tracks to our home. We'd like our home to remain private so it's important to us that there be a tall wooden fence between us and the tracks and that there be trees or hanging plants that prevent views into our home. Thank you for considering these options.</p>
44	<p>Margaret Christon</p> <p>I am very strongly in favor of the quiet zone being proposed for the historic district in Olde Town Arvada – i.e. along Grandview Avenue. With trains coming by every few minutes during peak hours – this is absolutely essential for those of us who live on this street. I have lived in my house for over 15 years – I moved here because of the character of the neighborhood and the large lots – I am an avid gardener. I love quietly putting in the yard – and this would be pretty hard to do with train horns and clangs every few minutes. I very much appreciate the single track in front of the house instead of two. Having the quiet zone will make all the difference in helping us tolerate this huge change to our neighborhood.</p>
45	<p>Margaret Christon</p> <p>I live on Grandview Avenue in a 100 year old house that I love. One of my big concerns as the Goldline moves forward is what I will look at out my front window once the project is completed. Right now there is a greenbelt with trees in front of my house. I would hate to see that replaced with a view of chain link fence and light rail wires. Please consider landscaping the north side of the track somehow – with trees and shrubs and even perennials and grasses. They will add beauty to the neighborhood and will also help buffer the vibration from the trains and afford us some privacy from the trains running in front of our houses every few minutes. Thank you.</p>
46	<p>Elaine Jurries</p> <p>1. Noise/vibration: I live on Grandview Ave. and the light rail will go right in front of my house. Needless to say, I strongly urge the "powers that be" to institute a quiet zone through Arvada. A quiet zone will help make living along the light rail more tolerable for the dozens of people who live in homes close to the light rail.</p> <p>2. Aesthetics: Since this part of Grandview Ave. is an historic district (Stocke-Walter), it would also enhance Arvada's reputation to have nice landscaping and trees in the zone between the tracks and Grandview Ave.</p> <p>Thank you Elaine F. Jurries</p>
47	<p>Evelyn King</p> <p>Comments on Draft EIS With the Purpose and Need statements suggesting the need for mobility improvement, there should be additional alternatives analyzed which might provide more mobility than the Preferred Alternative.? I also have concerns about the human and natural environment where the environmental consequences are concerned.? Specifically:</p> <p>1. Why were new general purpose highway lanes and bus/HOV lanes not included in the decisions made for cost/benefit.? The initial decisions?appear to?have been based on inaccurate costs for the rail alternative, with all the announced cost increases.?</p>

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



	<p>Considering the "human and natural environment," I believe highway lanes would provide greater mobility for many more people; with less disturbance of the natural environment, than the Preferred Alternative.? Where is the comparative data supporting the Preferred Alternative?? I believe the other alternatives would cost less than the Preferred Alternative and there is no valid reason why to exclude them from consideration in the EIS.</p> <p>2. I do not believe the EIS properly considered the impacts of construction on pollution and greenhouse gas emissions. The rail alternative shows?greater greenhouse emissions than the no-action alternative.? Exactly how many tons of greenhouse gases will be emitted during construction?? Since the reduction in highway traffic is extremely?tiny, I do not agree with the statement that the increase in emissions will be offset by the traffic reduction.? The fleet turnover and?flex/no fuel?car technology may not have been included in the EIS modeling; however, those vehicles will continue to provide mobility while emitting few if any emissions.? It is important to be open and honest with the citizens in this regard.?</p> <p>3. If the Preferred Alternative plans to eliminate single occupant vehicles (SOV), the EIS should provide data as to exactly how much that reduction will be, and the assumptions made.? The amount of overall traffic reduction is minuscule.?? I was very disappointed in the I-25 North Front Range EIS, which did not clearly explain how much traffic congestion reduction would occur with rail options versus highway options.? Again, let's be open and honest with the data provided.</p> <p>4. If there is a goal to ensure equal opportunity regardless of financial means, exactly how is it decided that the more wealthy don't have greater access to this subsidized transit versus those who have fewer financial means?? Will there be some form of means testing to determine fare equity?</p> <p>5. Regarding the concern for the human environment, I would like to know how the eliminated alternatives compared in the number of property acquisitions with the Preferred Alternative.? Property acquisition takes a heavy toll on the humans involved.</p> <p>Thank You, Dan King 303-588-6073 dking49326@aol.com</p>
48	<p>Georg Ek</p> <p>Megan Quinn's Residents weigh in on Gold line is commendable. I too attended the good meeting at the Arvada Center on Thursday, 7th of August, and due to a mix up did not present my comments to those assembled.</p> <p>The process of public involvement that has marked all the phases of preparation up to the development of this GOLD LINE CORRIDOR Draft Environmental Impact Statement, in my judgment has been one of the more uplifting actions of the 21st. Century.</p> <p>So much of this chaotic period, when nothing seems to have gone well, FasTracks and particularly the interaction of people concerning the Gold Line Corridor – even among those with differing views – has been both courteous and respectful.</p> <p>The beauty of FasTracks for me has been that it has involved the folk at the grass roots level in an equality of condition. Cooperation and coordination between all entities involved in the Gold Line planning has been characteristic.</p> <p>For me, FasTracks and the Gold Line plans have escaped the deluge of the international and national storms. It has been a calm sea remote from the stormy sea of trouble and discontent. The Gold Line horizon promises what I feel that which we all down</p>

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



deeply yearn: HOPE!

An aspect of promise for Arvada and adjacent communities along the Gold Line to which little has been addressed include:

The NORTHERN EXPOSURE

Job opportunities and attractions to Boulder and other cities north of Arvada promises to be more significant than it is in 2008.

Viewing the daily work force, population and transportation needs are increasingly oriented to the North.

The Pecos Street station, especially the optional Pecos St. station to the East, could more easily serve as the interchange of passengers – particularly those commuting north to work daily. Gold Line passengers could, if the optional East Pacos Station is selected, transfer to the Northwest and North Metro Corridors on the same or adjacent platforms.

If the East Pecos St. Option is chosen those ticketed to stations on the Gold Line from the northern corridors can transfer easily. On the other hand, if the Pecos west option is chosen, the transfer will be down the line, perhaps even somewhere in the Denver Union Station complex. How many will choose that inconvenience, and add to their precious transportation time?

The attraction for folk living north to attend performances at the Arvada Center continues to grow. The quality of its choice of performances and the professional actors and musicians have a wide state attraction currently. Even more so in the future.

A focus on attraction of those living in the northern exposure to the facilities off the Gold Line aside from the Arvada Center deserves attention. With a minimum of steps detrain from one of the North corridor trains to the Gold Line, and visa versa, makes the choice to go by rail over a gas guzzler appealing.

Additionally, the selection of the East Option at Pecos Street Station frees up space for the construction of a wye A railway wye connecting the northern lines to directly head into the Gold Line provides direct service and interchange not only of passengers but for railway service needs and railway equipment functions.

Isn't it reasonable to foresee the needs of special trains routed into Arvada over a wye from the north switching into the Gold Line Corridor?

Intermodal Connections

How very necessary it is for passengers to step off of one mode on to another!

Bus Stops need to be as close as space permits for passengers to transfer from or two rail or bus. Walking any distance beyond a few steps, especially anything even as short as a long block, is unacceptable – often impossible for those with strollers, carrying children, bearing shopping baggage or luggage and for the elderly and infirmed.

Busses are an adjunct to rails service, feeders that are next to not distant.

Fairs

Commuter Rail ticketing calls for the identical tariffs adopted for Light Rail service.

Ticketing for bus and rail must be the same and fair zones integrated.

Shorter trips on any mode need to be the same – not confusingly or unreasonably unlike.

Passengers boarding an express bus, for example, should not be tempted to select a local because of differences in cost. Some

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



	<p>passengers select RED line 52 over 72X and 76X because it's cheaper. This dichotomy must be thoughtfully addressed to attract ridership.)</p> <p>Esthetic and Historical Considerations</p> <p>Acute focus on esthetic and historical consideration appears to be part of the Gold Line plans. Both are necessary and must be an on going part of planning long after the Gold Line is in operation.</p>
49	<p>Michael Francone Central Street Capital, Inc.</p> <p>The biggest concern to our organization is the location of the rail stop at 39th-41st Inca. The surrounding neighborhood located East of Inca is a prime location for a TOD, it has many investors interested in developing the neighborhood into a high density mixed use neighborhood with Fox Street serving as a Main Street. High density mixed use development will benefit not only Denver and the neighborhood but RTD in the form of higher ridership of FasTracks at this location and also the park and ride for bus service. Of the three locations outlined in the DEIS the stop at 41st seems to be the best for the surrounding area. First off it is a midpoint on Fox opening up more of the surrounding area for development, it also allows for a longer staging area between the 38th Avenue stop light and the park and ride so buses don't clog the streets leading into the neighborhood.</p> <p>Another concern is the infrastructure in the area for pedestrians/bicycles, right now none exists. It is important that station design incorporate and keep in mind that pedestrians/bicycles from the surrounding neighborhood need to get to the station safely. Bike paths from the surrounding neighborhoods will be important.</p>
50	<p>Globeville Civic Association # 1, Sunnyside United Neighbors, Inc., Highland United Neighbors, Inc. 27 August 2008</p> <p>Mr. Dave Beckhouse, Federal Transit Administration c/o GBSM, Inc. 600 17th Street 2020-S Denver, CO 80202</p> <p>Dear Mr. Beckhouse,</p> <p>This letter of comment on the RTD Gold Line Draft EIS is a cooperative effort of three Registered Neighborhood Organizations (RNOs) in Denver. These organizations are:</p> <p>Globeville Civic Association # 1 (GCA # 1) 349 E. 47th Ave. Denver, CO 80216</p> <p>Highland United Neighbors, Inc. (HUNI) P. O. Box 11305 Denver, CO 80211</p>

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



Sunnyside United Neighbors, Inc. (SUNI)
 P. O. Box 11381
 Denver, CO 80211

Please see Attachment A for a map showing the three neighborhoods as well as the approximate location of the Gold Line 38th Avenue Station.

This letter falls into several sections, as follows:

1. RNO History of Involvement in Rail Transit Matters
2. Value and Importance of the 38th Avenue Station
3. 38th Avenue Station Character & Connections
4. 38th Avenue Station Location; NEPA Process Deficiency
5. Public Private Partnership Issues
6. Attachments

HUNI, SUNI, GCA # 1 Involvement with Rail Transit Issues and Process

Our three neighborhoods have been strong advocates for urban rail transit in Denver since it was first proposed, and we continue to believe in the tremendous value for the Denver metropolitan area of a successful rail transit system. We have taken part in all official processes and many unofficial meetings and events related to the Gold Line and the Commuter Rail Maintenance Facility since late 2004. We have attempted to operate within the NEPA processes so as to help bring about good outcomes. All three neighborhoods are founding members of Judy Montero's Council District 9 Stakeholders group. We have organized networks of interested NW Denver residents, and a website (www.SunnysideDenver.org) has posted relevant documents. We have sought out rail experts and NEPA advisers to enable us to participate more intelligently. A salient example of the three neighborhoods' cooperation with RTD was our early acceptance and advocacy for electric commuter rail on the Gold Line, when light rail became impossible. Taking the value of the entire Gold Line project as a given, we will concentrate our comments on the function most particularly important to our neighborhoods: the "38th Avenue" Station (aka Fox Station, aka Sunnyside Station.)

Importance of Gold Line 38th Avenue Station for Three Neighborhoods

We are very happy that the DEIS shows the 38th Avenue Station remaining as a basic part of the Gold Line project. From the time of the earliest discussions of an RTD rail network NW Denver residents and RNOs insisted on a station at the east end of Highland or Sunnyside. This station was to be NW Denver's only direct connection to the rail system, and NW Denver residents were the first to recognize the advantages of having the Gold Line station also serve the Boulder-Longmont line (now NW Rail.) It is our primary objective to see the 38th Avenue Station built and its revitalizing potential for surrounding areas realized. We believe that the new transit function will have many desirable effects for our neighborhoods and for the City as a whole. Among those effects are the following:

1. Our three neighborhoods are home to many lower-income residents. We host a concentration of public and subsidized housing, several community correctional facilities, and various institutions serving poor residents. The new transit mode within easy reach will offer opportunities of especial value to such residents. Whereas now a job at DIA, for instance, might seem too far away from

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



	<p>Sunnyside or Highland, the completion of the FasTracks system will open such possibilities for our residents.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Revitalization and redevelopment are likely in the vicinity of the new station. This new activity has potential to alleviate the consequences of environmental and social injustices stemming from a prior history of dirty industry in the area (smelting, brick making, heavy rail infrastructure and related enterprises.) 3. The 38th Avenue Station vicinity has excellent potential for Transit Oriented Development. This station is the first station away from DUS on two lines. Only two other stations in the FasTracks system have this characteristic (40/40 and Auraria.) A considerable acreage of underutilized land lies within half a mile of the 38th Ave station, both east and west of the railyards. It is logical and possible for a much higher density environment to be developed in this station's immediate vicinity, and we intend to work to encourage new concentrations of employment in the station area, e.g., a medical and/or educational complex. <p>Station Character and Connections</p> <p>Because the public comment period for the Gold Line DEIS will end on September 1st, we are forced to submit these comments before knowing where exactly the Fox St. station will be located. (About this schedule disconnect, please see below.) But whichever of the three potential sites is chosen, it is reasonable to enumerate the station characteristics that seem most essential to us:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We want the station to be a success – by which we mean that transit riders find it comfortable, safe, attractive and convenient to use. The station access must accommodate cars, buses, pedestrians and bicycles smoothly. Best practice, non-scattering light, downward-directed; shelter against wind and weather; protection from noise and smoke from the freight equipment operating nearby will all be essential ingredients in a successful station. 2. We support more, rather than fewer, access bridges from Sunnyside and Highland; this will be especially necessary if the most southerly site is chosen. The existing bridge over the railyard at 43rd Ave. should be upgraded; we believe this to be a railroad obligation. And a new bridge should reach the station platform from Sunnyside. The City is planning a pedestrian bridge over 38th Ave. at Inca to bring Highland residents more easily to the west end of the platform access bridge. 3. The whole catchment area must be considered as part of the station plan. Pedestrians and bikes approaching from SE Globeville via W. 44th Ave., for instance, need much better (and safer) infrastructure. 4. The station must be designed with sensitivity for future land use and TOD. In particular, the Fox Street frontage of the Station area must be designed and/or preserved for human-scale use. Improved street amenity (sidewalks, curbs and gutters, drainage, street furniture and lighting) along Fox Street is also a necessity. <p>38th Avenue Station Location; NEPA Process Deficiency</p> <p>The Gold Line DEIS exhibits three possible sites for the Sunnyside station. RTD plans to choose one of the three in September 2008, after Gold Line DEIS public comment closes. The lack of a site decision has caused the repeated postponement of Denver's planned Station Area Study – a study we hoped would clarify many issues related to traffic flow, foot and bike access, and logical zoning reconsiderations.</p> <p>In addition, a function not analyzed at all in the GL DEIS may be relevant to the choice of station site: RTD has concluded that the present Platte Division Bus Maintenance Facility site is the only practical location for the Commuter Rail Maintenance Facility.</p> <p>Thus, RTD has decided to conduct a separate Environmental Assessment for the CRMF. This EA – on no schedule coordinated</p>
--	---

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



with the Gold Line EIS – will study the “indirect

effect” of relocating the Platte Division bus facility (aka Bus Barn, aka BB.) RTD announced on July 1, 2008 that its preferred location for the new BB is the former Denver Post printing plant site at W. 44th Ave. and Fox Street (see Attachment B.) Although there have been developments, at the date of this writing we have no official indication that RTD has changed its mind. Concerned as we are with the smooth functioning of our future rail station, we naturally need to know how a new Bus Barn next door will affect it.

