

# GOLD LINE PUBLIC COMMENTS

## FEBRUARY 1-28, 2007



Comment	Date Captured	Source
<p>RTD FasTracks Gold Line Team</p> <p>RTD should not build the "Gold Line" through North Denver to serve Arvada &amp; Wheat Ridge. It is too expensive and too disruptive. RTD is already goin West with the "FasTracks West Corridor" No Steetcars on W. 38th! The current RTD Bus System serves our needs.</p> <p>Phil XXXXXX            XXXXXX Umatilla            Denver, CO XXXXXX</p>	Feb 01 2007	mail
<p>I like Option 3 as it gets people to Arvada quicker on a right of way that is already there. I am not to thrilled about having any sort of train or trolly on 38th Avenue.</p>	Feb 01 2007	website
<p>I can't belive RTD is still trying to put light rail down 38th, we voted on light rail a few years back and was told it was to be put on the existing tracks. Don't you get it we don't want it in a neighborhood, where are neighbors and kids have to live.I don't want it on 38th.</p>	Feb 02 2007	website
<p>after reviewing all the allignments i feel that 6G or 7BB would serve the residents better,and would foster more ridership. the parking at lakeside and other park and ride locations would be a magnet for new riders,as well as new business. if the streetcar route is used would like to see more stops along 38th.</p>	Feb 03 2007	website
<p>Someone needs to remind the railroads where and how they obtained the property they have been using for low these many years. It is my understanding that they were either given the land or purchased it from the government for next to nothing. I find it difficult to understand (well, not really, I guess) how they cannot be looking at the best interestest of the community. Could the reason be...oh, greed?</p> <p>While I am not affected directly--the 38th corridor is a distance from me, I don't own property in the railroad corridor that will spike in value. I have lived in this neighborhood for 36 years and just want the best for my neighbors.</p>	Feb 03 2007	website

# GOLD LINE PUBLIC COMMENTS

## FEBRUARY 1-28, 2007



<p>FW: Gold Line 38th Avenue comments from HUNI   Please review the attached letter that documents our feedback on the proposed routing of the Gold Line adjacent to the Highland Neighborhood.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Timothy XXXXX          Planning and Community Development Committee          Highland United Neighbors, Inc.          xxx.xxx.xxxx   F xxx.xxx.xxxx            xxxxxxxx.com</p>	<p>Feb 04 2007</p>	<p>website</p>
<p>RTD FasTracks Gold Line</p> <p>Attention: Don XXXXXX CH2MHill, Andy XXXX, Karen XXXXX, City of Denver          Copy: Judy XXXXX Council District 9, Kim XXXXX, Rick XXXX Council District 1, Keith XXXX SUNI, Dave XXXXXX RTD Board, Juanita XXXXX RTD Board</p> <p>Feburary 2, 2007</p> <p>Dear Sirs and Madams:</p> <p>The Highland United Neighbors Inc. Planning and Community Development Committee (HUNI PCD Committee) is very excited about the FasTracks program and has been proactively involved for the past three years in preparing input and feedback on the Gold Line and on the other FasTracks lines and facilities that will affect our neighborhood. This has taken the form of inter-neighborhood community meetings and planning processes, and involvement on many committees related to FasTracks land use and transportation issues. We have worked closely with Councilwoman Montero and her staff. In conjunction with our conterparts in the adjoining neighborhoods, we have issued inter-neighborhood position papers and goals statements.</p> <p>The PCD Committee met on Febuary 1st, 2007, to prepare general feedback on the new Gold Line Alternatives that now include options for rail transit on 38th Avenue. In our view, it is crucial that the review and analysis of these alternatives need to recognize 38th Avenue as a vital neighborhood corridor.</p> <p>Following is an initial list of criteria that need to be used in evaluating alternative transit systems along 38th Avenue. This list also starts to establish planning and design goals and needs for all current and future transit systems along the 38th Avenue corridor:</p>	<p>Feb 04 2007</p>	<p>email</p>

# GOLD LINE PUBLIC COMMENTS

## FEBRUARY 1-28, 2007



<p>1. The quality and character of 38th Avenue as a neighborhood-serving corridor is a priority. The revitalization of the corridor is important to the adjacent neighborhoods:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The corridor should be pedestrian-friendly.</li> <li>b. Transit should serve the residents of North Denver with convenient and fequent access to local service.</li> <li>c. Transit should help sustain mixed-uses at historic commercial nodes.</li> <li>d. Transit should improve the livability of nearby residential uses. New transit needs to help link the adjacent neighborhoods together and not create a barrier that seperates the neighborhoods.</li> <li>e. 38th Avenue should NOT become a busy regional-oriented transit corridor for the purpose of moving people through North Denver.</li> <li>f. Transit along 38th Avenue needs to combine and balance regional service with local service to serve the adjacent neighborhoods as well as the surrounding communities.</li> <li>g. On-street parking is an important ingredientof a revitalized 38th Avenue.</li> </ul> <p>2. The quality of transit and number of transit stops along 38th Avenue is critical:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Transit along the corridor needs to provide service and support to the adjacent neighborhoods.</li> <li>b. Connections to a regional transit network with frequent and convenient local connections that link with Union Station and to the regional network must be provided.</li> <li>c. Current users of buse service along 38th Avenue should not see a decrease in convenience if transit along 38th Avenue is changed.</li> <li>d. Travel speed of transit through the 38th Avenue corridor to Union Station is not the top priority.</li> <li>e. Transit stops along 38th Avenue should be associated with intersections that historically have had business uses.</li> <li>f. Transit should be user-friendly – and be designed to encourage ridership by those who do not currenty use public transit.</li> </ul> <p>3. Regional Transit Connections to Points North is important.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. A cross-transfer connection between local 38th Avenue transit and the Northwest Rail at 38th and Inca is a priority.</li> <li>b. North Denver residents should be able to commute towards Boulder without first going all the way to Union Station.</li> </ul> <p>4. Revitaliztion of the Fox Street neighborhood is a priority</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Both local and regional transit stops should serve this neighborhood.</li> <li>b. At the intersection of the rail yards with 38th Avenue;             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I. Good pedestrian connectivity should be provided East-West across the rail yards.</li> <li>II. Good pedestrian connectivity should be provided North-South across 38th Ave.</li> <li>III. Good access to a 38th &amp; Inca regional rail station should be provided to all three neighborhoods, Highland, Sunnyside, and Globeville.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
--	--	--