To elicit the information we need about the impacts of a new BB near our station, the three neighborhoods cooperated to present detailed questions to RTD and the City of Denver. These “41 Questions” (Attachment C) were hand-delivered to RTD and the City on July 21, 2008. We have had cursory responses from the City (Attachment D, received August 21, 2008.) From RTD the only response has been a note of acknowledgement from the General Manager, Mr. Marsella, dated 22 July 2008 (Attachment E.) We include the 41 Questions as a part of this comment letter in the expectation that they will be answered. These Questions/Answers will also be relevant to the Maintenance Facilities EA.

As suggested by our 41 Questions, the Bus Barn and its ultimate location have significant potential to affect multiple aspects of the FasTracks project. A facility expected to service at least 300 buses will obviously have a substantial dynamic effect upon the other impacts to the environment caused by the greater FasTracks development. NEPA analyses not just for the Bus Barn itself, but also for the Gold Line and NW Rail, and possibly for DUS, North Metro, and East Corridor, should account for any direct, indirect and cumulative impacts caused by the construction and operation of the Bus Barn. Some of those impacts include:

1. Increased traffic in the immediate Bus Barn vicinity and in the vicinity of the Fox Street Station directly caused by bus trips in and out of SW Globeville;
2. Indirect effects on traffic;
3. Impacts to air quality;
4. Levels of noise pollution and vibration;
5. The effect on ancillary Transit Oriented Development;
6. Impacts from the storage of fuels and other hazardous materials;
7. The potential for disproportionate impacts to low-income communities and possible measures to mitigate those impacts.

The various NEPA analyses now underway – and the Gold Line in particular – must assess these impacts in order to comply fully with the statute.

It is not our intention here to assign blame. But this concatenation of uncoordinated studies and absent information makes it impossible for our three neighborhoods to analyze and comment effectively upon the various Fox Street station sites. To us this seems to violate the spirit of NEPA, which aims to encourage and facilitate – not to frustrate – informed public involvement. To this extent, we believe that the Gold Line EIS process has been deficient.

Public Private Partnership Issues

The Preface and Appendix H of the Gold Line DEIS make reference to RTD's expectation that the Gold Line project will involve a PPP arrangement of some kind. The total budget for the Gold Line was established by the voters when they passed the FasTracks

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



	<p>funding measure. Any PPP structure will occasion increased total costs to the public, although those costs will not appear in RTD's budget. We believe that public officials and agencies have an obligation to explain these increased total costs. We are not sure where and in what manner this disclosure should best occur, but since the Gold Line DEIS documents the assumption of a PPP, we believe that the FEIS should at least recognize the necessity for full disclosure. We are also concerned to know what structure of accountability will bind the private operator to the public interest.</p> <p>Very sincerely yours, Mrs. Paulette Hirsch, President Globeville Civic Association # 1 Ms. Kristin Morley, President Highland United Neighbors, Inc.</p> <p>Tim Boers, Chair Planning and Community Development Committee Highland United Neighbors, Inc.</p> <p>Keith Howard, President Sunnyside United Neighbors, Inc.</p> <p>CC: Ms. Liz Telford, RTD Don Ulrich, CH2MHill Andy Mountain, GBSM</p> <p>Attachments</p> <p>A. Map showing Sunnyside, Highland and Globeville, with approximate location of the Gold Line 38th Avenue station, http://www.sunnysidedenver.org/documents/HUNI_SUNI_GCA_Map.pdf</p> <p>B. RTD Bus Maintenance Facility Site Selection Process: PowerPoint presentation made to RTD Board on 7/1/2008, http://www.sunnysidedenver.org/documents/Bus_Maintenance_Facility_Selection_Process.pdf</p> <p>C. 41 Questions http://www.sunnysidedenver.org/documents/BB_reloc_1_questions.pdf; Transmittal letter to RTD Director Chacon (http://www.sunnysidedenver.org/documents/Chacon_BB_letter.pdf)</p> <p>D. Denver Community Planning & Development responses to 41 Questions (8/21/2008) (http://www.sunnysidedenver.org/documents/41%20questions8-21-08.pdf)</p> <p>E. Cal Marsella note (7/22/2008) acknowledging receipt of 41 Questions</p>
51	<p>Willie R. Taylor United States Department of the Interior ER 08/713</p> <p>Mr. David Beckhouse Federal Transit Administration c/o GBSM, Inc.</p>

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



600 17th Street, Suite 2020-S
Denver, Colorado 80202

Dear Mr. Beckhouse:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Gold Line Corridor Project, Denver, Adams, and Jefferson Counties, Colorado. The Department of the Interior (Department) reviewed the document and provides the following comments.

WILDLIFE COMMENTS

The Department recommends that the Biological Resources chapter of the DEIS Incorporate discussion and guidelines for conservation of migratory birds, as follows:

Under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA), activities in grassland, wetland, stream, and woodland habitats, and at bridges (e.g., which may affect swallow nesting on bridge girders) that would destroy (i.e., "take") migratory birds, eggs, young, and/or active nests should be avoided. Although the provisions of the MBTA are applicable year-round, the primary nesting season of most migratory birds in eastern Colorado is from April 1 to August 15. Some migratory birds nest outside of this period. For example, raptors can be expected to nest during February 1 through July 15. Adherence to the following guidelines will help avoid the unnecessary take of migratory birds and help ensure compliance with applicable laws.

The Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) recommends that field surveys of habitats and structures in the project area be conducted by a qualified biologist to determine the absence or presence of nesting migratory birds prior to project construction or demolition. The results of these field surveys along with information regarding the qualifications of the biologist should be documented and retained on file by the project proponent until construction of the entire project has been completed. At bridges or similar structures where nesting may occur, measures may be taken early in the year, prior to the onset of nesting in order to prevent nesting re-initiation.

Please contact Dave Carlson, Regional Environmental Review Coordinator, telephone

303-236-4254, in the FWS's Ecological Services Field Office in Lakewood, Colorado, immediately if a field survey identifies the presence of one or more active bird nests that cannot be avoided by the project activities.

SECTION 4(f) COMMENTS

The Department appreciates that you have considered both existing and future planned properties in the Section 4(f) Evaluation; however, because there is no Preferred Alternative selected, we cannot concur that there is no feasible or prudent alternative to the Preferred Alternative selected in the document, and that all measures have been taken to minimize harm to these resources. We recommend that once you have selected a Preferred Alternative, specific mitigation measures be solidified for the affected Section 4(f) properties, and documented in the Section (f) Evaluation.

For further information concerning Section 4(f) resources, please contact Roxanne Runkel, National Park Service, telephone 303-969-2377.

We appreciate the opportunity to review this document.

Sincerely,

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



	<p>Willie R. Taylor Director, Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance</p> <p>cc: Ms. Elizabeth Telford Regional Transportation District Gold Line Corridor 1560 Broadway, Suite 700 Denver, CO 80202</p>
52	<p>Bill McDowell Pecos Street Station – Public Comment for the EIS Adams County Self Storage 5999 Pecos Street Denver, CO 80221</p> <p>August 8, 2008</p> <p>Mr. David Beckhouse Mrs. Liz Telford Federal Transit Administration, Region 8 Regional Transportation District C/O Gold Line Team Gold Line Corridor Project Manager GBSM RTD-FasTracks 600 17th Street, Suite 2020 1560 Broadway, Suite 700 Denver, CO 80202</p> <p>Dear Mr. Beckhouse and Mrs. Telford:</p> <p>I am writing on behalf of my partners and myself. We own Adams County Self Storage (ACSS) located at 5999 Pecos St. in Denver, Colorado. It is our opinion that part of our site would provide your project with the optimal location for the joint Pecos Street Station that will serve both the Gold Line and Northwest Corridor. As such, the purpose of this letter is to formally ask the FTA and RTD to consider our property as a 3rd alternative for the Pecos Street Station.</p> <p>First, I will start with a little background regarding 5999 Pecos Street and ACSS. The property is approximately 23 acres, and abuts the Burlington Northern line on the south for almost 1000 feet. We have developed our business with a unique system of storage containers that are not permanently fixed to the ground. They are currently configured to maximize storage options for our tenants, but all of them can be moved on site or elsewhere.</p>

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



	<p>Please also note that every one of our tenants is on a month to month lease.</p> <p>We point this out because we have been told the reason that our property has not been considered as an option previously is because the FTA is concerned about the time and cost of negotiating with a large number of individuals per the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970. It is our belief that this concern is unfounded, and has created a flawed process to date.</p> <p>Two examples include the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In order to reach the Pecos West Station Option an access road has to be constructed through the middle of ACSS. 2. When acquiring the Gold Line Right of Way, FasTracks is going to have to purchase or condemn ACSS property (as shown on the draft alignment). <p>It is our belief that should FasTracks decide to locate the Pecos Street Station on our property that we as the business operators can downsize, reconfigure the storage containers, or relocate existing tenants to other units on site. We are the only body that you would need to negotiate with.</p> <p>Another item that should be considered is the cost savings of locating the Station and the Parking Lots on the same side of the Burlington Northern line. If built on our property the project will be able to eliminate the cost of a pedestrian bridge currently required with the Pecos East Station alternative.</p> <p>Much like the FTA and RTD we have been gathering facts and information over the past few months (or years in your case) in order to make educated future decisions regarding this project and our property. We are excited about the future of rapid transit in this area and can only hope that before a final decision is made on the location of the Pecos Street Station our property is thoroughly examined and compared to the current two options.</p> <p>Sincerely, Bill McDowell Partner Adams County Self Storage (303) 499-1441</p>
53	<p>Brian Murphy Bombardier</p> <p>Section 2.2.5 Conceptual Alternatives of the Gold Line DEIS lists two of the four different fixed-guideway transit technologies selected for potential use as Electric Multiple Unit (EMU) and Diesel Multiple Unit (DMU). Does the definition of EMU and DMU include locomotive hauled coaches? If not, can this alternative been considered in the DEIS? Locomotive hauled coaches could be a cost effective and efficient solution for the project.</p>
54	<p>Timothy T. Carey Department of the Army Corps Of Engineers, Omaha District August 29, 2008</p>

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



	<p>Federal Transit Administration, Region 8 Mr. David Beckhouse c/o Gold Line Team, GBSM 600 17th Street, Suite 2020 Denver, Colorado 80202</p> <p>RE: Gold Line Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), Application #200680390 Comments on DEIS</p> <p>Dear Mr. Beckhouse:</p> <p>Reference is made to the Gold Line Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) that was delivered to the Denver Regulatory Office July 11, 2008. The document describes the proposed plan to provide Commuter Rail from Denver Union Station in downtown Denver to Ward Road in Wheat Ridge, Colorado.</p> <p>The DEIS indicates that you are currently in negotiations with Union Pacific Railroad regarding the amount of clearance between the existing tracks and your proposed set of tracks. If they require a 50 foot track center, the additional wetland impacts for the project may exceed the 0.50 acre threshold and require an Individual Permit rather than a Nationwide Permit. We assume you will notify us as soon as that decision is made as additional information will be needed such as all the Township(s), Range(s) and Sections (s) where the project exists, adjacent property owners, etc.</p> <p>The determination of which permitting process is appropriate is predicated upon the amount of impacts to jurisdictional waters. We will use the Approved Jurisdictional Determinations to guide our evaluation of impacts. Since the extent and magnitude of these are not known at this time, we cannot provide any input for the DEIS regarding this matter. For the same reasons, we cannot comment on which Alternative in the DEIS may be the least environmentally damaging, practicable alternative that meets your purpose and need (LEPDA).</p> <p>Please note that Ms. Margaret Langworthy is the new project manager for this application. If you have any questions or need clarification, please contact her at (303)-979-4120.</p> <p>Sincerely, Timothy T. Carey Chief, Denver Regulatory Office Department of the Army Corps Of Engineers</p>
55	<p>Craig G. Kocian City of Arvada Liz Telford, AICP Gold Line Project Manager Manager of Corridor Planning-Environmental RTD FasTracks Team 1560 Broadway Suite 700 Denver, CO 80202</p>

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



Re: Gold Line Draft EIS

Dear Ms. Telford:

The City of Arvada staff has reviewed the Draft EIS and we offer the following comments:

1. We appreciate the diligent and energetic work of RTD and its consultants in arriving at a preferred alternative, assessing its impacts and coming up with appropriate mitigation. The work of your team has been extremely professional and responsive to the concerns of our community. We look forward to working closely with RTD on the Final EIS and more detailed design plans.
2. During the Final EIS, we feel that it is important to continue the high level of public involvement in developing more detailed design plans and performance specifications. In particular, we believe public involvement and coordination with the City is important for:
 - a. Catenary design through residential sections of the City and Olde Town in particular
 - b. The new bridges that will span the Union Pacific Railway, Ralston Creek, Kipling Parkway and the Wadsworth Bypass
 - c. Fencing design
 - d. Retaining walls
 - e. The transformer needed at the Sheridan Station
 - f. Station shelter design for the Sheridan, Olde Town and Arvada Ridge stations
 - g. Pedestrian bridges at the Olde Town and Arvada Ridge stations
 - h. Specific access and circulation plans for all three transit stations.
3. We support RTD's direction in mitigating noise and vibration impacts from the Gold Line. We agree that it is essential to pursue Quiet Zone improvements at existing at-grade rail crossings as horn noise for existing trains and proposed commuter rail is the key noise issue. We also agree with RTD's direction in mitigating vibration impacts between Carr Street and Independence Street by employing track isolation and turnout modification techniques.