# GOLD LINE PUBLIC COMMENTS

## FEBRUARY 1-28, 2007



<p>We appreciate this opportunity to provide the FasTracks Gold Line Team with meaningful input and will continue to work with the team to help make the best decisions for the long term success of future transit service for the region and the Highland Neighborhood. Please call me if you have any questions or comments. Sincerely,</p> <p>Highland United Neighbors Inc.</p> <p>Timothy XXXXXX Chair, Planning and Community Development Committee XXX-XXX-XXXX XXXXX.com</p>		
<p>Generally I think it's a good idea. I'm anxiously awaiting it. I'd like to see the most modern approach - maybe streetcar? or whatever.</p>	Feb 05 2007	public workshop kiosk
<p>Several of my neighbors and I would love to have the access to any of the proposed routes that go along 38th Ave. We are excited by the prospect of walking to one of our stations and not using our cars at all. The rail route, with the closest station at Sheridan will make it very difficult for us to use the system at all. Thank you</p>	Feb 05 2007	public workshop kiosk
<p>I would very much like to know why the first time I heard about the Gold Line was from a neighbor on the evening of the public meeting. It would behoove RTD to inform the public that will be most impacted by this project. I live directly on one of the proposed lines. I find it irresponsible on the part of RTD that honesty during the FASTRACKS campaign in the voting season was not paramount. I may not have voted in RTD's favor had I known that such a plan was in development.</p>	Feb 05 2007	public workshop kiosk
<p>I live on the corner of 38th and Newton just moved in 3 months ago. I was not told about these plans and fear the loss of all value in my home which is paid for. This property will be worthless with transit 20 feet from the door. What is wrong with the current #38 bus which serves this area very nicely? Millions of dollars later we will have the very same service we have right now.</p>	Feb 05 2007	public workshop kiosk
<p>I would like to see good station connectivity for pedestraains and bicyclist. I also like the TOD potential for the ECU alternative.</p>	Feb 05 2007	public workshop kiosk

# GOLD LINE PUBLIC COMMENTS

## FEBRUARY 1-28, 2007



<p>If you do consatruction on 38th avenue, the contractor should be given a bonus for fniishing early and a penalty for finishing late. Both should be hefty for motivation. Example - in case is extreme distress caused area businesses at Speer and Federal.</p>	<p>Feb 05 2007</p>	<p>public workshop kiosk</p>
<p>Using the existing rail right of way is the best option because it is the most efficient. Traffic has no effect on this service so there are fewer delays and schedules are predictable. This is very important when you consider transit during the work week. It's difficult to consider the other options when you could be late for work because of traffic delays. The BN\UP option isn't much more expensive and it's more efficient than a street car. Street cars are like buses on rails. If we go that route we might as well stick with or expand the bus system and save money.</p>	<p>Feb 05 2007</p>	<p>public workshop kiosk</p>
<p>Alignment must run down 38th to allow Denver riders convenient access. FastTracks should not only serve suburban needs as those of us in the city are footing the bill for this project as well. Do NOT bypass Northwest Denver. Run streetcar with signal priority to speed up trip for all. I support streetcar with rail alignment along 38th Ave.</p>	<p>Feb 05 2007</p>	<p>public workshop kiosk</p>
<p>If there were to be any system going down 38th. Ave. I do not see how it would not affect the east-west flow of traffic in Northwest Denver in a major way. Where would the traffic that would normally travel down 38th. go in the neighborhood? Certainly 44th, nor 29th, nor 46th could make up for 38th. Ave. It would seem that then traffic would have to go into the neighborhood, causing safety problems. Where would the parking that is now on 38th. go?</p>	<p>Feb 05 2007</p>	<p>public workshop kiosk</p>
<p>My interest in seeing the rail line option and streetcar on 38th as the 2 alternatives that receive further cost engineering. In addition, I am concerned that significant care be given to beautifying the neighborhood and cooridor as construction occurs (e.g. station stops, enhancement for potential economic develop of neighborhood bizs, the RR underpass on 38th). Infact, I'd like to see community input into the final plans of the selected alternative. In addition, I would like to find out who to talk with or collaborate with in exploring additional, private funding for beautification of the 38th/RR underpass beyond what's in the budget for it's repair (I am director of fdn and corp. fundraising at Regis U. and would be happy to help in this effort).</p>	<p>Feb 05 2007</p>	<p>public workshop kiosk</p>
<p>Street car, It sounds like a glorified bus service. What will happen to bus service? and whywould ARVADA Want that? my personal opion is that you guys overlooked northwest denver whne you propsted the original line. We in northwest DENver propsted the i70 cooridor three years ago. with a lot supporters, What happened? It woudl have served both arvada and northwest denver. and it could have involved someting likekthat you did for the southeast corridor? some one could have convinced cdot yodoimprovements to i-70 earlier than projected.</p>	<p>Feb 05 2007</p>	<p>public workshop kiosk</p>
<p>38th ave is already limited where parking is concerned and as a business owner, limited parking more than what ism will do more damage than good</p>	<p>Feb 05 2007</p>	<p>public workshop kiosk</p>

# GOLD LINE PUBLIC COMMENTS

## FEBRUARY 1-28, 2007



<p>I think you are doing a very good job on the Gold Line EIS process. I am impressed with the team. I support your narrowing to the two alternatives of street car and the BN/UP alignment.</p> <p>Please design the transit vehicles of FasTracks to carry bicycles. Today, many people want to bike to work and play, but distances are too great. Putting bikes on trains offers a long term sustainable option for our community and our planet. The trains should at least have areas with hooks to simply put your bike up. The current system on the SE and SW lines are not very good for carrying bikes. I do credit RTD for allowing bikes at all. RTD is great! Let's do even better.</p>	Feb 05 2007	public workshop kiosk
<p>My concerns are that my business will suffer due to the lack of parking. My customers drive down 38th and see my sign, if there isn't the traffic flow that is in existence now, my business will suffer. The alternative that is the most sense is the railroad corridor. The streetcar idea looks good in the movies but it will limit the number of stops that the public is able to board public transit. Also where will the buses go? If the original railroad can't be used I believe the project should be abandoned! Save the money.</p>	Feb 05 2007	public workshop kiosk
<p>I think the proccess is well done. I am disappointed that west 38th avenue will noat be considered for light rail. I am willing to participate in one of the groups for improvement of the west 38th Avenue Street Car Alternative.</p>	Feb 05 2007	public workshop kiosk
<p>New options for mobility in the Northwest portion of the metro area are essential. I appreciate your hard work to resolve the issues related to ROW use along the rail corridor. While I like both of the alignment options recommended to move forward in the process, I'm concerned that the additional mobility provided by the streetcar option is marginal at best (9 minutes trave time saved) for a cost of \$362M.</p> <p>Many have spoken passionately about objections to rail along 38th, and concerns about impacts to businesses and residences. Some of the same issues were raised when Elitch's moved to Downtown, and yet the neighborhood is enjoying high property values. Northwest Denver could look upon rail as an amenity, and for 38th St. to be a place where several neighborhoods are joined in the future, rather than the dividing line as it is now.</p> <p>Did you consider a streetcar on the Sheridan alignment?</p> <p>I'd be interested in being part of future focus groups.</p>	Feb 05 2007	public workshop kiosk

# GOLD LINE PUBLIC COMMENTS

## FEBRUARY 1-28, 2007



<p>I believe that the UP/BNSF alignment is the best, and that it does serve NW Denver -- in an indirect but real way -- by reducing traffic demand on our NW streets and arterials. Providing a new transit mode that does not compete for space in the street, is a clear benefit.</p>	<p>Feb 05 2007</p>	<p>public workshop kiosk</p>
<p>I don't favor either recommendation. Street car will be a glorified bus service, not any better than today. I am disappointed that when the gold line was proposed you didn't think about northwest denver. we are left out of the picture with only one connection. It would help tod but nothing else. Why didn't you look at the I-70 corridor? You aren't putting at much money and time into our project as opposed tot he Southeast line. We are being shortchanged. Why can't you put the same political pressure on CDOT to improve I-70 as you did on I-25? I owuld be happy to meet with you with some of my neighbors.</p>	<p>Feb 05 2007</p>	<p>public workshop kiosk</p>
<p>Any consideration of running a street car along 38th Ave is crazy. Citizens voted for Fast Tracks in this part of town because we were led to believe that the alignment would follow the rail lines. The deals need to be negotiated with both UP and BN railroads. The right people can somehow make these deals work.</p>	<p>Feb 05 2007</p>	<p>public workshop kiosk</p>
<p>Agree with recommendations. Need more information on noise, traffic.</p>	<p>Feb 05 2007</p>	<p>public workshop kiosk</p>
<p>Need to see the whole picture on these alternatives before we can judge them.</p>	<p>Feb 05 2007</p>	<p>public workshop kiosk</p>
<p>If EMU can't work, streetcar could be a great opportunity for the community. Opportunity for revitalization.</p>	<p>Feb 05 2007</p>	<p>public workshop kiosk</p>
<p>Please explain that the population of Colorado will increase by another one million about the same time the transit system will be instituted. 38th avenue will be at a standstill long before that. NW Denver residents fail to realize that the neighborhood will be passed by and this may be our one opportunity to actually see something positive be accomplished on 38th.</p>	<p>Feb 05 2007</p>	<p>public workshop kiosk</p>

# GOLD LINE PUBLIC COMMENTS

## FEBRUARY 1-28, 2007



The major untapped ridership that is evident in the figures presented at tonight's meeting is a strong argument for the sincere pursuit of the street-car alternative on 38th Avenue and north on Harlan Street. Please register my enthusiast support for this alternative - and find a way to provide the priority for the street car that will make this an attractive and viable alternative to driving.	Feb 05 2007	public workshop kiosk
Thank you for taking our input and adjusting the alternative regarding Lowell.	Feb 05 2007	public workshop kiosk
Gold Line could be a catalyst for re-development. Must create good opportunities for businesses, not obstacles (re: re-zoning). Create a healthy environment for businesses.	Feb 05 2007	public workshop kiosk
Concerned about impacts on Harlan. Why isn't bus sufficient? How were routes developed?	Feb 05 2007	public workshop kiosk
Street Car seems to be a questionable expense. Seems like an "electric bus".	Feb 05 2007	public workshop kiosk
Emergency access along 38th is a major concern.	Feb 05 2007	public workshop kiosk
I think we need to move ahead with some plan. We need examples from other cities. Don't reinvent the wheel.	Feb 05 2007	public workshop kiosk
We voted for Fastracks to be on the Railroad alignment. Stick to the route that voters voted on.	Feb 05 2007	public workshop kiosk
Are there existing agreements with BN/UP? How do they affect the Gold Line?	Feb 05 2007	public workshop kiosk
I don't think a lot of the recommendations because we need more information.	Feb 05 2007	public workshop kiosk
Railroads - what if you only get agreement with one railroad? I don't see liability as an issue that can't be solved.	Feb 05 2007	public workshop kiosk

# GOLD LINE PUBLIC COMMENTS

## FEBRUARY 1-28, 2007



I support transit down 38th. The street was designed for transit originally and we should get that back. There are obstacles but overall there is nothing but benefit. Rail was the original occupant of 38th. This neighborhood is becoming more popular, and transit would compliment the community.	Feb 05 2007	public workshop kiosk
I am concerned about traffic, safety, and my property value. I do not like the idea of a train or railcar going by in front of my house. Please include me in future meetings and discussions.	Feb 05 2007	public workshop kiosk
If rail comes back to the community along 38th Ave., parking won't be as big of an issue.	Feb 05 2007	public workshop kiosk
Concerned about stations on Sheridan/Federal. Where would they be located? Concerned about property acquisitions and that the need for parking would create need for acquisitions.	Feb 05 2007	public workshop kiosk
please email me a gold line brochure.	Feb 05 2007	public workshop kiosk
Think this project is a waste of money.	Feb 05 2007	public workshop kiosk
I am for operating in the railroad alignment.	Feb 05 2007	public workshop kiosk
The auto is more convenient than public transit.	Feb 05 2007	public workshop kiosk
It doesn't make sense to run transit down 38th if we are trying to make streets more pedestrian friendly. Clashes with idea of increased density and a pedestrian friendly street.	Feb 05 2007	public workshop kiosk
Seems like most people are in favor of the railroad alignment.	Feb 05 2007	public workshop kiosk
Spend more time and energy lobbying elected officials for indemnification bill.	Feb 05 2007	public workshop kiosk

# GOLD LINE PUBLIC COMMENTS

## FEBRUARY 1-28, 2007



If we trade buses for a more expensive mode along 38th, it's not worth it. Think it's a bait and switch and unfortunate that you didn't foresee the situation with the railroad.	Feb 05 2007	public workshop kiosk
Worried about small businesses. If they lose parking, that could be problematic.	Feb 05 2007	public workshop kiosk
What is effect on crime with transit projects? What security is provided? How does transit affect accidents? Safety is a major issue for me, which is why I am opposed to 38th.	Feb 05 2007	public workshop kiosk
How does transit affect property values? How will it affect traffic?	Feb 05 2007	public workshop kiosk
Business owners on 38th don't want it. It will kill small businesses. We want what the citizens want.	Feb 05 2007	public workshop kiosk
For the railroad route and against 38th Avenue alignment.	Feb 05 2007	public workshop kiosk
People who live off of 38th will have more cars parking in front of their houses. Residents need special permits. Where would the stations be?	Feb 05 2007	public workshop kiosk
Worried about how 38th route could have secondary effect on parking on neighborhood streets. Traffic increase is concerning.	Feb 05 2007	public workshop kiosk
I voted for this to be further north, and I don't see the benefit to the community. I would prefer if you would take it off of 38th.	Feb 05 2007	public workshop kiosk
Appreciate the work to help make the streetcar an asset to the community.	Feb 05 2007	public workshop kiosk
Concerned about 38th route up Harlan. Would like more time to consider the alternatives. People on Harlan don't know about this. Think the process is going too fast. This route isn't what we voted on.	Feb 05 2007	public workshop kiosk