On these topics, we have the following questions:

 - a. The word "potential" is used when describing vibration impacts but is not used when describing noise impacts. The EIS states that further vibration analysis will be completed during project design. We are concerned because the 18 single family homes that would experience vibration impacts are at, or just above, the 72 VbD level that defines an impact. When will this analysis take place and how may it differ from that which has been done to date? Might these homes "fall out" of the impact definition range?
 - b. There is a clear commitment to noise mitigation in the implementation of Quiet Zones through Arvada. However, it appears that vibration mitigation will be implemented only if it is reasonable and feasible (Section 3.8.2.4). The City expects that the determination of whether mitigation is reasonable and feasible will be included in the FEIS. Please confirm or explain as necessary.
4. While the City appreciates that RTD must follow applicable Federal laws, City Council is of the opinion that the Denver and Northwestern Denver Tramway feature north of the parking area is barely identifiable and not "significant". In reality, there may be more benefit from what may be learned from any artifacts extracted from the site. These could be displayed at the Olde Town Station and offer an historic benefit to the citizens of Arvada. We see this as an opportunity and a possible community project to

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



	<p>be taken on by a group of interested citizens. Further, the current plans for the location of structured parking are influenced by this feature and it may be advantageous to move the structure further to the north. Moving the structure further to the north may better facilitate the extension of West 56th Avenue and transit-oriented development in that area.</p> <p>5. Page 3.11-8 states that a Letter of No Further Action for the remediation of the Lucky Mart has not been received from the State. Please explain what, if any, effect this may have on the Gold Line and associated costs.</p> <p>6. How have costs for handling of hazardous materials been accounted for in the construction costs for the project?</p> <p>7. Chapter 4, Transportation Systems.</p> <p>a. The Final EIS should reflect the City's adopted master plan with respect to the extension of West 56th Avenue between the Wadsworth Bypass and Vance Street. This road extension will be mutually beneficial to RTD and the City. The West 56th extension which includes signalization of its intersection with the Wadsworth Bypass, provides RTD a more direct connection to station parking, improves bus circulation and may reduce the improvements needed at the intersections of West 55th Avenue with the Wadsworth Bypass, Vance Street and Olde Wadsworth Boulevard. This extension also implements one of the goals of our Transit Station Framework Plan and facilitates much better access to Olde Town proper and our planned redevelopment area south of the tracks. The City of Arvada would like to partner with RTD in constructing the West 56th Avenue extension to facilitate our mutual goals.</p> <p>b. With regard to Section 4.7.1, Parking Demand, we are concerned that the opening day parking supply for the Ward Road Station may be significantly undersized. Looking at this station from a purely intuitive standpoint, it would seem the end of the line station needs more than 200 spaces on opening day. To the extent that opening day supply doesn't address actual demand, increased pressure will be placed on Arvada Ridge and Olde Town Stations.</p> <p>c. Arvada continues to believe that a parking structure is needed at the Olde Town Station long before 2030, if not on opening day. We realize that RTD cannot currently charge for parking (except for out-of-district users) so we would like to explore all possibilities. To this end, we suggest that RTD acquire the necessary property for the parking structure now and deed it to the City. Construction and operation of the parking structure would be handled by the City with RTD partnering in a suitable percentage.</p> <p>d. Regarding the amount of parking, Table 4-7 seems to indicate that parking at the Olde Town Station will consist of 650 structured spaces in 2030, yet Sheet SP-011 in the Appendix shows just a portion of the spaces structured. What is RTD's intent with respect to the amount of structured parking?</p> <p>e. Structured parking will also free up land for transit-oriented development and be more compatible with our urban form objectives for this area.</p> <p>f. It should be noted that West 51st Place does not connect with Miller Street as shown in Figure 4-17.</p> <p>g. Table 4-9 recommends elimination of the Lee Street crossing at the Arvada Ridge Station. While we realize that the ultimate decision regarding whether this crossing is allowed rests with the PUC, we feel that the Lee Street crossing and the extension of Lee Street to the south is important to providing better connectivity for motorists, pedestrians and emergency vehicles. This crossing and extension of Lee Street is shown on our adopted Transit Station Framework Plan.</p> <p>h. The traffic impact analysis has been conducted for streets and intersections within one quarter mile of the stations. The City</p>
--	---

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



believes that impacts extend well beyond this radius. Because RTD has used and refined the DRCOG model, information on access and mode of access to the stations is known. The City requests an evaluation of traffic volume increases, and mitigation, on streets used to access the stations, such as Olde Wadsworth and Ridge Road. Further, we request the evaluation of intersection impacts, and mitigation, beyond the one quarter mile radius used, such as Olde Wadsworth and Ralston Road. This comment applies to the three Arvada stations.

- i. Specific to the Sheridan Station, the Zenobia Street access is about 70 feet from intersection of Sheridan Boulevard and W. 60th Ave., which does not comply with the City's standards for access to new development. The City requests that RTD develop an alternative access.
 - j. Section 4.1 states "However, for New Starts Purposes, FTA headquarters has not reviewed or approved the travel forecasting, Summit modeling, or model calibration used for evaluating the Preferred Alternative." What does this mean and how might the pending review affect the EIS? When will this review occur? The model is fundamental to nearly every aspect of the project.
 - k. Changes in current bus service will likely change with the Gold Line. Where in the document are changes in bus service discussed? This is a very important element to the overall improvement in mobility that the Gold Line will bring to the City.
8. The City of Arvada prefers the Pecos Street East location for the station planned in this area as it facilitates a connection with the Northwest Rail Corridor. In addition to providing a more convenient transfer point for Arvada residents that travel to or from the northwest area, this station location seems to be most consistent with the plans of our neighbor, Adams County.
9. While we realize that station design will be addressed during the Final EIS, we would encourage RTD to explore opportunities to incorporate renewable energy technologies. For example, given the east to west orientation of most station platforms, there is an opportunity to incorporate solar panels on south facing roofs of the stations. Since the cost of photovoltaic technology is expected to drop in coming years, RTD may find this approach very cost effective in terms of offsetting costs associated with consumption of electricity. Incorporating solar in station design would also deliver an important message to our citizens about the importance of renewable energy in addressing the issues of global warming and regional air pollution.
10. With respect to the anticipated public private partnership (PPP), the City suggests that the contractor/operator receive a bonus (or a deduct) based on satisfaction ratings from the public. Also regarding the PPP, the City would appreciate involvement in the selection of the contractor/operator, or as a minimum, that our opinion be considered in the decision-making process.
11. RTD should fully investigate the use of recycled materials in constructing the Gold Line. Arvada is fortunate to have a major concrete and asphalt recycling operation just west of Sheridan Boulevard.
12. To further address the issue of air pollution during construction of the Gold Line, RTD should investigate requiring contractors to use low sulphur diesel fuel and clean diesel technology.

The City appreciates the opportunity to comment and we look forward to continuing the excellent working relationship that the City has enjoyed throughout this project.

Sincerely,
Craig G. Kocian
City Manager

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



	<p>C: Arvada City Council Members Bill Ray, Deputy City Manager Mike Elms, Director, Community Development Department Jim Root, Director, Public Works Department Bob Manwaring, Deputy Director, Public Works Department Mike Smith, Planning Division Manager Kevin Nichols, Senior Planner Patricia Lorence, City Traffic Engineer</p>
56	<p>Carmen Lerma Mendoza Regency Student Housing</p> <p>I am writing on behalf of The Regency: Auraria's Student Housing Community. Our property is located at 3900 Elati Street. We have over 500 students who would benefit from and definitely use the new rail stop. Our preference would be the stop at 41st because this would allow better access to buses and would make development in the neighborhood more likely. Also for the use of this rail stop, it would be important for Brannon Sand and Gravel to relocate.</p> <p>Finally, the safety of our residents and other users is very important so having both pedestrian and bicycle access to the rail stop are important so that they are safe from traffic.</p>
57	<p>Kenneth P. Charles DEIS No surprises, just hope the funding holds up. Ken Charles</p>
58	<p>Constantin Nickonov</p> <p>DEIS comments For both the record and your immediate consideration, I would like to add the following comments to the Gold Line DEIS process. My area of concern is around the first stop from Denver Union Station, which will ultimately be shared by the Northwest Rail line -- and possibly other future commuter lines (both local and regional), the station in the proximity of 38th Ave. and Fox St. It seems to me that a lot of thought has gone into defining the area east of the station, while almost nothing is planned for the west side. This is an omission, which will not serve well the surrounding neighborhoods, whose most dense populations are currently located to the west. Plans for access, parking, and bus service must be carefully considered to ensure both neighborhood ridership and minimal strain on the vicinity -- which will, in turn, promote the Transit Oriented Development that is logical for the blocks around the station.</p> <p>What are your plans? How has the public been involved -- and how will the public be involved -- in making sure Denver's only transit station along the Gold Line serves its residents best?</p> <p>Constantin Nickonov</p>

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



59	<p>Tom Graham Concerned Commuters Gold Line DEIS Comments Gold Line DEIS Comments</p> <p>When, at public presentations, comparisons of effectiveness between various rail and bus solutions were requested, the response invariably was, “Bus was taken off the table at the outset,” or similar answers. This was troubling to experienced transportation planners. ES.3 of the DEIS states that over 20 alternatives were evaluated and, “Highway widening and bus/HOV lanes were not supported by the public due to the environmental impacts associated with the required interstate widening.” Quite to the contrary, knowledgeable public commentators have, from the start of the FasTracks planning process, recommended that a form of bus rapid transit(BRT), with, or without reserved express lanes, HOV, etc., is the appropriate solution to reduction of traffic congestion in this region, and at greatly less cost than rail systems. In support of this expert opinion are recent GAO reports ranking BRT as more cost effective. This DEIS includes only these alternatives: (1) Do nothing, 2) Transportation System Management (TSM), which consists largely of token bus service improvements, and (3) Build the rail line. Transit planning is a response to the public dissatisfaction with increasing traffic congestion, and FasTracks was sold to the public as a solution. This DEIS neglects solutions, and is a classic exercise in pre-determined outcome. It certainly is insulting to the public. Note well that the earlier Gold Line Major Investment Study (MIS) published by RTD, included new highway lanes as well as Bus/HOV lanes, which cost very much less than rail alternatives. There is no valid reason for neglecting them in this DEIS. Further, the rail system is forecast to reduce traffic by a negligible 0.0085%. (TSM would be a similar 0.0097%). Some project consultants put the figure at zero. The MIS estimated the Gold Line to cost \$281 million. Later, published documents and comments by public officials gave a figure of \$316 million for a line extending to downtown Golden. By the date of the ‘04 election, the figure was \$355 million. This DEIS puts the price at \$609 million, 117% over the original, for a line about half the length of the original plan. Transit planning professionals consider the early estimates as being intentional “low-balling” to help get the project approved. Had these cost increases been divulged, highway lanes and BRT solutions would have been enormously attractive, and certainly would have been chosen. The excuse of “unforeseen materials cost increases” is not supported by the experiences of many other major projects. The no-action alternative produces virtually the same amount of carbon monoxide as the rail alternative. The rail alternative produces more greenhouse gas emissions than no-action. This DEIS claims that this increase would be offset by traffic reduction, but since the reduction is already taken into account, the statement appears to be purposely misleading. The DEIS neglects to</p> <p>mention greenhouse gas emissions during construction. The DEIS statements on pp. 3.7-6 and 3.7-9 are contradicted by the table on 3.7-10. It is noted that the most vigorous support of rail, in lieu of the widely accepted solutions for this type of region, including bus and other traffic measures, comes from advocates of Transit Oriented Development (TOD), and its real estate speculation opportunities. In addition, enormous effort and money has been expended by people and firms who recognize that contracting opportunities for rail system design and construction far exceed those for other modes. These advocates also recognize that the average citizen lacks knowledge of the technical and financial aspects of transit, and is influenced by mere slogans.</p> <p>Respectfully submitted, Tom Graham Transitanalysis@aol.com 303-429-6588</p>
----	---

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



60	<p>Perry Stearns</p> <p>BNSF trains currently using the Gold Line passageway have in the past month greatly increased the cautionary noises they emit. They are now exceedingly loud. What is the meaning of this? Is this really disturbing noise day and night a protest designed for some particular end?</p>
61	<p>John Kiljan Gold Line Draft EIS Comments September 1, 2008</p> <p>Dave Beckhouse, FTA c/o GBSM, Inc. 600 17th Street 2020-S Denver, CO 80202</p> <p>Dear Mr. Beckhouse:</p> <p>Here are my comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) issued by the Regional Transportation District (RTD) for the Gold Line for its 45-day public comment period. These comments are on the four underlined subject headings that I feel are the most important. All of them relate to the Olde Town station site, its support facilities and future access to Denver's airport from Arvada's Olde Town.</p> <p>56th Avenue and Bus Routing Plans</p> <p>The DEIS does not address the planned routing of RTD busses that will connect to the Olde Town commuter rail station. Only the bus loading and unloading areas on a new extension of 56th Avenue are shown on project plans (Figures 2-26 and 2-27, file attached). These figures also show the new 56th Avenue extension will be the only access to the closer-in northern Olde Town RTD parking lot. That northerly lot is also where the DEIS shows a three-story parking structure is to be built by 2030 on top of the 2015 opening-day parking.</p> <p>Yet, as essential as the 56th Avenue extension is to the parking plan in the DEIS, RTD does not plan build this extension of the road. The DEIS only shows the extension is to be built 'by others'. See Figure 4-17 in the DEIS. Currently, the City of Arvada, which estimates the cost of the road to be \$1.3 million, has not budgeted to build an extension of 56th Avenue, nor has any other private entity that I am aware of.</p> <p>Without knowing the routing of the connecting busses into these parking lots and to the other drop off points on the plans, and without knowing whether or not 56th Avenue will actually be extended, the impacts on city traffic can only be guessed at by the public when reviewing this document.</p> <p>I request that the final EIS show:</p> <p>the expected bus routes in and out of the Olde Town lots with the planned 56th Avenue extension (assuming some entity does fund it), and</p> <p>how RTD plans to handle the bus routes and mitigate other traffic flow issues if 56th Avenue is not extended by others, and the cost (or savings) to the Gold Line project if the City of Arvada (or any other entity) does not build the 56th Avenue extension as</p>

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



expected, and

the impact the increased cost may have on the other elements of the Gold Line if RTD adopts build-to-budget restraints for the Gold Line.

Pedestrian Access and Bridges

I had assumed from participating in early Gold Line focus groups, that there would be at least one, and possibly two, pedestrian bridges at the Olde Town station. They were to have been multi-purpose, allowing access to the Gold Line platform while freight trains were using the adjacent track, and to provide safer and faster access for pedestrians crossing to or from the parking and residential areas on the south side of the tracks to the business district on the north side while either the freight or commuter lines were in use. These bridges are not in the DEIS, nor is any comparable pedestrian underpass, nor can I see where the DEIS says why they have not been included. (Note: A pedestrian 'bridge' is shown in Olde Town in the DEIS, but it does not cross the tracks, or anything else, and serves a different purpose.)

I request that the final EIS show how the pedestrian access and safety issues these bridges were meant to address will be mitigated and why a pedestrian bridge is not needed to do that.

The Economics of a Three-Story Parking Structure

The DEIS calls for the construction of a three-story 455-space parking structure on the north Olde Town station parking lot by 2030, if not before. That this structure will be built as a part of the Gold Line has been confirmed in public hearings and in a recent presentation to the Arvada City Council by RTD. However, other statements in the DEIS leave the structure's viability and the impacts of not having the structure in doubt. Specifically, the DEIS says that all the Gold Line's engineering elements will be subject to a 'value engineering' review, and that the Gold Line will be a public-private partnership (also known as Penta-P) that will design-build-operate-maintain-finance the line under a decades-long contract, and that 455-space structure will only add 150 additional spaces to the Olde Town station parking (see again Figure 2-27 and related text).

RTD did not provide cost figures for the structure in the DEIS, but City of Arvada has estimated the total cost of the structure to be about \$20 million. That comes to \$133 thousand for each additional parking space for the Olde Town station. Even if the structure's cost were offset by charging for each of the 455 parking spaces in the structure, depending upon the cost of financing, I estimate that the daily parking fee would have to be between \$5 and \$11 a day just to cover the cost of the structure's construction. Even those numbers assume full occupancy 365 days a year and no ongoing maintenance or operations costs.*

It does not appear from the numbers that have been made available to the public that the parking structure, as a Gold Line design feature, is an economically feasible investment--regardless of whether or not it is publicly or privately funded. The concern, of course, is that if adequate close-in parking cannot be provided by RTD for the Olde Town station--either surface or structured parking--the spill-over demand for commuter parking will have an adverse impact on local businesses and residences.

I request that the final EIS include the calculations that show the proposed parking structure has a reasonable chance of passing its upcoming value engineering review. If it cannot, I request that RTD show in the final EIS where else it plans to provide for the additional 150 spaces of close-in parking that the DEIS says will be needed by 2030.

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



The Doubling of the Time Needed to Reach DIA by Public Transportation

Although I've listed it last, this is my primary concern with the DEIS.

RTD plans to discontinue its financial support for the A-Line shuttle service from Olde Town to Denver International Airport (DIA) on the Gold Line's opening day--effectively canceling the service. It appears that this is being done with the hope that the A-Line ridership will move to the Gold Line and that the A-Line would be in competition with the Gold Line for ridership if it were to continue to operate.

The impact of loosing this service is not addressed in this DEIS, nor, as far as I know in the planning documents for Denver Union Station (DUS) or the Fastrack's East Corridor that runs to the airport from DUS, or in any other publicly available RTD planning document.

Because of the pending A-Line cancellation, the opening of the Gold Line will not be a happy event for Arvada business travelers and vacationers who plan to use public transportation to reach DIA and the rest of the world. Moreover, the economic impact of loosing the A-Line goes beyond the line's mere ridership numbers. From my own experience, I believe that businesses that are considering locating in Arvada will make their decision, in part, on how easy access will be to our regional airport for its employees. The same is true for Arvadan's who work for established companies in other metro areas that require frequent travel for their employees.

Again, none of this is addressed in the DEIS, but here is the relevant information as I have come to understand it over the past year:

The A-Line is the successor to the earlier RTD AS route from Olde Town to DIA that ran a full-sized bus to DIA. RTD discontinued the AS route in early 2003 saying that it was not cost effective, but agreed to be a sponsor of the replacement A-Line to mitigate the impact of the AS line's cancellation.

The replacement A-Line ran a smaller and more cost-effective shuttle service and was supported in a three-way partnership between RTD, the City of Arvada and local businesses.

Even though the A-Line does not enjoy the same fare subsidy of other RTD routes, it is efficient enough that it has been able to fund the periodic replacement of its three vans and it no longer needs a subsidy from the City of Arvada to continue to operate.

A-Line ridership is currently about 32,000 trips per year and growing.

The A-Line leaves hourly from RTD's Olde Town parking lot and has a 45-minute trip time to DIA. The return trip is also offered hourly.

Outbound service begins at 5 AM and last return service is at 9 PM, requiring earlier departures or later arrivals to take a \$75 private taxi ride. There is no other privately run shuttle service going from DIA to Olde Town or anywhere else in Arvada.

The A-Line will permanently stop its service on the opening day of new Gold Line planned for sometime late in 2015, leaving the Gold Line as the only public transportation option for access to DIA. This reason for this is that the A-Line may not operate in competition with the Gold Line.

Unlike the current A-Line where passengers simply carry their luggage from the adjacent parking lot to a waiting van a couple of hundred feet away, travelers to DIA via the Gold Line who park in the lots will have to pull or carry their luggage up the Vance Street hill (or use the pedestrian 'bridge' to take them up to the level of Grandview Avenue), then walk the half-block to the platform, and

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



then travel to DUS on the commuter rail line.

There will then be another transfer at DUS. Since the Gold Line trains will be arriving at Track 6 or Track 7 at DUS, DIA-bound travelers will then get off their train and take their luggage up an escalator (or use a handicap-access elevator) to cross over Tracks 5, 4, 3 and 2 and then descend by another escalator to wait for the East Corridor train leaving on Track 1. There are no plans to coordinate the East Corridor departure times with the Gold Line arrival times at DUS. The additional time needed to disembark from the East Corridor terminus and reach the actual DIA terminal is not known. See also Diagram 3 in file <DUS_tracks.pdf> which is attached.

The total trip time to DIA from Olde Town via the Gold Line, including wait times at DUS for the East Corridor train is expected to be about 90 minutes.

RTD estimates that trip times to DIA using the Gold Line may take 15 to 20 years to be comparable to those of simply continuing the A-Line, or any other bus service, to DIA from Olde Town.

A number of full or partial mitigation measures are possible to reduce the impact of the increased travel times and inconvenience that go with using the Gold Line as a substitute for the A-Line. These include simply continuing the A-Line at its present level of support even if it does lower Gold Line ridership, requiring the private-sector partner to run it's own equivalent shuttle service for the life of its Penta-P contract with RTD, bringing the Gold Line into the same platform as the East Corridor and schedule some, or all, of all those trains to continue onto DIA without the need to transfer between trains, setting up once-an-hour express 'air trains' to DIA from Arvada that arrive at Track 1 and then continue onto DIA without the need to disembark at DIA, providing sidings on the East Corridor to allow an express non-stop service to DIA from DUS on a half-hourly basis that will bypass regular commuter trains on that corridor, and coordinating arrival and departure times on Tracks 7 and 1 to reduce the average wait times for DIA passengers from Arvada.

At the risk of pointing out the obvious, a number of these mitigation measures can also help improve access to DIA for other metro-area communities and for Denver's central business district.

I request that the final EIS address the impact on public transportation to DIA with a discontinued A-Line service and identify the measures RTD plans to make to mitigate those impacts.

Sincerely,

John P. Kiljan, P.E.
6185 Field Street
Arvada, Colorado 80004
303-423-9875
jpkiljan@yahoo.com

xc via e-mail:

Regional Transportation District <comments@rtdgoldline.com>

Dave Beckhouse, FTA <David.Beckhouse@fta.dot.gov>

Wally Pulliam, RTD Board, District L <wally.pulliam@rtd-denver.com>

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



Dave Ruchman, RTD Board, District M <d.ruchman@comcast.net>

Liz Telford, RTD <Elizabeth.Telford@rtd-fastracks.com>

Bob Frie, Mayor, City of Arvada <BFrie@arvada.org>

Kevin Nichols, City of Arvada planning <KNICHOLS@arvada.org>

Bob Wilson, GLAC chair <rewilson_pe@comcast.net>

Mark Schaefer, GLAC member <Mark_schaefer@urscorp.com>

Shelley Cook, Ride Provide (A-Line) <cooks@attglobal.net>

Rachael Zenzinger, CCPPC member <r.zenzinger@comcast.net>

* These are my simplified calculations for break-even parking charges for the 455 spaces in the structure. The \$20M structure (the city's figure) works out to \$44,000 per space. Amortized over 30 years at 4.5% (roughly the going rate for un-insured municipal bonds) comes out to about \$4.70 a day. This is an optimistic interest rate considering that RTD's investment bankers used a 7% cost-of-money rate for RTD when calculating whether or not to select the EMU over the DMU for the line. If I were to be conservative and use that rate and calculated it only bonding for 20 years (the City of Arvada's preferred bonding term) it would kick the daily rate up to a more challenging rate of about \$11.40 per space per day.

Figure Links

Figure 2-26

See the attached file or click on this link to see this figure.

http://www.flickr.com/photos/jp_k/2757014715/sizes/o/

Figure 2-27

See the attached file or click on this link to see this figure. http://www.flickr.com/photos/jp_k/2757852016/sizes/o/

Attachments

This file: DRAFT EIS COMMENTS.doc

DEIS Figure 2-26: 2-26.jpg

DEIS Figure 2-27: 2-27.jpg

RTD's PDF file containing Diagram 3: DUS-tracks.pdf

[file: DRAFT EIS COMMENTS.doc]

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



<p>62</p>	<p>Keith Dameron</p> <p>I believe you could save millions of dollars on this project if you use bi-level (or double deck) rail cars. A bi-level car will carry nearly twice as many passengers as a single level car. You would save money by ordering fewer cars and reducing annual maintenance costs. You also would save money by not needing to build platforms as long.</p> <p>The DEIS states that you would need 20 EMU cars. I believe you would need about 12 bi-level EMU cars for the same projected ridership. For example; a two car, bi-level train would carry more people than a three car single level train. Shorter platforms would save construction dollars in the beginning and maintenance costs down the road.</p> <p>I was told at one of your meetings that bi-level EMU technology did not exist at this time. I have since found out that there are three transit operations in the USA that use bi-level EMU's. METRA in Chicago has one line called the 'Electric' line. They use vehicles manufactured by Nippon-Sharyo. In fact, they have ordered (or are receiving) new vehicles for this line now.</p> <p>NJ Transit and the Long Island railroad also use bi-level EMU technology on a part of their system.</p> <p>Originally the argument against bi-level cars was that DUS was going to be underground. That is not true now!</p> <p>Also, a Gold line decision to use single level EMU cars would appear to affect the Northwest Rail corridor due to the shared portion of track from DUS to Pecos. It would appear to be extremely short-sighted to force Northwest rail to use single level cars due to the Gold lines catenary height.</p> <p>Please consider the use of bi-level EMU technology on the Gold Line!! It saves money up front and allows increased ridership in the future (at an additional cost savings).</p>
<p>63</p>	<p>Richard R. Taft Urban Ventures, LLC September 1, 2008</p> <p>RTD Gold Line Comments Mr. Dave Beckhouse – FTA c/o GBSM Inc. 600 17th St., #2020-S, Denver, CO 80202Mr.</p> <p>Dear Mr. Beckhouse,</p> <p>We are hereby submitting the following comments following our review of the RTD Fastracks Gold Line Corridor, Draft Environmental Impact Statement published July 18, 2008.</p> <p>Urban Ventures LLC, in partnership with Perry Rose and Company has entered into a contract to purchase the existing Marycrest Convent site at the corner of 52nd and Federal, in Denver. Under our current master plan for redevelopment of this site, we are planning a neighbor hood of 300+ housing units and 20,000 square feet of commercial space.</p>

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



Our review focused on the potential positive impacts that the Gold Line might have for the redevelopment. We have reviewed the following Sections of Chapter 4 of the Draft EIS:

- Section 4.3 Existing Transit Service,
- Section 4.4 Future Transit Service and Operations,
- Table 4-1 Gold Line Transit System Management (TSM) Alternative Bus Operations Plan:
- Route 31 – Federal and Route 52 – West 52nd Ave/South Pearl St
 - Table 4-4 Preferred Alternative Bus Operations Plan
- Route 31 – Federal and Route 52 – West 52nd Ave/South Pearl St
 - Current Bus Operations Schedules for Routes 31 & 52 as of August 19, 2008.

This review has brought to light the following information:

- In both the TSM and the Preferred Alternatives, the service levels of Routes 31 and 52 do not change from the No Action Alternative. In other words Bus frequencies for these two routes do not change from current levels.
- In addition, the table does not accurately reflect the Service Frequency of Route 31. The Table simply lists the frequency as 15 minutes peak and off peak. However According to the Current Bus Operations Schedule for this Route on RTD's web site, current as of August 17, 2008, the 15/15 frequency is only for stops south of I-70. For all stops north of I-70 the current scheduled frequency is 30/30.
- As for Route 52 the frequency is listed as 30/30 when in fact the current schedule on the web site is 15/30.

It is our opinion that RTD should plan for increased frequency of bus service on the 31 Route to 15/15. We believe this will significantly enhance the convenience and accessibility for riders from the north who will use the Gold Line and that such an improvement will result in increased Gold Line ridership

We request that further studies be conducted of Existing and Future Transit Service and specifically on establishing a 15/15 minimum frequency of all routes within the study area that travel north/south on Federal, and a 15/30 minimum frequency for the routes that cross Federal.

In addition we request that any further study consider relocating the 52 Route back to 52nd Avenue east of Federal. We feel that the redevelopment of the Marycrest site with its projected 300+ new households will also act as a catalyst for new development along Federal.

Any of us at Urban Ventures and Perry Rose will make ourselves available to review this letter and participate in any further Transit Service analysis that RTD and FTA undertake.

Sincerely,
Richard R. Taft, Vice President, Development
Urban Ventures, LLC

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



64	<p>David Heller DRCOG DRCOG Comments on Gold Line DEIS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. p. ES-3. Table ES-1: Goals for Gold Line Study Area. How were these goals developed? Were they part of the initial screening process? 2. p. ES-20 and throughout document. Reference of the Gold Line study as being in the 2030 Metro Vision Regional Transportation Plan is made throughout the document. There should be some mention that the Gold Line study is also included in the adopted DRCOG 2035 Regional Transportation Plan. (I don't know how feasible it is to update all the 2030 RTP references to 2035 RTP). 3. p. ES-25: Opening day is listed as 2015 in this EIS, but Liz Telford mentioned 2016 in her 8/18 presentation to the TAC. (Dates should be consistent). 4. p. ES-29. I like these insets where certain terms, (e.g. "Quiet Zone") are defined. 5. p. ES-30. Define "linked transit trip" 6. p. ES-31. Figure ES-19 Travel Time Comparison—While it may seem obvious, I would specifically indicate the units of time—minutes—on this chart. 7. p. 1-3 In Section 1.3.2.1--."As detailed below, automobile and bus travel times in the study area will increase in 2030 by approximately 35 percent." (from what--2005?) 8. p. 1-4. I am glad you included this section on Regional Connectivity. That objective supports one of DRCOG's goals and policies in reviewing any major transportation improvement. 9. p. 1-5. Minority and low-income households should be defined (although they are later in Section 3.1.2. Environmental Justice) 10. p. 1-5. Bottom. The US EPA defines the Denver metropolitan area as an attainment/maintenance area for PM10, CO, 1-hour ozone, and nonattainment for the 8-hour ozone standard. 11. p. 1-6. Top ¶--However, in 2007, Denver had measured violations of the 8-hour ozone standard. Also—under Affordability section—this information needs to be updated based on latest FasTracks cost increase. (August 2008) 12. p.3-1-7. Bottom ¶--These changes are supported by local and regional plans. [Cite specific plans] 13. p. 3.1-10. Under Low-Income definition. –List specific low-income thresholds. 14. p. 3.1-14. Elaborate further on Metro Vision 2030 Plan definition of low-income households. 15. p. 3.7-1. Fourth ¶ down—The USEPA has recently designated the Denver metropolitan area as non-attainment for 8-hour O3. 16. Under Regional Transportation Conformity section, update as follows..."The Preferred Alternative of the Gold Line project is included in the DRCOG 2008-2013 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and is consistent with the DRCOG Metro Vision 2035 Regional Transportation Plan. 17. p. 5-6. 5.3 Financial Feasibility section, including Table 5-5 needs to be updated to reflect latest FasTracks Annual Program
----	--