# GOLD LINE PUBLIC COMMENTS

## FEBRUARY 1-28, 2007



<p>As taxpayers and voters we expressed interest in the railroad as an alignment. I understand that the accident in Glendale, CA has modified that plan, but it seems that too much time is being given to the 38th/Harlan alignment. I hope that the railroad, RTD, and other government agencies can come to some agreement about the possibility of implementing a plan that includes both insurance and indemnity so we can once again get "on track" with the original plan. The city streets will be congested enough in the future without our adding to the problem. If we can't go underground like an eastern city, then maybe we can find an alignment that will improve our arterials or at the least not make the problem worse. Thank you.</p>	Feb 05 2007	public workshop kiosk
<p>Don't see the long term benefits of streetcar. Why aren't light rail options eligible for funding?</p>	Feb 05 2007	public workshop kiosk
<p>Concerned about parking situation for small businesses on 38th. Take them into consideration. What will the effect be during construction? How will you help small businesses through challenges? Possible problems during snow storms?</p>	Feb 05 2007	public workshop kiosk
<p>How will streetcars keep moving when traffic is dense in 2030?</p>	Feb 05 2007	public workshop kiosk
<p>I attended the gold line meeting this evening (2/5/07) at the Masonic Center. I wanted to again voice my support for streetcar on 38th avenue. It seems to me that most of the comments against streetcar came from the lack of details available regarding issues such as parking and construction schedules. As these details become available through the next few stages of inquiry, I hope that public acceptance of this option will grow. I believe that returning streetcars to NW Denver will anchor the trend of economic revitalization across the area. Thank you for your efforts on the fastracks project!</p>	Feb 05 2007	website
<p>The pictures and films of the StreetCar alternative show traffic following in the same lane as the streetcar. You mentioned that the idea is to have the vehicle move fast to encourage ridership. If the vehicle is in the middle of traffic how can it move faster than traffic. Also will this alternative take away the parking and traffic lanes that Light Rail was going to?</p> <p>As one of the speakers said tonight - If we can't use the train right of way then leave the buses to service Northwest Denver.</p>	Feb 05 2007	email

# GOLD LINE PUBLIC COMMENTS

## FEBRUARY 1-28, 2007



<p>I heard quite a few times that the people speaking didn't know about the decisions being made by RTD about 38th Avenue. This lack of communication is a problem for the people in the 38th Ave. corridor. I would imagine that over 50% of the people in that area weren't even aware of the meeting tonight.</p> <p>The folks I heard speak were from locations NOT on 38th Avenue. Since the preferred alternative - streetcar - uses 38th Avenue whether it's up Sheridan or Harlan, the 38th Avenue residents should be the ones that are consulted about whether it is approved or not. People from areas adjacent to 38th Avenue certainly can have their view on it but the problems will be carried by the residents and businesses along 38th Ave.</p>	Feb 05 2007	email
<p>38th Ave. input   Thank you for conducting a very informative meeting tonight at Highlands Masonic! I was impressed with the scope and the knowledge you presented.</p> <p>This was my first meeting, and it was great to hear so many sides to the 38th Ave. Street Car proposal.</p> <p>There are a few comments and observations I would like to make:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Citizens noted the traffic already congested on 38th Ave. With more people moving in and density increasing, that traffic will only become more congested - it is a given. Many have stated they would not ride the Street car, but continue to use their own cars to get downtown. (How irresponsible and selfish is that in terms of our environment???) The RTD design is meant to decrease the need for cars which = less traffic = less toxic emissions. And in addition to that <b>MOVE PEOPLE QUICKLY!</b> Look how long it took the voters to go with light rail, when it was so obvious we needed it decades ago. Denver is growing and growing, and the costs of improving traffic flow will continue to rise. It is more fiscally responsible to tackle this now, than in 5 years from now. Having experienced how other cities 'move people' (Wash.DC;San Fran; etc) has made me a believer, in solving this problem now, rather than when it becomes a larger problem. And it will become a larger problem!</li> <li>2. Yes many citizens had important questions that need to be answered: parking, design models, guarantees against eminent domain from the City, Construction 'downtime' of their business operations, etc. All are valid. What bothers me is that even though this was a Community meeting, the future benefit of the Community was really being ignored by those citizens who had negative comments.</li> <li>3. What about another model all together? Raised Monorail down 38th that does not interfere with anything traffic or pedestrian related???? What other options could there be other than what has been presented?</li> <li>4. Parking issues: believe me, if you make a fair offer for someone's property on 38th (and there are PLENTY of less attractive parcels that have seen better days!) they will take the money and move on!! Parking lots will appear as if by magic! This can't possibly be a contentious issue!</li> <li>5. Parking on the street: it is actually dangerous in some sections on the north side of 38th, west of Federal, and they should be removed altogether, as the parking merges into traffic lane. The areas that have safety, I suggest no meters or paid parking, but limit the hours a person can park there.</li> </ol>	Feb 05 2007	email

# GOLD LINE PUBLIC COMMENTS

## FEBRUARY 1-28, 2007



<p>6. Generally speaking, 38th Ave. is not an attractive street. Some businesses have tried quite hard to make their property attractive, and we applaud them, but for the most part, it isn't a Destination Shopping District' at all. It is in need of a 'makeover'. Transportation improvements will improve the whole corridor! It will attract businesses to invest in the street.</p> <p>7. Thinking ahead: Lakeside will be redeveloped and we hope into something fabulous like a better version of Belmar, with elements of Olde Town Arvada mixed in. A Station at Harlan and Lakeside (44th) is being foresightful, as THAT will be a shopping destination!</p> <p>8. Also thinking ahead: Tennyson Street is, and will also continue to undergo a facelift, and having a station at Tennyson and 38th is very responsible and smart: That is becoming (more so) a Destination Shopping and Art District, and the taxes from that district will add more and more to the City of Denver's coffers. When you go west of Sheridan, the taxes go to those cities, not Denver.</p> <p>9. How is it that the neighborhood can't as a whole, EMBRACE these progressive changes?? They are certainly designed to improve our quality of life, be environmentally responsible, create more beauty around us, and be that much more proud of the neighborhood we all come home to!!!!</p> <p>Thank you for letting me give you my input.          Very Sincerely,          Debbie XXXX          Business and Property owner on Tennyson St. - in the heart of the ArtWalk!          XXXXXXXX          Debbie XXXXX          XXXXXXX.net          xxx-xxx-xxxx          Fax: xxx-xxx-xxxx</p>		
<p>Myself and other district administrators would like to meet with RTD / Gold Line representatives in regards to the proposed alignments. We are concerned with the cost to the school district with alignments which may cause us to begin transportation into schools which have been walk in schools for students. Additionally, the director of DPS would like to attend this meeting.</p>	<p>Feb 06 2007</p>	<p>website</p>
<p>It is absolutely unreasonable for you to think of going up 38th Avenue. It needs to go the way the voters voted. It will destroy our North Denver neighborhood. My family has been a part of 38th Avenue since 1900, and it destroys neighborhoods. We have people that cross it with wheelchairs and they will not be able to do this. There will be accidents. It's just unconscionable. So that's my vote. Thank you.</p>	<p>Feb 06 2007</p>	<p>phone</p>

# GOLD LINE PUBLIC COMMENTS

## FEBRUARY 1-28, 2007



<p>Public Meeting Comment   I am a resident of the 38th Ave corridor where the streetcar is being proposed as an alternative. I went to the Feb 5 public meeting and I wanted to thank you for your time and effort that you have put into the analysis. I think the streetcar would benefit the neighborhood greatly and sincerely hope that it is chosen for NW Denver.</p> <p>You mentioned looking into making the streetcar faster otherwise fewer people will not use it. I'm guessing the major intersections (Federal and 38th, Sheridan and 38th, etc.) are bottlenecks for traffic especially during rush hour having to share the road with cars and all.</p> <p>Could tunnels or elevated bridges, etc. to be used only by the streetcar at those intersection be researched to make the route faster.</p> <p>I know it will increase the cost of the project but it appeared that the initial estimate was below the amount which can be allocated for the Gold Line. If ridership increases as a result of it being faster then it might be worth the price. Just a comment for your consideration.</p> <p>Thanks again!</p> <p>Robyn XXXXX Xavier &amp; 41st St</p>	<p>Feb 07 2007</p>	<p>email</p>
--	--------------------	--------------

# GOLD LINE PUBLIC COMMENTS

## FEBRUARY 1-28, 2007



<p>Thomas XXXX3          XXXX West 46th Avenue          Denver, Colorado XXXXX          XXX-XXX-XXXX</p> <p>RTD Gold Line Team          c/o GBSM          600 17th St., Ste. 2020-S          Denver, Colorado 80202</p> <p>Greetings:</p> <p>RE: Gold Line Alignments</p> <p>I have lived in North Denver more than twenty-five years and was very interested when the possibility of transit through the area came to be considered after the problems with the railroad alignment alternative developed. I have attended the various meetings on the topic since last fall and have closely followed the process. I appreciate the efforts by the consultants and RTD staff to explain and communicate during the EIS process.</p> <p>I submit the following comments for your consideration:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The RR alignment with EMU vehicles seems the best alternative to fulfill the original concept of FastTracks in terms of ridership and performance. To be viable I think the route has to follow the railroad ROW for the entire 11 miles. Any jerry-rigged option consisting of EMU with a transfer to streetcar or light rail is doomed to poor performance given the relatively short length of the route. Impedance at the transfer point will take a heavy toll.</li> <li>2. If the railroad alignment is not possible or feasible then the streetcar alternative along W. 38th Avenue and up Harlan is the best alternative if it can be made to meet the performance criteria.</li> </ol> <p>The neighborhood still feels very burned by the imposition of 1-70 through the area to the detriment of parks and residential areas. Similarly we do not want to be merely a conduit for a regional transit line taking suburbanites to Downtown Denver. Any line has to provide real benefits to the area through which it passes. Light Rail through the area with its greater impacts and only two widely separated stations does not provide enough benefit.</p> <p>The Streetcar provides substantially more stops and more potential to benefit the area through transit oriented development</p>	<p>Feb 07 2007</p>	<p>mail</p>
--	--------------------	-------------

# GOLD LINE PUBLIC COMMENTS

## FEBRUARY 1-28, 2007



<p>and redevelopment along the corridor. W. 38th Avenue is the only east-west corridor in North Denver that is feasible for transit given its width, zoning, character, and compatibility with existing city plans. The corridor is designated an “area of change” in Blueprint Denver – the official planning document adopted by City Council in 2002. As many people in the IFT pointed out, W. 38th is not exactly belived in terms of its aesthetics or the availability of community and business services. A transit line along the street has the potential to make a more vibrant and useful area for North Denver and the city. It should be noted that there are individual historic resources and districts along the route that should be respected in the course of the line's construction and any redevelopment.</p> <p>RTD staff and their consultants should be encouraged to explore ways of making the streetcar option work, through dedicated ROW, removal of on-street parking, and such operational alternatives as variable stops (express-local runs) and multi-unit operations. To reduce costs and impacts, many of the stations could be simple non-elaborate structures.</p> <p>Please feel free to contact if any points need clarification.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Thomas XXXXX</p>		
<p>Hello - I attended Monday's public meeting and agree that it does not make sense to carry the LRT alternatives forward. I think if we are serious about reducing travel down 38th Avenue and increasing public transportation rider ship, fixed dedicated lanes must be used for the streetcar. Otherwise it is an expensive, unnecessary upgrade to the existing bus service.</p> <p>Thank you for a very informative meeting. Once again you have presented the facts for each alternative in a clear and non-biased manner leaving all of us to form our own opinions.</p>	Feb 07 2007	website
<p>What kind of access will be given to bicyclists (especially commuters) along the Gold Line? Thanks</p>	Feb 07 2007	public workshop kiosk
<p>I AM 200% OPPOSED TO STREET CARS. WE ALREADY HAVE BUSES ON THE STREETS AND STREETCARS WON'T BE AN IMPROVEMENT, THEY WILL HAVE TO STOP AT STOP LIGHTS. EMUS USING THE EXISTING RAILROAD WOULD BE MUCH BETTER.</p>	Feb 07 2007	public workshop kiosk

# GOLD LINE PUBLIC COMMENTS

## FEBRUARY 1-28, 2007



<p>I am not sure where the Old Towne Station is planned to be but I own a store in on Grandview and parking is already a problem so it makes sense to me to put the station above the rtd lot and put a parking garage below, because if the station is anywhere west people will not want to walk and they will take our already limited parking spaces.</p>	<p>Feb 07 2007</p>	<p>public workshop kiosk</p>
<p>It appears that the preferred alternative is going to be the EMU through Arvada. In that case, RTD needs to look ahead to developing light rail or street car service through Northwest Denver that would connect to the Gold Line and other rail lines through the RTD service area.</p>	<p>Feb 07 2007</p>	<p>public workshop kiosk</p>
<p>Although the Electric Rail is the least expensive proposition I am strongly against it. It seems the light rail alternatives through North Denver were doomed from the start via the costs involved. If Fast Tracks is just for Arvada and the North Corridor it is not equity. I don't think many of the opponents have any idea of the environmental impact that leaving these cars on what will become the parking lot of West 38th Street and sucking fumes. Most people don't realize the value of simply not being in a car, buying gas, not searching for and not paying for parking. I would have voted for dedicated lines and less car traffic on 38th. I will take streetcars as the next best thing.</p>	<p>Feb 07 2007</p>	<p>public workshop kiosk</p>
<p>Property - We have water rights-Ditch water runs beside property-The financial impact on our property; Safty-we have small children-we have not put a fence on our property-we enjoy the beauty-impact of safty and will we have to put a fence up. Who pays for that? Noise? Noisy enough with the present traffic.</p> <p><b>MOST IMPORTANT----THE GRADE SCHOOL- I DO NOT WANT A STREET CAR OR LIGHT RAIL IN FRONT OF OUR SCHOOL.</b></p> <p>I voted for fast tracts-a long the RR tracts. The bus system to down town is only 20 minutes. IF longer I would not use the new system.</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>Feb 07 2007</p>	<p>public workshop kiosk</p>
<p>The rail corridor alternative is the only viable option that will effectively serve the northwest area. The streetcar option fails to serve northwest riders. I don't believe the projected ride times of streetcar from Ward Road, particularly during rush hour. I believe streetcar simply shifts ridership from northwest area to the 38th avenue corridor. 38th Corridor is better served by a more local arm of the transit system. From Arvada, the streetcar proposal is no better then buses on the same route and worse then the current system.</p>	<p>Feb 07 2007</p>	<p>public workshop kiosk</p>