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



	<p>Evaluation Summary (APE).</p> <p>18. An overall implementation bar chart, showing the completed steps, future steps and approximate date of completion with significant milestones, (i.e. FEIS, New Starts submittal, Final Design, ROW, Construction, Opening Date, etc.) would be helpful. I do not believe I saw any timeline this comprehensive in the document.</p>
65	<p>Michael Tavel</p> <p>comment on gold line DEIS Regarding 38th Ave station area:</p> <p>This station should be planned to be as accessible as possible to pedestrians coming from 38th Ave, and thus as close as possible to 38th Ave.</p> <p>This is so that North Denver residents, when walking or cycling, can easily access the station from our primary east-west mixed-use transportation corridor.</p> <p>A pedestrian bridge over the rail yards, and close to 38th Ave, is necessary due to the substandard pedestrian environment at the 38th Ave. underpass.</p> <p>The station area should be planned to support dense TOD redevelopment on the east side of the rail yards.</p> <p>The gold line EIS should coordinate with the Northwest Rail EIS on these topics:</p> <p>The Fox Street neighborhood will become a significant TOD due to market demand and its position on the line to Boulder from Denver. The Northwest rail should stop all day in both directions to coordinate with this redevelopment, and to provide additional paying customers for the Northwest Rail.</p> <p>We must ensure that the Northwest Rail can transfer its riders to the Gold line in both directions. This is to support travel between Arvada and Boulder.</p> <p>If the Northwest rail, on opening day, stops both ways all day at the Pecos station, but not at 38th Ave, then there needs to be a cross platform transfer at the Pecos station so that riders originating at 38th Ave in the morning can transfer to northwest rail and travel to Boulder – without having to first travel to Union Station.</p>
66	<p>I'd like to see the Olde Town station match the community character and be built with brick & stone. While it isn't the least expensive building system on the front-end it will cost less over the life of the building and be beautiful addition to the area. Using load-bearing masonry instead of just a veneer over a steel frame will reduce the construction cost by 25 % by decreasing the amount of steel.</p>
67	<p>Christine Howland</p> <p>REF TO SHERIDAN STOP ON GOLD LINE:</p> <p>Of course I suggest moving the stop to the West side of Sheridan first. But is that is COMPLETELY not possible, than I suggest:</p> <p>To handle Traffic – speed bumps and/or median islands to slow drivers down on 60th Ave, having only one entrance to the facility</p>

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



	<p>by keeping it towards the West end of 60th.</p> <p>To handle security – The low height parking lights that face directly downward is good but if they were motion lights that would be better. The trains run about every hour through the night so motion lights need to be focused on the lot only. This will also help with privacy.</p> <p>To handle privacy – The proposed parking lot directly behind our homes on 60th Ave is the main violator. Trees and fencing will not be enough. Even a set back of 10 yards to the lots edge will not be enough. Our homes sit above the open space lot (owned by the Fire Alarm Company). To provide you a better picture, I can see the roof of the storage facility. We don't want to loose our view of the mtns so a large wall at decided height may help. But the best option is to have the proposed second parking lot on the South side of the tracks with a pedestrian bridge. Liz, project manager, said this was too costly but when you consider landscaping for privacy and safety, the cost will be the same.</p>
68	<p>Jennifer Husum</p> <p>I prefer the stop at 41st out of all the proposed stops. I think it would do a lot for the development of the surrounding area. This new stop needs to have pedestrian and bicycle access to maintain and increase ridership. Due to student housing in the area, if the access points are done right, over 500 students will be able to use this station. Also, if the 41st street station is implemented Brannan Sand and Gravel needs to be relocated. Thank you.</p>
69	<p>Jane Schnabel Comments for Gold Line DEIS</p> <p>Jane Schnabel 7005 Grandview Ave. Arvada, CO 80002</p> <p>The DEIS is very thorough and addresses all aspects of the project which I have been involved with as a community member since the MIS was conducted in 1999. Following are only a few areas that I would like to emphasize as being crucial for inclusion in the final draft.</p> <p>3.5.2 Affected Environment</p> <p>The Stocke-Walter Historic District on Grandview Avenue between Lamar and the Wadsworth By-Pass will be the gateway to Olde Town Arvada. Twenty thousand riders per day will be able to view the homes and activities of the residents on Grandview as well as the residents viewing many EMU's daily. This visual and privacy impact needs to be mitigated with more than just the proposed wire fencing in the DEIS (figure 3.5.9). A suggestion for a similar type fencing that is being used on the new Grandview bridge is put forth. If it is of sufficient height, vines and other natural vegetation would help not only with visual impact, but could also act as a noise buffer. A fencing of this type would also provide an aesthetic quality for the historic neighborhood not found with the standard chain-link type fence.</p> <p>3.5.18 Arvada Section, Structures and Retaining Walls</p> <p>Because the tracks pass 50-100 feet in front of historic residential structures on Grandview Ave. in the Stocke-Walter Historic District, it is imperative that the recommendation for a single track from Ralston Creek to approximately Dudley Ct. be followed. This</p>

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



	<p>also will allow all historic structures in the Olde Town proper to remain untouched. It is also recommended that architectural catenary poles be used throughout the area.</p> <p>3.8.1 Noise</p> <p>Noise mitigation using Quiet Zones is imperative. According to figure 3.8-3, all residences on Grandview Ave in the Stocke-Walter Historic District and businesses located on Grandview Ave. in Olde Town will be “severely impacted” by noise. It is essential to pursue Quiet Zone improvements at existing at-grade rail crossings since horn noises from existing trains and proposed commuter rail will continue to be the primary noise issue. The tracks in the Stocke-Walter Historic District will be only 50-100 feet from the front doors of most residences.</p> <p>Thank You, Jane Schnabel 7005 Grandview Ave. Arvada, CO 80002 303-423-5585</p>
70	<p>Lola Salazar Salazar Family Foundation</p> <p>Hi there,</p> <p>As one of the owners of the Regency Student Housing Community I really think out of the three rail stops outlined in the DEIS for Inca Street I prefer the stop at 41st. I can't stress the importance enough of our student safety to and from the rail stop. I know if the stop at 41st is done correctly I am confident our 500+ students will use the light rail system to school and around town.</p>

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



71	<p>Doug Magee</p> <p>Gold Line DEIS comments Gold Line DEIS Comments and Questions</p> <p>The Gold Line Corridor Draft EIS is an impressive document. It is well written, extremely detailed yet the Executive Summary presents the nearly two-year EIS process in an interesting and substantial way. The graphics, maps, charts, tables etc. are well designed and work well to enhance the narrative sections of the document. While hundreds of pages in length, the document is enjoyable to read, that is if the topic is of interest to the reader.</p> <p>The Gold Line Corridor EIS process provided a good analysis of various routes and alternatives – from LRT, DMU, EMU and Streetcar – and determining the best technology (EMU) and route to be used (existing rail corridor) to serve the NW Denver area. I support the preferred alternative described in the DEIS document.</p> <p>The East Direct Design option for the alignment of the Gold Line from DUS to Pecos St. station is the correct alignment choice for this segment of the line.</p> <p>The FTA's New Starts funding program is mentioned in the DEIS. Can that federal funding be secured as well as any Penta P funding (private funding pilot program)? Or, are these two funding sources mutually exclusive and you pursue one source or the other?</p> <p>Do the Gold Line and Northwest Rail projects actually share the same tracks (trackway) from DUS to Pecos St., or do the two projects just share the bridge structures and alignment ROW for the first few miles north of DUS? If track is shared, is it envisioned that schedules for both routes will meet the proposed schedules even though tracks are shared?</p> <p>The preliminary train operating schedules are excellent, but RTD should have flexibility to reduce late night (10:30 PM and later) and early morning (from 4:30 AM) to one train per hour seven days a week based upon actual ridership. RTD should base any revised schedules after at least six months of operations.</p> <p>The DEIS breaks down the construction schedule but the 36 to 48 month schedule seems long. Why will it take so long to build the 11 miles of rail line and station construction for the Gold Line?</p> <p>Parking spaces available at the seven stations for opening day in 2015 seem appropriate except for the end of line station at Ward Rd. While ridership projections are based upon industry-accepted methodology, I believe the estimate of 200 parking spaces needed at Ward Rd. for 2015 is too low. RTD needs to be flexible in its design of the Ward Rd. station so in the event additional parking spaces are needed once the line opens, that RTD quickly can create temporary parking (a gravel lot) where the additional spaces projected for 2030 parking will be constructed.</p> <p>The inclusion of Quiet Zones (QZ) on opening day in 2015 from Lowell Blvd. in Adams County to Tabor St. in Wheat Ridge must be part of the Gold Line design from the beginning. Local jurisdictions within this area must invest in QZ for existing freight train operations prior to opening day in 2015 for the Gold Line.</p> <p>Pedestrian and bike accessibility to each of the seven stations is critical. Such access needs to be coordinated with each local jurisdiction as part of proposed TOD plans by each jurisdiction for each station. Pedestrians, bikes, persons with disabilities, including those in wheelchairs, and buses need to have priority over other vehicular access to the stations.</p>
----	--

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



	<p>What is the difference between the electrical power needs of EMU technology (kVA) vs. the electrical power needs of a light-rail vehicle (Vdc)? Do EMUs use more or less power to get up to, and maintain speed compared to LRTs?</p>
<p>72</p>	<p>Guillermo V. Vidal City and County of Denver September 2, 2008</p> <p>Mr. Dave Beckhouse, FTA c/o GBSM, Inc. 600 17th Street 2020-S Denver, CO 80202 Re: RTD Gold Line DEIS Comments</p> <p>Dear Mr. Beckhouse:</p> <p>Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the Gold Line Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). Several city staff from multiple agencies and departments have reviewed the document and provided comment. The full list of comments is available for consideration by FTA and RTD on the enclosed spreadsheet.</p> <p>There are two issues of particular interest and concern to the City and County of Denver that I would like to call attention to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RTD Gold Line Denver Station Location: Of the station options presented in the DEIS, the City and County of Denver supports the 41st Avenue Station location as the preferred station location in Denver. Specific reasoning for our support of this station location can be found in the enclosed spreadsheet. 2. RTD Gold Line Preferred Alignment: The preferred alignment identified in the DEIS will intersect property owned by the City and County of Denver at 3501 Park Avenue. Currently, there are several existing and planned critical operations at this site that would either be temporarily or permanently impacted if this alignment is selected. The City's preference and current plan is to continue and expand operations at this location. Impacts from the construction of a new rail alignment across this property will affect critical day to day operations and would likely cause displacement of at least some of the City's current facilities and operations. Such impacts are likely to have additional environmental and fiscal implications which must be adequately discussed with the City and addressed by RTD prior to publication of the Final Environmental Impact Statement. At this time, discussion of these potential impacts and mitigation efforts are not included in the DEIS document as reviewed and must be taken into consideration. The City and County of Denver is a strong proponent of the RTD FasTracks program and the Gold Line Environmental Impact Statement process. We look forward to continuing to work with FTA, RTD and the Gold Line stakeholders to address all of the issues and concerns of this future improvement as we continue to move this effort from concept to reality. <p>Sincerely, Guillermo V. Vidal</p>

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



	<p>Manager of Public Works CC: Councilwoman Judy Montero, District 9 Councilman Rick Garcia, District 1 Bob Kochevar, FasTracks Liaison, Public Works Peter Park, Manager, Community Planning & Development Crissy Fanganello, Director Policy & Planning, Public Works Michael Sheehan, Senior Engineer, Public Works Steve Gordon, Manager, Community Planning & Development Tom Hoaglund, Senior City Planner, Community Planning & Development Jenn Hillhouse, Senior City Planner, Public Works</p>
73	<p>Jeanne Shreve Adams County c/o GBSM, Inc. Attention : Dave Beckhouse, FTA 600 17th Street, #2020-S Denver, CO 80202 September 2, 2008</p> <p>RE: Adams County's Official Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the RTD FasTracks Gold line</p> <p>Dear Gold Line Project Management Team,</p> <p>Adams County has actively participated in the Gold Line Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) process through regularly attending meetings and organizing multiple county staff meetings with the project team.</p> <p>The County is pleased with the progress of the Gold Line EIS process and looks forward to working towards the Final EIS with the project team and the other jurisdictions along the corridor.</p> <p>To that end, please find attached Adams County's official comments for the DEIS.</p> <p>Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at 303.453.8809.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Jeanne M. Shreve, Transportation Coordinator</p> <p>Cc: Rob Coney, Director, Planning and Development Besharah Najjar, Acting Director, – Public Works</p> <p>Adams County's comments are grouped by the following topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pecos Junction Station • Clear Creek at Federal Station • 60th Avenue Impacts

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



- Other Roadway Impacts
- Reasonably Foreseeable Future Projects and Impacts to TOD Planning Area
- Drainage and Water Quality

Pecos Junction Station

- The County refers to the Gold Line station at Pecos as Pecos Junction.
- The County's preferred location for Pecos Junction is the East Option, and the County requests the Pecos West Option be eliminated prior to the Final EIS.
- Adams County understands the East Option is contingent on the construction of the Pecos Grade separation project (Project). There are multiple references to the Project being 'unfunded'. This is an inaccurate statement. The FIR cost estimate for the Project is \$43 million. The identified funds for the project are:
 - \$10 million federal
 - \$14.4 million Union Pacific Railroad (reimbursement arrangement per PUC allocation requirements.)
 - \$8.4 million Adams County in 2008; with \$7 million proposed for 2009. As costs and additional financial resources are identified, the County's financial portion will adjust accordingly.
- Based on the FIR cost estimate for the Pecos Grade Separation Project (Project), the funding shortfall is approximately \$3 million. Adams County requests RTD consider financially contributing \$3 million to the Project because it affords the only rail-to-rail transfer station outside of the City and County of Denver.
- In order to eliminate the West Pecos Station Option from further consideration, what documentation is required to satisfy the District that the Pecos Grade Separation Project is funded, and the County is committed to building the project?
- Figure 2-23 indicates an "access road by others." If the Pecos West Option is kept in the Final EIS, RTD should be responsible for building the access road (extension of 60th Avenue) from Pecos to the station.
- Will 700 parking spaces be adequate to support a regional Park and Ride facility at Pecos Street? Because Pecos Junction is a transfer station between the Northwest rail and the Gold Line, it is logical to assume more parking would be needed.
- RTD has stated they will abide by all local standards and regulations throughout the FasTracks EIS processes.
- RTD and the Gold Line Team should review and be familiar with Subsection 6-08-05 in Chapter 6 of the Adams County Standards and Regulations, of which the Gold Line will be required to comply with for a Rapid or Mass Transit Facility.
 - At the time of the development application for Pecos Junction Station, RTD will be required to submit a narrative and associated analysis of the motor vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian traffic likely to be generated by the stations, including but not limited to traffic generation at various times of the day, potential congestion, and potential demand for parking generated by the development.
 - As a part of the application submittal, RTD will be required to show parking projections at the Pecos Junction Station that include both the Gold Line and Northwest Rail. This analysis should be conducted prior to the Final EIS.