# GOLD LINE PUBLIC COMMENTS

## FEBRUARY 1-28, 2007



<p>I would like to go on record as preferring the street car alternative. It would be great for people in our area to get around on it. It would serve the city well.</p>	<p>Feb 07 2007</p>	<p>public workshop kiosk</p>
<p>I'd definitely like the Electric Rail BN/UP - on the rail line. I do not want any alternatives with street cars in any way shape or form. No street works The street cars mess up traffic, they're slow and I'm interested in fast rail transportation to the Denver hub and out to the airport. For the alternative, I'd rather go with the buses. We have a good bus system and I use the buses. I'd like the buses to be the alternative, not the street car.</p>	<p>Feb 07 2007</p>	<p>public workshop kiosk</p>
<p>If the Gold Line was streetcars, we would never have passed FasTracks. A system that takes 50 minutes won't work. It must be faster than express buses. Don't reduce us to a second class system with streetcars.</p>	<p>Feb 07 2007</p>	<p>public workshop kiosk</p>
<p>When I voted for the gold line transportation system, I thought I was voting for a system which resembled the south I25 system. The thought of a street car system is not what I thought I was getting. If I knew that a street car system was an option I would not have voted for it.</p>	<p>Feb 07 2007</p>	<p>public workshop kiosk</p>
<p>We already have buses that serve Northwest Denver. Only difference between streetcar and bus is the type of fuel. Keep buses for local communities and continue to evaluate the BN/UP Alignment.</p>	<p>Feb 07 2007</p>	<p>public workshop kiosk</p>
<p>Think EMU on the BN/UP is the best alignment.</p>	<p>Feb 07 2007</p>	<p>public workshop kiosk</p>
<p>It's important to compare the ridership times and numbers between stations. With streetcar, will the ridership increase intra-station, but decrease from end to end? It seems that the RR alignment attracts more riders on longer trips, and the streetcar would likely attract more ridership between neighborhoods only. Additionally, to further support the economic development that Arvadans have wanted, the RR alignment seems the only viable option.</p>	<p>Feb 07 2007</p>	<p>public workshop kiosk</p>
<p>Have you identified bill sponsors? What is the level of support? What is the last date to submit a late bill?</p>	<p>Feb 07 2007</p>	<p>public workshop kiosk</p>

# GOLD LINE PUBLIC COMMENTS

## FEBRUARY 1-28, 2007



<p>If we cannot have more rapid access to downtown than our vehicles, ridership will be extremely low. We will have spent a huge amount of money on an option we did not approve.</p> <p>By definition, any transport running on a street will go no faster than my car. I know that it will transport people more efficiently, but I don't think that the general public will know how to factor this in. By the time I drive to Park n Ride and wait for the streetcar, I believe that any reduction in commuting time from there on in will be obliterated.</p> <p>If I cannot have an alternative that will avoid the traffic snarls instead of sitting in them, I'll simply drive.</p> <p>I believe that No Action is preferable to spending a lot of money to essentially replace bus service.</p>	Feb 07 2007	public workshop kiosk
<p>City of Arvada supports railroad ROW alternative. Travel time is the primary reason. We voted for FasTracks. Capital costs/operating cost per rider better for EMU. Also ongoing costs. EMU alternative has far fewer at-grade crossings.</p>	Feb 07 2007	public workshop kiosk
<p>Stick with the original alternative, it's the most cost effective, fastest, most ridership. I don't care what vehicle is used, the EMU fulfills the railroad's new criteria, use it. I prefer the electric anyway. Mass transit is important to implement, BUT, it must be fast and convenient if you expect people to get out of their cars and use it.</p>	Feb 07 2007	public workshop kiosk
<p>Streetcar could be supplement AFTER Gold Line. FasTracks sold as entire system. If Gold Line is 40-50 min. ride, no one will use the system. Need better communication with local governments re: legislation. Work together to get bill passed.</p>	Feb 07 2007	public workshop kiosk
<p>Thanks to RTD for hard work and listening to community.</p>	Feb 07 2007	public workshop kiosk
<p>I commend the process. This is an opportunity to provide input. This is a democratic process. It's commendable that we have the opportunity to comment and that nothing has been decided. EMU opens new possibilities for what happens north re: connections to NW Rail.</p>	Feb 07 2007	public workshop kiosk

# GOLD LINE PUBLIC COMMENTS

## FEBRUARY 1-28, 2007



Streetcar could be a round two. It is meant for urban network. With a third technology more infrastructure would need to be added. Access to northern areas is huge benefit of EMU. Inter-connectivity better for long run.	Feb 07 2007	public workshop kiosk
I approve of the ways the alternatives have been narrowed down. Keeping light rail doesn't make sense. I am opposed to keeping LRT on the table. Streetcar is the lesser of the two evils.	Feb 07 2007	public workshop kiosk
I criticize RTD for their biological denial. What about water closets on the trains and stations. You could probably have them on the EMUs. Investigate California trains to see what they have. EMUs would open up possibilities for connections to Castle Rock and Colorado Springs. Scheduled passenger service would have to be a loop to make the most of the tracks. The DIA connection with EMUs is important to us and also to Boulder and Fort Collins.	Feb 07 2007	public workshop kiosk
RTD and the consultants are to be commended in following through on what President Ford stated - it's possible to disagree without being disagreeable.	Feb 07 2007	public workshop kiosk
Streetcar is going back to the 30's. We voted for Light Rail we deserve Light Rail.	Feb 07 2007	public workshop kiosk
Schools west of Harlan is a safety concern for children. Streetcars on Harlan would create a traffic mess.	Feb 07 2007	public workshop kiosk
If we voted for light rail alternative, how are other alternatives on the table? If we can't get light rail route, we may not want anything at all.	Feb 07 2007	public workshop kiosk
A lot of work has gone into the concepts which are not viable for what we want. Don't throw it away, use it for future municipal systems. The work is a point of departure for what we want.	Feb 07 2007	public workshop kiosk

# GOLD LINE PUBLIC COMMENTS

## FEBRUARY 1-28, 2007



<p>The work all of the RTD team has been excellent. Thanks!</p> <p>Although you've heard from me previously, I want to note that not everyone attending tonight's meeting at The Arvada Center is in favor of EMU on the original corridor.</p> <p>While the revised (lower) construction numbers clearly are making the EMU alternative look far better than it did previously, many of my neighbors and I would prefer the streetcar alternative regardless of the cost reduction to the EMU option.</p> <p>Also, I think your modeling software that determines ridership numbers/costs per rider are flawed. Although certainly you will loose Arvada riders if it is a longer ride into downtown, I think you will pick up at least that many coming through a more environmentally-friendly community where people are more likely to leave their cars at home than those in the Denver 'burbs.</p> <p>Is there any possibility that both could be done as a part of FastTracks EMU plus a streetcar (that runs up 38th from the EMU line to Sheridan)????</p>	Feb 07 2007	public workshop kiosk
<p>I totally support railroad route. Alternative alignments are very poor by comparison. I voted for light rail down the railroad route. If that can't happen, is streetcar a given?</p>	Feb 07 2007	public workshop kiosk
<p>RTD must indemnify the railroads so we can build on alternative 3 rail lines. AFter they get indemnified it should not matter if they build electric rail, light rail or bike paths. Their necks aren't on the chopping block - RTD can take the fall. A lawsuit might be in order to get railroads to let RTD use light rail as originally planned on Alternative 3. Once again, railroads won't take the fall. What are they afraid of?</p>	Feb 07 2007	public workshop kiosk
<p>Streetcar idea is a bad ides. We voted for service on the BN/UP line with light rail cars. I'd rather just ride the bus from Arvada to central Denver rather than waste \$362 million on streetcars. We haved buses, they aren't super fast but buses are pretty good and we save \$362 million.</p>	Feb 07 2007	public workshop kiosk

# GOLD LINE PUBLIC COMMENTS

## FEBRUARY 1-28, 2007



<p>I'm not able to attend the FastTracks Gold Line meeting in Arvada on 02-08-07 but would like to convey my comments on the options. I'm in favor for the heavy rail proposal. My reasons are that I take the bus from Arvada to Mineral &amp; Broadway every day. When the Gold Line goes into service I would suspect that the 76X &amp; 68X would go away. Today I have to go to 88th and Sheridan to catch a bus to get to work before 7 a.m. If you would choose the street car option it would increase the amount of time to get to Downtown from Arvada. I don't see too many passengers willing to do that. We already have the route 52 that meanders throughout Arvada and North Denver to Downtown. In order to get people to take public transportation and park their vehicles there must be an option that works for them. We deserve the same type of transportation option that the Southwest and Southeast Corridors offer.</p>	<p>Feb 07 2007</p>	<p>email</p>
<p>I attended your presentation in Arvada last night. I strongly support the UP/BN electric rail option. Please add this to your growing list of preferred options by the citizens of the area. thanks Doug Parker</p>	<p>Feb 08 2007</p>	<p>website</p>
<p>Keep the Trolley OFF grandview and away from streets with single-family home entrances. Utilize existing railroad spaces for commuter trains only if you must spend the money. Trolley cars are a waste of money.</p>	<p>Feb 08 2007</p>	<p>comment card</p>
<p>Opinion on Streetcar Alternative   Hello,</p> <p>I attended the Goldline Workshop last night (2/7/07) at the Arvada Center, at which time I personally submitted a letter with my opinions regarding the Streetcar Alternative. I was requested to submit the letter to you as a pdf file, so it could "go into the record." The letter you requested is attached to this email.</p> <p>Please confirm that you received this email and are able to work with the pdf file that I sent.</p> <p>Thank you,          Carol XXXX          XXX-XXX-XXXX</p>	<p>Feb 08 2007</p>	<p>email</p>

# GOLD LINE PUBLIC COMMENTS

## FEBRUARY 1-28, 2007



<p>February 7, 2007  RTD Gold Line Team  c/o GBSM  600 17th Street, Suite 2020-S  Denver, CO 80202</p> <p>To whom it may concern:</p> <p>I am a property owner in Olde Town Arvada and I wish to express my viewpoint regarding the two remaining alternatives for the Gold Line that will serve Arvada and Wheat ridge.</p> <p>STREETCAR HARLAN/RALSTON (ALTERNATIVE 7BB)</p> <p>I am very strongly OPPOSED to this alternative for the following reasons:</p> <p>1. Public Safety</p> <p>Streetcars and trolleys were a common means of transportation at the “turn of the century,” prior to the advent of the automobile. To enhance public safety, in recent decades most cities have opted to eliminate rail systems that move through public streets. The internet is littered with articles involving pedestrians and motorists who are injured or killed by trolley systems. For example, the worst accident ever experienced by the Chicago Transit Authority involved a streetcar that collided with a gasoline tanker, killing 34 persons and injuring many more (see attached article: Chicago Historical Information). Chicago now has an elevated rapid transit system, removing the potential for such trolley tragedies. In cities where trolleys still operate today, many attorneys specialize in trolley litigation.</p> <p>Public safety must be a number one priority in city/transportation planning. Streetcars would create a new and very serious hazard for pedestrians and motorists in Arvada. As noted in the attached article (Trolley worker killed...), it can take up to 300 feet to bring a trolley to an emergency stop. This fact alone creates a statistical certainty that motorists and pedestrians in Arvada will be seriously injured and killed if a trolley system becomes operational in the city streets. Compounding the situation in Arvada is the fact that the proposed trolley route runs through residential areas where children play; in front of a large elementary school that stands a few feet from Grandview Avenue; within a block of the public library; within two blocks of a prominent private school/church, and through the downtown area where alcohol is served in at least three establishments (see attached article: Streetcar accident victim returns to Biever).</p> <p>2. Security</p>	<p>Feb 08 2007</p>	<p>email</p>
--	--------------------	--------------

# GOLD LINE PUBLIC COMMENTS

## FEBRUARY 1-28, 2007



Unfortunately we are living in an era where security is becoming increasingly important in mass transportation. In several major cities around the world, terrorists have already killed and injured people using explosive devices in buses, trolleys, and trains. Homeland Security in the US is moving in the direction of increased screening for mass transportation passengers. If an explosive device were to go off in a trolley or bus in the United States — similar to what has already happened in Great Britain — there would naturally be public fear and reservations about the safety of such vehicles. Unlike trains or airplanes (where commuters board at a central station) it is virtually impossible to screen passengers boarding trolleys on street corners. Looking to the future, I think security should be a major consideration in selecting any mass transportation plan. If a choice exists between “federally certified crash-worthy passenger rail cars” running between stations (where screening devices could be adopted) versus open-access street trolleys (where screening/surveillance is virtually impossible), I feel it would be irresponsible to adopt the later.