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



- Adams County considers the Pecos Junction Station as a regional Park & Ride facility because of the direct access to/from I-76, and the close proximity of I-70 and I-25.
- Including the Northwest Rail line in the EIS Gold Line parking analysis for Pecos Junction will allow local jurisdictions to better react to the direct ridership implications of the FasTracks program at multiple stations, potentially alleviating parking demand at both Westminster's 71st & Lowell Station, and Denver's 38th/41st Avenue station. Placing more parking at Pecos Junction helps to meet Adams County's objective of providing a regional commuter park and ride facility while potentially allowing for additional development opportunities for Westminster and Denver at their respective stations.
- According to Table 4-5, 65% of the trips to the Pecos Junction station will be by transit. Currently the RTD Route 6 is the only service along Pecos with no additional bus service proposed in the Preferred Alternative Bus Operations Plan (Table 4-4). How does the District account for this high percentage of bus trips to the Pecos Junction Train Station?
- Section 4.7.3.2 Pecos Station Options –
 - The first bullet under Pecos East Station reads, “Construct free westbound right turn lanes into the northbound lane addition in 2015.” Does this statement indicate an additional number of (dedicated) right turn lane(s) from 60th Avenue onto northbound Pecos? This statement needs to be clarified. Figure 4-12 needs to be updated to reflect the number of lanes on both 62nd and Pecos Street required for mitigating the traffic impacts. Greater coordination between the Gold Line team and the Pecos grade separation team is needed to ensure the latter does not preclude any needed mitigation requirements for FasTracks.
 - The second bullet under Pecos East Station reads, “...150 feet east of Federal Boulevard...” This needs to be changed to Pecos Street. Table 4-8 also references Federal Boulevard when it should be referencing Pecos Street under the Pecos options.
 - The second bullet also states, “...the access location should be a minimum of 150 feet east of [Pecos Street] by 2015.” 62nd Avenue is classified as a major collector and the Adams County Standards and Regulations requires a spacing of 600 feet between all major accesses. Due to the high percentage of truck and bus traffic in this area, this additional storage should be considered necessary for traffic to operate efficiently.
- According to Figure 4-7, Gold Line Study Area Roadways 2030, Pecos Street will experience severe congestion during the PM peak from I-76 north, and from 52nd Avenue south by 2030. The DEIS does not indicate the Gold Line's proportionate share of the traffic on Pecos Street by 2030, particularly in the areas indicated to fail by 2030.
- Clear Creek at Federal Station
- The County refers to the Gold Line station at Federal as the Clear Creek at Federal Station.
- RTD and the Gold Line Team should review and be familiar with Subsection 6-08-05 in Chapter 6 of the Adams County Standards and Regulations, of which the Gold Line will be required to comply with for a Rapid or Mass Transit Facility.
 - At the time of the development application for the Clear Creek at Federal Station, RTD will be required to submit a narrative and associated analysis of the motor vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian traffic likely to be generated by the stations, including but not limited to traffic generation at various times of the day, potential congestion, and potential demand for parking

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



	<p>generated by the development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to Figure 4-7, Gold Line Study Area Roadways 2030, Federal Boulevard will experience severe congestion during the PM peak along the majority of the corridor by 2030. The DEIS does not indicate the Gold Line's proportionate share of the traffic on Federal by 2030. • At the Clear Creek at Federal station it appears that the area depicted in the preliminary station plan in Figure 2-24 is larger/different than what is shown on the property acquisition map on page 3.3-8. • Section 4.7.3.3 Federal Station – The first bullet point refers to 61st Avenue. This needs to be changed to 60th Avenue. • Figure 3.10-3 on p. 3.10-13 shows drawings of the Federal West Station impacts on Clear Creek. Federal West is not an option in the Preferred Alternative. • Adams County does not currently allow parking in the flood plain. Under this current County policy, the District would be required to raise the station and park & ride out of the floodplain prior to development. Please refer to Drainage and Water Quality comments for further discussion on this topic. <p>60th Avenue Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RTD and the Gold Line project team need to have greater coordination with the County and Urban Drainage to minimize potential conflicts and ensure the future alignment of 60th Avenue, the Gold Line alignment, the TOD redevelopment area, and necessary drainage improvements specified in the Clear Creek Drainage Master Plan are planned and implemented in an integrated manner. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Adams County understands 60th Avenue will need to be realigned as a part of the Gold Line project on the east side of I-76. The DEIS does not discuss 60th Avenue requiring realignment. Please clarify this assumption and reflect the proposed 60th Avenue realignment in future EIS documents. – The Clear Creek Drainage Master Plan proposes a realignment of 60th Avenue near Federal Boulevard. • Adams County is concerned about the Gold Line alignment creating a new at-grade crossing at 60th Avenue, particularly in light of the TOD Study market analysis, which indicates the area surrounding 60th Avenue is viable long-term for more intensive mixed use development. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – RTD should consider grade separating 60th Avenue from the Gold Line railroad tracks. Because the Gold Line alignment is already on a portion of the I-76 embankment south of 60th, the District should analyze the feasibility of staying on the highway embankment to 60th Avenue, grade separate 60th Avenue, and continue on embankment making the gradual descent to grade north of 60th. – Furthermore, the County's Clay outfall project will likely intersect 60th Avenue and the Gold line at close to the same point. The Clay outfall project includes a pedestrian/bike trail to connect the Guardian Angels neighborhood south of 56th Avenue to the TOD redevelopment area and the Clear Creek and Little Dry Creek regional Trails. Please refer to Drainage comments for further discussion on the Clay outfall project. • Other Roadway Impacts
--	---

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



- According to Figure 4-7, Gold Line Study Area Roadways 2030, 52nd Avenue and Sheridan Boulevard and will experience severe congestion during the PM peak by 2030. The DEIS does not indicate the Gold Line's proportionate share of the traffic on 52nd or Sheridan by 2030, particularly in the areas indicated to fail by 2030.
- Reasonably Foreseeable Future Projects and Impacts to TOD Study Area
- A clear list of reasonably foreseeable future projects within the corridor study area should be disclosed and reflected in the analyses of DEIS. The list should include the following Adams County projects:
 - Pecos Grate Separation Project
 - Clay Outfall/Trail Project
 - CARMA Midtown Project north of I-76
 - 62nd Avenue realignment east of Pecos Street to Lipan Street
 - 60th Avenue realignment between Federal and Pecos due to Gold line and drainage master planned improvements
- The DEIS does not account for the 1,200 homes planned at the CARMA Midtown project north of I-76.
- It appears that the study area shown in Figure 2-2 does not include the Perl Mack neighborhood to the north, which would provide a major source of ridership for the Pecos Junction station.
- Concerning section 3.5 on visual impacts, the DEIS focuses only on current conditions (p. 3.5-16). The County's TOD planning calls for intensive commercial and residential uses in the area, particularly around the Federal station. The text comes across as dismissive because the area is currently vacant or industrial. The Final EIS should ensure the design of structures and walls to accommodate the rail line will be compatible with future uses and not focus solely on existing conditions. Also, the text describes impacts to the Clear Creek Trail crossing, but no rendering is provided.
- The Gold Line crossing of Federal Boulevard has definite visual impacts, namely traffic, on Federal Boulevard. RTD should provide much better assurances of mitigating the visual and physical impacts to this major corridor.

Drainage and Water Quality

- The DEIS does not discuss the Clay Outfall Project, which is a current drainage outfall system from Clay Street, south of 56th Avenue, to Clear Creek. The alignment of the outfall system is approximately halfway between Federal and Pecos. The county will utilize this project to build bike/pedestrian trail connections between the residential areas south of I-76, the stations areas, and the Clear Creek and little Dry Creek trail systems. It appears the outfall/trail intersects 60th Avenue at approximately the same location as the Gold line alignment. Greater coordination between the clay outfall/trail project and the Gold Line is crucial to ensure the former does not preclude any additional requirements needed to support the tracks and commuter trains traversing over the outfall system, as well as necessary safety measures needed to ensure the safety of bikes and pedestrians using the trail as the Gold Line crosses it at-grade.
- The DEIS ignored the "Major Drainageway Phase B, Conceptual Preliminary Design for Clear Creek," dated February 2008 (Phase B Plan). This Report was sponsored by the City of Wheat Ridge, City of Golden, City and County of Denver, Jefferson County, Adams County, and the Urban Drainage and Flood Control District (UDFCD). The design provides the blue print for

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



	<p>removing the Clear Creek at Federal Station from the 100-year floodplain. The EIS must follow any applicable Phase B Plan implementation recommendations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed Federal and Sheridan Stations will be located within the designated 100-year floodplain by both the Federal Emergency Management Agency and Adams County. The DEIS has not analyzed the impacts of proposing such stations in a flood zone area. The Federal Station is proposed to be built at-grade without any analysis of how the station will be in compliance with the County and National Flood Insurance Regulations. Adams County's regulations currently prohibit the storage of floatable, in this case parked cars, in the floodplain. Any action to remove the proposed stations from the floodplain will require a Letter of Map Revision. • RTD should consider financially participating in the channelization of Clear Creek per the UDFCD Phase B Plan. Current County regulations require parking areas to be elevated out of the floodplain. RTD will either have to raise the station platforms and parking area at the Clear Creek at Federal station out of the floodplain, or alternatively participate in the Phase B Plan. The County would prefer RTD's participation in the Phase B Plan Drainage Master Plan. • Section 3.10.2 Water Resources <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Page 3.10-6, Paragraph 4 – Please note that a Colorado Discharge Permit System (CDPS) Groundwater Cleanup of Gasoline Wastewater General Discharge Permit may be required for the dewatering of contaminated ground water. - Page 3.10-12, Groundwater – It is recommended to revise the reference to the “NPDES” permit and replace it with, “Colorado Discharge Permit System Stormwater Construction Permit”. Also, at the end of the same sentence after “discharged”, it is recommended to add, “in accordance with federal and state regulations.” - Page 3.10-25 Floodplains/Drainage/Hydrology – General Comment: Improvements made within the drainageways should be made in accordance with applicable approved drainage master plans. - The DEIS should list applicable drainage master plans.
74	<p>Marie Madeau</p> <p>train horns Hello, I do want to make sure that the train horns will not be blasting me and thousands of others out of bed between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. They really are obnoxiously loud and way too long. I know the decibel level is being abused. They really don't need to blare them as loud and long as they do. I can be walking my dog at Crown Hill lake and hear the train horn. I don't know why the ducks and geese on the lake need to know there is a train coming. Yeah, it's really that loud. Please tell me it will go back like it was for the last 13 years and hear no train horns. At least while the majority is sleeping. Hopefully it's not a surgeon having to do surgery the next day. I await your response. Thank you. Marie</p>
75	<p>Steve Nguyen City of Wheat Ridge RTD Gold Line Comments Dave Beckhouse, FTA c/o GBSM, Inc. 600 17th Street 2020-S</p>

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



Denver, CO 80202

RE: Gold Line Fast Track Corridor Draft Environmental Impact Statement

The City of Wheat Ridge has reviewed the above document and has the following comments:

Table 2-12 – Gold Line Station Characteristics

The City of Wheat Ridge does not believe 200 spaces on opening day is sufficient given that the existing Ward Rd. park-n-ride will be relocated to the new transit station and the fact that Ward Rd. is an end-of-line station.

There are 491 spaces at the current Ward Rd. park-n-ride. Data provided by RTD states there was an average utilization rate of 42% between 2004 and 2008. The 2008 utilization averaged 53%. Fifty –three percent of 491 is 260, indicating that opening day parking will provide fewer spaces that are currently utilized at the current park-n-ride.

Page 4-8 of the DEIS states, “Ward Rd. is an end-of-line station with a higher capture area than other stations and is planned to be served by six bus routes.” Page 4-9 shows the Ward Rd. station as having the second highest number of projected station boardings of all the stations on the Gold Line. One should expect that utilization of mass transit should increase significantly once the Gold Line is in service.

The City is concerned that inadequate parking projections will doom the success of the Gold Line Ward Rd. Station. The parking impact will spread onto adjacent City streets and neighborhoods where there is little or no public parking. Adequate opening day parking has been a problem on some early RTD transit corridors. Thus, it is crucial that thorough projection analysis be done to determine the adequate number of opening day parking spaces. Appropriate mechanisms should be established to promptly address any unforeseen increases in demand for both opening day and 2030 scenarios.

While the City is concerned with the current design providing inadequate parking on opening day, it is also concerned with valuable real estate being used for surface parking that could potentially become land used for TOD. As state below, the City would prefer that a parking structure would ultimately be constructed at the Ward Rd. in lieu of the initial surface parking.

As currently proposed by RTD, approximately 10 acres will be acquired for surface parking adjacent to the proposed station site. This is valuable real estate with the potential for future TOD as proposed in the City's Northwest Subarea Plan. The City does not have the funding or developer support at this time to engage in discussions about structure parking. The City would like the fact it would prefer structured parking to be included in the DEIS even if the funding is not available at this time. If structured parking were to become a reality, the City wants to be sure it is addressed properly throughout the EIS process to be sure there would be no issues with FTA at a later date.

FIGURE 3.2-2 Current Zoning in the Gold Line Study Area

The current zoning shown on this map does not show the correct zoning designation per the City of Wheat Ridge zoning maps. The DEIS map indicates the zoning has either Commercial or Other. The correct zoning for the area is primarily PID – Planned Industrial District or I – Industrial both north and south of the tracks. There are a few small commercial parcels fronting on Ward Rd.

FIGURE 3.2-3 Future Land Use in the Gold Line Study Area

The future land use indicated on this map shows Industrial or Commercial land uses for the Ward Rd. station area. This is incorrect per the Northwest Subarea Plan. The Northwest Subarea Plan contains a Preferred Land Use Map indicating the desired future land uses for the area. The Preferred Land Use Map shows this area as being primarily Mixed Use north of the tracks with

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



	<p>Commercial on parcels fronting on Ward Rd. The area south of the tracks is Office/Light Industrial with commercial fronting on Ward Rd.</p> <p>Page 4-29 Future Facilities</p> <p>The two bullets under the Ward Road Station are incorrect. The first bullet should read that the proposed Tabor Street and Van Bibber Creek Trail are planned by Arvada not Wheat Ridge. Those connections are in the City of Arvada. The second bullet does not make sense as written. A suggested statement instead would be, "Per the City of Wheat Ridge Northwest Subarea Plan, additional connections are proposed from Ward Rd. on the west along 50th Place and from the east along Ridge Rd.</p> <p>Section 3.10-11 – Preferred Alternative, Direct Impacts, Surface Water Runoff and Water Quality</p> <p>This section states that the runoff from the rail structures along the alignment would be collected and brought to the storm water system through under-drains and discharged to the local storm drainage systems. This is incorrect for the Ward Road station area and the rail line along Ridge Road. There are no storm sewers for existing or projected drainage in this area of the City. Impact from Ward Road Station drainage will be a major concern due to the fact that there are no existing drainage facilities. This station is thousands of feet away from the nearest available storm drain outfall. Non-traditional drainage facilities, such as over-sizing the detention pond, should be explored. The appropriate solution would require the construction of a new storm sewer system connecting to the available downstream facility. The DEIS does not discuss the inadequate storm drainage system in the vicinity of the Ward Rd. station or related solutions to address proper storm drainage.</p> <p>Page 4-25</p> <p>Figure 4-18 Depicts Ward Road Station Area Intersection Mitigation. While this document has identified major transportation improvements associated with station planning for the station, other crucial related improvements should be identified to provide a properly interconnected safe roadway network that has sufficient capacity. 50th Avenue and 52nd Avenue between Ward Road and the proposed north-south connecting road should be improved with turn lanes to provide safe travel to and from the station. The connection to Ridge Road should be identified and constructed by opening day as this connection will serve the residential/commercial area to the east of the station. Current indirect access to Ridge Road is via 52nd and Simms Street, which are local streets. These streets are substandard and inadequate to serve additional new traffic. Additional traffic introduced to these streets will have great impact to this existing residential area.</p> <p>Section 3.12.4 Avoidance and Minimization</p> <p>Parking lot and stored transit vehicles overnight at end of the line –there is no specific discussion to address safety issue in terms of vandalism and break-in.</p> <p>Page ES-35 How Would This Project Be Paid For?</p> <p>The City of Wheat Ridge believes that there should be an equitable method for local agencies to contribute their share of the local match to the project costs. The benefits of the Gold Line to local agencies should be proportionate to the share of the total local match. Based on the Study Area generated for this document, Jefferson County is a benefited agency and therefore should participate in the local match. It is also clear that agencies, such as Westminster, will benefit greatly from the Gold Line and should share in the local project match.</p> <p>Park and Ride Facility Acquisition</p> <p>As previously discussed, it is the City's understanding that the current park-and-ride at I-70 and Ward Road will be moving or consolidating with the new Gold Line Ward Road transit station. The City fully supports the plan and acknowledges that this is good</p>
--	--

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



	<p>planning. This presents an opportunity for the City's long range plan of realigning Youngfield/Ward Road to address the regional traffic congestion in the area. Specifically with the relocation of the current park, the City is seeking an opportunity to acquire the current Ward Road Park and Ride for future major roadway realignment. The DEIS should speak to the disposal of the Ward Road Park and Ride.</p>
76	<p>Eugene Howard SUNI (Sunnyside)</p> <p>During the DEIS presentation, a mock station design was shown. I thought this was a great starting point and provides a good concept of what a final station may look like. Whatever ends up being a final design, there needs to be serious consideration for renewable/sustainable energy and raw materials for this station (and for all stations along the Gold line corridor). Pedestrian and alternate modes of transportation must be factored into the station, the station's design and security. The relocation of the Bus Maintenance Facility should NOT be placed in close proximity to the Inca/38th Street station. There had been discussion of placing a bus maintenance facility in close proximity of this station (the former Denver Post site). Residents of SUNI, HUNI and Globeville are vehemently OPPOSED to this location being used for anything but vibrant, progressive, private redevelopment – NOT a transit maintenance facility of any sort for any kind of mass/bulk transit maintenance facility.</p>
77	<p>Chandler Romeo Neorama</p> <p>Comment re: 38th & Inca Station Hopefully my comment isn't too late. I have great concerns over the location of the 38th & Inca station. In particular, there are three areas which need to be served by this station -- Sunnyside west of Inca, Highland, and the area to the northeast of the I-25 interchange. Of those three, I am most concerned that Highland, one of our oldest and most established neighborhoods in Denver, will be completely left out, without safe access to light rail, if the station is not located as close to 38th avenue as possible. 38th is a very dangerous street for pedestrians, and if that station is not located with safe access for Highland residents in mind there could be dire consequences. Please do not cut out an entire neighborhood from light rail access. Please locate the station close to 38th Avenue and provide safe pedestrian access for all.</p> <p>Chandler Romeo (303) 433-5917 home (303) 437-7788 cell</p>
78	<p>Jody Ostendorf US EPA Region 8</p> <p>EPA's comments A signed copy was mailed today. Please call if you have any questions or concerns. Thanks! (See attached file: GoldLineDEIS.doc)</p> <p>Jody Ostendorf NEPA Program U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 8 1595 Wynkoop Street Denver, CO 80202</p>

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



79	<p>Larry Svoboda U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 8 David Beckhouse, Federal Transit Administration c/o Gold Line Team, GBSM 600 17th Street, Suite 2020 Denver, CO 80202 Re: Gold Line Corridor Draft EIS, CEQ# 20080276 Dear Mr. Beckhouse:</p> <p>The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region 8 has reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Gold Line project. Our comments are provided in accordance with our authorities pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), 42 U.S.C. 4231, Section 309 of the Clean Air Act, and Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>The proposed project is to provide commuter rail from Denver Union Station (DUS) in downtown Denver to Ward Road in Wheat Ridge, Colorado. From DUS to Pecos Street, the alignment is shared with the Northwest Rail project. Including the 3.5 mile shared section from DUS to Pecos Street, the total proposed alignment would be 11.2 miles long and include seven stations. West of Pecos Street to Ward Road, the alignment will be within the existing BNSF Railway Company and Union Pacific Railroad Company (BNSF/UP) freight railroad right-of-way (ROW). The Federal Transit Administration, local governments, regulatory agencies and the public concurred with the selection of the Preferred Alternative in the summer of 2007. The Gold Line study area is in the Denver metropolitan area and encompasses the northwestern portion of the City and County of Denver, and parts of Adams County, Jefferson County, the City of Arvada and the City of Wheat Ridge.</p> <p>The DEIS considers three alternatives including the No Action Alternative, the Transportation System Management (TSM) Alternative and the Preferred Alternative. The No Action Alternative includes existing projects and financially committed projects within the study area to respond to the expected growth in the study area to the year 2030. The TSM alternative represents the "best that can be done" without implementing a major capital investment. This alternative is also described as the "best bus alternative." The Preferred Alternative provides faster, safer and more reliable travel time over single occupancy vehicles and/or buses in the other alternatives (Tables 5-1 and 5-2, DEIS page 5-2). In expanding service to traditional and new transit users, the Gold Line will result in reduced vehicle miles traveled, and corresponding reductions in greenhouse gases. Despite the projected growth in the project area, air quality, as measured in CO, NOx, VOC and PM10, is expected to modestly improve under the proposed action (Table 5-3, DEIS page 5-4).</p> <p>Overall, EPA finds the DEIS provides a thorough description of the alternatives evaluation process, the proposed alternatives and the environmental impacts of the project. The document is well-organized, with excellent graphics and schematics, and easy to read. The Gold Line EIS team has combined land use and transportation planning, with an emphasis on environmental resources, in developing its Preferred Alternative. While much depends on how negotiations with the railroad companies proceed, the Preferred Alternative will minimize environmental impacts by sharing portions of the railroad right-of-way. By utilizing an existing corridor, the Gold Line will have limited impacts to wildlife habitat, ecosystems, wetlands and source waters.</p> <p>Although the proposed Gold Line will encourage new development around the transit stations, it will primarily be compact urban development. Infill development and redevelopment will contribute to reducing urban sprawl in the outskirts of the Gold Line study area and offer redevelopment opportunities for older suburbs. Communities that accommodate more infill and redevelopment can</p>
----	---

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



	<p>greatly reduce the environmental impacts of development. Infill can reduce overall impervious surface in a watershed, reduce trip times and distances to lower emissions and energy use, help protect human health and attract private capital to upgrade infrastructure and/or clean up contamination.</p> <p>EPA's primary concern is with impacts to surface water quality from increased impervious surfaces for parking facilities. In the project area, the South Platte River, Clear Creek and Ralston Creek are all impaired for E. coli, and Clear Creek is also impaired for aquatic life use and organic sediment. The Preferred Alternative will add 55-58 acres of new impervious surface, which will increase contaminated runoff loadings to those impaired waters. The DEIS should better address the impacts from increased flooding and erosion due to new impervious surfaces associated with residential, business, and transportation development on those water bodies.</p> <p>As a cooperating agency over the past two years, EPA has attended numerous Agency Working Group meetings and public meetings. EPA notes that the extensive inter-agency and public process, where alternatives were changed or added based on agency and public concerns with community and/or environmental impacts, has resulted in high community support for the Preferred Alternative. Federal, State, local community leaders, and the public provided comments and input at five milestone meetings for each step of the alternatives screening process. EPA commends the Gold Line EIS Team for involving affected local governments, agencies and the public in a thorough, collaborative planning and decision making process.</p> <p>Based on EPA's procedures for evaluating potential environmental impacts of proposed actions and the adequacy of the information presented, EPA is rating the Preferred Alternative as EC-1. The "EC" rating means that our review has identified potential environmental impacts to impaired water bodies that should be further addressed in the FEIS. The "1" portion of this rating means that the DEIS contains sufficient information to fully assess environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment. A summary of EPA's rating system is enclosed.</p> <p>If you have any questions or would like to discuss our comments, please contact me at 303 312-6004 or the lead reviewer of this project, Jody Ostendorf, at 303 312-7814.</p> <p>Sincerely, Larry Svoboda Director, NEPA Program Office of Ecosystems Protection and Remediation</p>
80	<p>Thomas Hoaglund City and County of Denver Show pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation to station platform on Figures 2-16 through 2-21</p>
81	<p>City and County of Denver Show pedestrian and bicycle connection from Fox Street to station platform</p>
82	<p>Thomas Hoaglund City and County of Denver</p>

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



	Add "However, the City of Denver is currently reevaluating the area of stability designation and land uses on the east side of the Denver Gold Line Station as part of an ongoing station area plan."
83	<p>Thomas Hoaglund City and County of Denver</p> <p>Add "The area on the east side of the Denver Gold Line Station is already beginning to change from industrial uses with projects such as the Auraria Student Housing at 39th Avenue and Elati Street."</p>
84	<p>Thomas Hoaglund City and County of Denver</p> <p>Add information about existing pedestrian crossing of railroads at 43rd Avenue.</p>
85	<p>Thomas Hoaglund City and County of Denver</p> <p>41st Station Advantages-The 41st Station location is closer to the Quigg Newton Homes, a Denver Housing Authority property, and would provide better transportation access to the low-income residents of Quigg Newton.</p>
86	<p>Thomas Hoaglund City and County of Denver</p> <p>41st Station Advantages-The 41st Avenue station location is closer to the 44th Avenue connection across I-25 to the Globeville neighborhood and would provide better transportation access to the residents and businesses of the Globeville neighborhood.</p>
87	<p>Thomas Hoaglund City and County of Denver</p> <p>41st Station Advantages-The 41st Avenue station location would provide for a more feasible pedestrian bridge structure connecting to the residents of the Sunnyside neighborhood to west of the consolidated mainline railroad tracks.</p>
88	<p>Thomas Hoaglund City and County of Denver</p> <p>41st Station Advantages-The 41st Avenue station would require fewer property displacements than the 39th Avenue option.</p>
89	<p>Thomas Hoaglund City and County of Denver</p> <p>41st Station Advantages-The 41st Avenue station would provide better opportunities for configuring parking and bus transfer facilities to support pedestrian access and neighborhood development objectives.</p>
90	<p>Thomas Hoaglund City and County of Denver</p> <p>41st Station Advantages- The 41st Avenue station location is more centered among existing and future usable land areas. More employment and residents would be located within a 10 minute walk of the station than with the 39th Avenue location. Much of the</p>

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



	land near the 39th Avenue location is in the right-of-way for I-25.
91	<p>Thomas Hoaglund City and County of Denver</p> <p>41st Station Advantages- The 41st Avenue station would create fewer impacts to the 38th Avenue/Fox/Park Avenue intersection that could be caused by queuing of buses and automobiles entering the bus transfer and park-n-Ride.</p>
92	<p>Thomas Hoaglund City and County of Denver</p> <p>39th Avenue Station Advantages-The 39th Avenue station location is closer to the Highlands neighborhood south of 38th Avenue. Several residents of the Highlands neighborhood have expressed a strong desire to have the station as close to their neighborhood as possible.</p>
93	<p>Thomas Hoaglund City and County of Denver</p> <p>39th Avenue Station Advantages-The 39th Avenue station location is closer to the 38th Avenue business corridor. However, much of land near the station does not front onto 38th Avenue because of the viaduct stretching from Fox Street to Lipan Street.</p>
94	<p>Savannah Jameson City and County of Denver</p> <p>Landmark recommends that the 39th Avenue East Station not be selected due to adverse Effects to NRHP-eligible property</p>
95	<p>Savannah Jameson City and County of Denver</p> <p>Add to mitigation table (3.4-14), "If the 39th Avenue East Station is selected, move, restore and rehabilitate the buildings at 705 38th Avenue, Texaco Site (5DV9173)."</p>
96	<p>Savannah Jameson City and County of Denver</p> <p>The Texaco Site (5DV9173) has significant historic value.</p>
97	<p>Marco Cabanillas City and County of Denver</p> <p>ROW improvements will be required along station frontages; i.e. Fox Street, W 39th Ave, W 40th Ave, W 41st Ave, W 42nd Ave. Improvements may include, but not be limited to the following: ROW dedication, if necessary; roadway widening and construction to align with adjacent segments, curb & gutter and sidewalk, curb ramps, signing and striping, public street lighting, etc.</p>
98	<p>Marco Cabanillas City and County of Denver</p> <p>If access to station is via private roadway, driveway shall be required, not curb returns and pedestrian ramps. Continuous sidewalk</p>

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



	with no grade changes across access entrances and exits. At access points via public intersections in the ROW, returns and ramps will be considered.
99	<p>Marco Cabanillas City and County of Denver</p> <p>ROW improvements will be required along Inca St entrance near vicinity of the west side of the pedestrian bridge. Since minimal improvements currently exist in this area, full frontage improvements may include, but not be limited to the following: ROW dedication, if necessary; roadway widening and construction to align with adjacent segments, curb & gutter and sidewalk, curb ramps, signing and striping, public street lighting, etc.</p>
100	<p>Marco Cabanillas City and County of Denver</p> <p>Pedestrian routes within station are unclear. Pedestrian connections from public ROW to station area, and vice versa, are also unclear. As we move forward, more information and discussions are necessary to achieve complete pedestrian route networks.</p>
101	<p>Marco Cabanillas City and County of Denver</p> <p>All work in the ROW shall conform to current City and County of Denver Specifications.</p>
102	<p>Marco Cabanillas City and County of Denver</p> <p>Replace all damaged or substandard existing curb and/or sidewalk. Sidewalks must be ADA compliant.</p>
103	<p>Marco Cabanillas City and County of Denver</p> <p>Regardless of which station site is selected, what will happen to the ROW and access to Galapago St cul-de-sac to the south of the station? Will the existing cul-de-sac remain as ROW and tie into exiting bus route to Fox Street? The alignment (existing cul-de-sac to new bus exit route) should align in a "T" intersection. W 39th Ave and Galapago should remain in ROW, due to access to businesses. In general, more discussion regarding access to businesses on W 39th Ave and Galapago cul-de-sac.</p>
104	<p>Philip Kim City and County of Denver</p> <p>Proposed pedestrian bridge footings for the 38th Ave Station in Inca may interfere w/existing 72" storm main, along w/possible future storm improvements. Pedestrian bridge options extending onto private property are the preferred options.</p>
105	<p>Philip Kim City and County of Denver</p> <p>All 3 Denver Gold Line Stations will require re-route of two north-south public sanitary mains. Relocation of public sanitary mains will need to be constructed and as-built prior to vacation of ROW.</p>

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



106	<p>Philip Kim City and County of Denver</p> <p>Coordinate w/Denver storm master plan engineer to determine when storm improvements will be made at the 38th and 39th crossings.</p>
107	<p>Philip Kim City and County of Denver</p> <p>Discuss intention to incorporate regional water quality in station area design.</p>
108	<p>Philip Kim City and County of Denver</p> <p>Both rail options at 31st and Fox conflict w/an existing regional water quality pond and 72" storm outfall for the Prospect Park area. These facilities will need to be protected or relocated.</p>
109	<p>Thomas Gregg City and County of Denver</p> <p>There are numerous misstatements in this paragraph, and the information is outdated. Recommended rewrite is suggested as follows:</p> <p>When assessing the potential impacts of transportation projects, the pollutants of primary concern are carbon monoxide (CO), ozone (O₃), and particulate matter 10 microns in diameter or smaller (PM₁₀). The United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) classifies the Denver metropolitan area (DMA) as an attainment/maintenance area for PM₁₀, CO, 1-hour average ozone, and currently in attainment for the criteria pollutants particulate matter less than 2.5 microns (PM_{2.5}), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), and lead (Pb).</p> <p>In November 2007, the USEPA designated the DMA and part of Weld and Larimer counties as non-attainment for 8-hr ozone (>= 85 parts per billion [ppb]). The Regional Air Quality Council (RAQC), in cooperation with the State of Colorado, is preparing a state implementation plan (SIP) to be submitted to EPA in mid-2009 to demonstrate compliance (8-hour average <85 ppb) by the end of 2010. In addition, in March 2008 the USEPA promulgated a more protective 8-hour ozone standard of 75 ppb that is scheduled to take effect around 2015. A revised SIP for the 75 ppb standard needs to be submitted to the USEPA in 2013.</p> <p>The improvements recommended in the Gold Line project will result in reductions in air pollutant emissions, greenhouse gas emissions, and energy consumption over the No Action and Transportation System Management (TSM) Alternatives.</p>
110	<p>Thomas Gregg City and County of Denver</p> <p>Visibility – Fast Tracks Impacts: Slightly lower growth in auto passenger traffic than without FasTracks. Greenhouse Gases: CO₂ not CO</p>
111	<p>Thomas Gregg City and County of Denver</p>

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



	Please make past tense, these items are already in place and this document needs to appear current
112	<p>Thomas Gregg City and County of Denver</p> <p>I do think this needs to be updated with 2005-07 data, especially for ozone since those years factor into our non-attainment designations.</p>
113	<p>Thomas Gregg City and County of Denver</p> <p>More care needs to be taken in discussing ozone. While the number of exceedances are correct, please make it clear that the 8-hr ozone standard is based on the 3 year average of the 4th maximum, so while there may be exceedances in any given year, those monitors are demonstrating compliance.</p>
114	<p>Thomas Gregg City and County of Denver</p> <p>Replace "cause positive air quality impacts" to "improve air quality"</p>
115	<p>Thomas Gregg City and County of Denver</p> <p>I am not sure I understand the logic with applying 2030 emission factors to earlier years. It doesn't paint a flattering picture of the future, regardless of whether it is no-action/preferred. It seems to me that you would like to show a reduction or a smaller increase in emissions, taking into account cleaner vehicles and a higher fleet penetration of these clean vehicles than was in place in 2005.</p>
116	<p>Thomas Gregg City and County of Denver</p> <p>As per the previous comment, the info in Table 3.7-3 shows that the preferred alternative reduces regional emissions over the no action, yet the data in Tables 3.7-4 & 5 show that the preferred alternative is slightly worse than the no-action for ambient the hot-spot analysis. Granted one is hot-spot and one is regional, so it might be worth pointing that out.</p>
117	<p>David Erickson City and County of Denver</p> <p>Please check the address for Westric Battery Company. I am not aware of a "Galago" Street in Denver. I'm thinking this should be "Galapago Street".</p>
118	<p>David Erickson City and County of Denver</p> <p>There are two additional sites the authors may wish to include in Table 3.11-2. First, a CDOT site is located at Fox Street and Platte River. This facility is identified on the Colorado Storage Tank Information System (COSTIS) as a leaking underground storage tank (LUST) site. Second, the TD Rowe Corporation is located at 4230 Elati. This facility also is identified as a LUST site.</p>
119	David Erickson

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



	<p>City and County of Denver</p> <p>Figure 3.11-1 is informative but the legend should be expanded to identify the meaning of the numbers shown in dark gray (e.g. 00070-0000637).</p>
120	<p>Jon Novick, City and County of Denver</p> <p>Although the use of the Driscoll model is a relevant and important part of the evaluation of potential impacts to water quality resulting from the Gold Line, the selection of zinc and copper as the constituents of concern ignores several important constituents that could result in runoff from impervious surfaces constructed as part of the Gold Line project. In particular, organic compounds (Segment 14 of Clear Creek is listed for organics in sediment) and bacteria (all three affected stream segments are listed for E. coli). Discharges of these constituents from impervious surfaces constructed as part of the Gold Line project could exacerbate existing problems in the affected stream segments. As a result, an adequate evaluation of potential impacts to water quality from the Gold Line needs to consider, at a minimum, copper, zinc, organics and bacteria.</p>
121	<p>Jon Novick, City and County of Denver</p> <p>See comment above on Driscoll modeling (page 3.10-9).</p>
122	<p>Jon Novick, City and County of Denver</p> <p>Please clarify within this paragraph if the analysis of potential impacts on water quality was conducted assuming permanent BMPs were in place or if the analysis was conducted to evaluate impact during construction</p>
123	<p>Al Polonsky City and County of Denver</p> <p>In reference to and commentary on the use of silt fences and similar type construction BMPs, if not properly installed and or maintained these CBMPs have greatly diminished effectiveness. In additional, silt fences and other types of BMPs can be more effective when used in combination. The agency has observed, in general and not necessarily on RTD projects, that silt fences are not properly installed or regularly maintained. As significant soil disturbance will occur near surface water bodies for Gold Line project, the agency suggest that RTD pay particular attention to this issue.</p>
124	<p>Al Polonsky City and County of Denver</p> <p>References to increased impervious area as a result primarily of PnR and stations but no clear statement that all development will be accounted for with permanent water quality/quantity BMPs to address storm water impacts. It is understandable that there can be no details provided at this stage, but the premise that there will be no net increase in storm runoff rates as a result of this development would be re-assuring.</p>
125	<p>Jon Novick, City and County of Denver</p>

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



	Further discussion of the potential impacts of discharges from dewatering of bridge piers is needed. Should the piers need to be installed to depths greater than equivalent to the level of surface water in Clear Creek, will additional dewatering be required? If so, BMPs and impacts on water quality need to be described.
126	Jon Novick, City and County of Denver The second sentence in this paragraph is speculative and should be removed. Comprehensive modeling has not been conducted to evaluate impacts of the Gold Line on water quality and the Driscoll modeling that was conducted (presented earlier in this section) indicates that there will be water quality impacts.
127	Jon Novick, City and County of Denver Please verify the accuracy of Community Facilities that are stated to be depicted on the map. For example, the map legend contains an icon for churches, but there are no churches depicted in the study boundaries. This appears to be inaccurate as a quick comparison to an online map shows numerous churches exist within the study boundaries. Similarly, the map may not accurately reflect Police facilities as it does not depict a Denver Police Department district office (District 1) near Pecos and I-70. Please correct and verify other relevant community facilities have not been omitted (e.g., recreation centers), if they are relevant to the intent of the figure.
128	Gene Hook City and County of Denver General comment – all tables and figures in the document should stand alone. Specific comment – this table does not provide a complete explanation for the abbreviations "SF" and "MF", nor does it explain the meaning of "NA" in the line for Adams County (while providing a numeral value for residences affected). Please provide complete definitions as a footnote or within the table itself.
129	Gene Hook City and County of Denver It is not explained why the table does not contain a reference to impacts within Denver. Please provide an explanation within a footnote or in related document text.
130	Gene Hook City and County of Denver Last column of table is labeled "Traditional Transit Users". In a footnote, might wish to clarify these are "in addition" to the other populations listed in the other columns, and who might be included in this population, e.g., "including the elderly and no-car households", if that is the case.
131	Reynaldo Ornelas City and County of Denver Perform protected left turn warrant study for northbound movement at Fox St & 39th Ave intersection.

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



132	Reynaldo Ornelas City and County of Denver Perform protected left turn warrant study for southbound movement at Fox St & I-25N intersection.
134	Reynaldo Ornelas City and County of Denver Perform signal warrant studies for major Park-n-Ride driveway entrances and exits that intersect with avenues along Fox St using forecasted volumes and expected pedestrian volumes.
135	Reynaldo Ornelas City and County of Denver Signing and striping plan for Inca St & Fox St for impacted blocks using forecasted vehicular movements. Include time-limited parking mitigation measures for residential areas.
136	Michael Sheehan City and County of Denver Include the most recent graphics depicting the changed alignment.
137	Jennifer Hillhouse City and County of Denver Continue to meet the concurrence requirements of temporary occupancy including: possibility of increasing security efforts along the detour route, minimize the potential negative impacts to trail users, and provide the City and County of Denver with a draft bicycle detour plan for review.
138	Jennifer Hillhouse City and County of Denver Pedestrian access improvements will be required for much of the station area as access to the station is constrained by substandard infrastructure including: sidewalks, curb ramps, lighting, storm drainage and roadway pavement.
139	Jennifer Hillhouse City and County of Denver Bicycle routes within the station are unclear. Bicycle connections from public ROW to station area, and vice versa, are also unclear. As we come forward, more information and discussion are necessary to achieve complete bicycle route networks.
140	Jennifer Hillhouse City and County of Denver Discuss the ability for bicycles to use the Inca pedestrian bridge to access the Denver Gold Line Station.

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



141	Jennifer Hillhouse City and County of Denver Discuss bicycle access and connection to existing bike route and provide suggestions to extend existing bicycle out if necessary.
142	Jennifer Hillhouse City and County of Denver Discuss impacts/mitigation of the length of the 38th Ave. pedestrian bridge.
143	Jennifer Hillhouse City and County of Denver Discuss visual impacts of pedestrian bridge required for 2015 and additional impacts with 2030 structure.
144	Jennifer Hillhouse City and County of Denver Add information on potential future multimodal options along 38th Ave. and discuss opportunities to link modes.
145	Jennifer Hillhouse City and County of Denver Need to work with waste water on impacts to storm drainage along Inca Street.
146	Jennifer Hillhouse City and County of Denver Denver Gold Line Station is likely to increase traffic and use of 44th bridge and may require additional traffic study to better understand impacts.
147	Jennifer Hillhouse City and County of Denver Clarify what 2007b stands for. The Denver Strategic Transportation Plan will be finalized in September, 2008.
148	Jennifer Hillhouse City and County of Denver General comment – reference stations within Denver as the Denver Gold Line stations instead of including street names.
149	Jennifer Hillhouse City and County of Denver Add "neighborhood" after northwest Denver-therefore the sentence should read "The 38th Avenue Station is close to downtown Denver and allows residents of the densely populated northwest Denver neighborhoods to avoid..."
150	Jennifer Hillhouse City and County of Denver

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



	After the last sentence of section 4.5.2 add " The Denver Strategic Transportation Plan recognizes the need to increase person trips to become multimodal in nature which may affect future modal access to the Denver Gold Line Station and thus Denver is interested in knowing what RTD plans are for servicing this area in the future.
151	Jennifer Hillhouse City and County of Denver General comment- We appreciate RTD's need for phasing parking and we hope prior to build out further evaluation will be conducted to understand the need for additional parking, land use changes etc.
152	Jennifer Hillhouse City and County of Denver Document impacts to the displacement of the City and County of Denver Park Avenue West Maintenance Facility located at 3501 Park Avenue.
153	Will Kralovec City and County of Denver Include mixed use development when describing TOD in the 3rd sentence.
154	Edward Nichols SHPO 5DV10434 – Town & Country Motel: Was the property evaluated under National Register Criterion A for either transportation or commerce for significant association to the context of motor courts/hotels along major transportation corridors in Denver? Several similar hotels/motels have been determined eligible on both east and west Colfax Ave in Denver. Why is this building not a good example of the International Style in Denver? We do not concur that integrity of setting and feeling have been lost due to commercial and industrial uses near this property The historic setting within the historic boundary for this resource is intact and conveys a feeling of a motor court/hotel.
155	Edward Nichols SHPO 5DV10489: The site form states that the surveyed building is one of many buildings located on the parcel and that no information on this specific building was found. What was the history of the entire parcel and are the other buildings related to this building? Do all the buildings share the same history? In our opinion, the entire parcel should be evaluated for historical significance.
156	Edward Nichols SHPO 5DV10490: We do not concur that the resource is eligible for the NRHP. In our opinion, the additions of the dormers overwhelm the historic integrity of the building in such as way that the building can no longer convey the significant area of architecture under National Register Criterion C. We would consider the building contributing to an eligible historic district, but not individually eligible for the NRHP.

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



157	<p>Edward Nichols SHPO</p> <p>5DV10492: We are unable to concur with the recommended finding of eligible for the NRHP. The site form states that this resource is "a good and rare representative example of the style and type of structure found along Fox Street " This statement does not clearly describe the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction Please specify the style (such as Queen Anne style) or type (such as Terrace) and include the character-defining features that make the style or type significant under National Register Criterion C.</p>
158	<p>Edward Nichols SHPO</p> <p>5DV3512.3: We understand that the past determinations of eligibility of the multiple segments is confusing. We recommend that you assess whether or not the surveyed segment can support the overall eligibility of the entire linear resource, which we agree is eligible under Criterion A for transportation.</p>
159	<p>Edward Nichols SHPO</p> <p>5DV6243.5 and 5DV6243.6: According to the item 17 of the Linear Component Forms, OAHP determined the entire linear resource not eligible for the NRHP on January 19, 2001. According to our database, a segment of the entire resource, 5DV6243.1, was officially determined not eligible on that date. The entire linear resource of 5DV6243 has not been evaluated for NRHP status.</p>
160	<p>Edward Nichols SHPO</p> <p>5JF519: This evaluation includes segments 5JF519.4, 5JF519.6, and 5JF519.11. The effects spreadsheet lists two different findings of effects for this resource. Keeping in mind that the entire linear resource is being evaluated and not just the segment, we concur with the recommended finding of no adverse effect.</p>
161	<p>Edward Nichols SHPO</p> <p>5JF4451 – Jolly Rancher: On the Management Data Form under item 38, the Jolly Rancher Candy Company is recommended as not eligible for the NRHP. The site form states that only two buildings related to the candy company remain, but no further justification for the recommendation of not eligible is provided. In our opinion, the railroad spur (5JF4451) should be more fully evaluated within the entire complex of the candy factory. After reading the brief history of the Jolly Rancher Candy Company included on the site form, we have questions on whether or not the Jolly Rancher Candy Company is significant under Criterion A at the local level in either commerce or industry. If so, the railroad spur should be evaluated to determine if it could contribute to the overall eligibility of the candy company. There is not enough information provided in the site form to determine if the candy company may be significant under Criterion C. We recommend that the entire complex as well as the railroad spur be evaluated for NRHP eligibility.</p>

GOLD LINE DRAFT EIS COMMENTS

JULY 18-SEPTEMBER 1, 2008



162	Edward Nichols SHPO 5JF4463 – Vacant Land/Barn: The site form states that the resource is only significant under Criterion C for architecture. The site form states in item 35 that the historical background of the resource is not known, but in item 42 the statement of significance states that the building is significant to Wheat Ridge's history as an agricultural and farming community. Please clarify why this resource is significant to Wheat Ridge's agricultural and farming history.
163	Edward Nichols SHPO 5JF4452: Change "No archaeological resources affected" to "No historic properties affected" in the report.