### 3. Commute Time/Reliability

“FasTracks,” as defined on the web page <http://www.rtd-denver.com/fastracks/#overview>, is: “RTD's twelve year comprehensive plan to build and operate high speed rail lines and expand and improve bus service and Park-n-Rides throughout the region.” According to Mayor Hickenlooper, “Denver, all 31 municipalities, voted unanimously to support FasTracks...all seven counties supported, all 15 Chambers of Commerce, scattered throughout the entire region, supported it.” (see attached article: Issues and Opportunities Facing Local Governments”)

Subsequent to this vote, a “streetcar alternative plan” has been proposed for the Gold Line. This plan will almost double the commute time from Ward Rd to downtown Denver — from 25 minutes to 41 minutes. Furthermore, reliability ratings of the proposed trolleys is “low,” especially in bad weather. This is a great concern because bad weather is precisely the time when the public needs to avoid expressways and rely on a commuter system. Reliability ratings of electric commuter rail is high, however. Arvada wants, needs and deserves a reliable, on-time, commuter system. Even in good weather, if the proposed trolleys run on schedule, it is estimated that each passenger from Ward Road to Denver would waste an additional 32 minutes a day (16 minutes each direction) on a trolley. With a daily ridership of 11,000 passengers, this represents 5,866 additional wasted manhours PER DAY, if trolleys were ridden as opposed to faster commuter rail cars. Additionally, due to the noise level, electrical fields, and frequent stops encountered on trolley systems, accomplishing meaningful work via cell phone or laptop computer can become problematic. Simply put, it is difficult to understand how SlowTrolleys qualifies for the FasTracks concept that the taxpayers voted to support.

### 4. Quality of Life

I moved to Arvada in 1972, and it has been my experience that it is a peaceful, quiet community. I have visited cities in the United States where trolleys still exist, and they were everything but quiet. The warning bells at every intersection, the metal wheels on metal tracks, the vibrations, etc. all generate noise pollution. It is my understanding that Arvada's trolley system

# GOLD LINE PUBLIC COMMENTS

## FEBRUARY 1-28, 2007



would run up to 18 hours per day and in close proximity to people's homes. Needless to say this would affect their property values as well as their sleep!

The movement of streetcars through city streets is bound to affect the flow of traffic and create more congestion, especially at intersections and trolley stops. The proposed route on Grandview Avenue will be particularly problematic because the street has already been narrowed for streetscaping. Two cars can barely pass one another now. Olde Town Arvada already experiences traffic congestion. Adding to this problem could be detrimental to merchants, especially if parking spaces have to be sacrificed for trolley tracks.

Although some people consider trolleys to be a bit nostalgic, they can also represent a major eyesore. There's nothing nostalgic about tracks and overhead wiring — which, similar to fire plugs and utility poles, only add aesthetic clutter to both business and residential landscapes. Nor is there anything nostalgic about seeing these large streetcars pass in front of a living room window every 8 to 30 minutes, as many homeowners would be forced to view.

Lastly, it should be noted that automobile fuel consumption and emissions will be increased if motorists are forced to idle behind trolleys at stops or yield right-of-way at intersections, thus increasing the air pollution and fuel costs.

### 5. Potential Litigation

In light of all of the above issues, I also am concerned about the potential for litigation should the “streetcar alternative” be selected. Although fewer properties would be purchased with the streetcar alternative compared to the rail car alternative, I feel that the community outrage over the substitution of SlowTrolleys for FasTracks —along with the negative environmental impact — could potentially lead to endless petitions and injunctions, project delays, and enormous legal expenses. Although electric trolleys do qualify as light rail transportation, they do not seem to fall within the definition of FasTracks (“high speed rail lines”) published on RTD's website. The name itself (“FasTracks”) implies speed; a slow trolley system isn't what most thought they were voting for. It would be unfortunate ... and a huge waste of taxpayers' money ... if eight years from now Arvada was tied up in court battles and wound up with nothing.

Furthermore, if the streetcar alternative is someday implemented, litigation is likely to occur indefinitely due to inevitable bodily injuries resulting from the trolleys — as experienced by other cities with trolley systems which run within public streets. Why invite such problems if an alternative exists?

### ELECTRIC COMMUTER RAIL BN/UP (ALTERNATIVE 3)

I fully SUPPORT this alternative plan because electric commuter rail cars would run along the freight tracks at a high rate of speed, as envisioned in the original FasTracks plan. Although the cost of implementation is slightly more on the front-end, I

# GOLD LINE PUBLIC COMMENTS

## FEBRUARY 1-28, 2007



<p>believe the long range benefits to the public and the overall cultural impact are greatly increased with this option. This plan would not compromise the landscape or traffic flow. It would also save thousands of man-hours daily in travel time; but most important, it would satisfy the public's need for a modern, safe, high-speed, reliable commuter rail system between Arvada and downtown Denver.</p> <p>Some argue that the streetcar alternative would be "more convenient" because it would run through neighborhoods. My answer to that is: "Should we ever choose convenience over safety? Should we almost double the commute time for those who plan to use FasTracks for their daily commute to work? Do we really want tracks running down our public streets and through our beautiful residential neighborhoods? And should we even consider creating more congestion in Olde Town? ... I THINK NOT!"</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to present these facts and perspectives.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Carol XXXXX</p>		
<p>I would like information on how to get this re-routed from and off of 38th Avenue to farther north i.e., per the voter's votes.</p>	<p>Feb 08 2007</p>	<p>website</p>
<p>I was at the meeting in Arvada on Wednesday and I thought the comment by Arvada mayor Ken Feldman were right on point. The focus of RTD's energy should be on getting legislation passed so they can start negotiations with the BNSF. The mayor said the city could help in the process with their political clout with the state representatives and he felt isolated from the process. RTD should utilize all their allies to get the legislation started.</p> <p>If a bill doesn't get passed this session, will RTD try again in the next session? I want to thank RTD for the effort and approach to the open process they have employed.</p>	<p>Feb 08 2007</p>	<p>website</p>

# GOLD LINE PUBLIC COMMENTS

## FEBRUARY 1-28, 2007



<p>Light Rail via 38th ave.   I am against the route down 38th to Harlan.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This will devalue property values.</li> <li>2. It is cruel to put people out of there homes.</li> <li>3. Closing out businesses would devalue the area too.</li> <li>4. The elderly of the area may be affected negatively, hindering their mobility on foot.</li> <li>5. People who live on and use 38th get down town Denver, may or may not use the line, when they can get to work by car faster.</li> <li>6. This is a historical are, and the small town atmosphere is important to preserve.</li> </ol> <p>Will the subject be put to all over public vote? If so, when?          I live on 35th avenue, between Harlan and Pierce.          Please reply to Jane XXXX, at XXXXXXXX.com&lt;mailto:XXXXXXXXX.com&gt;</p>	<p>Feb 08 2007</p>	<p>email</p>
<p>In comparing the two alternatives of #3 (EMU-BN/UP) versus #7BB (Streetcar-Harlan/Ralston), there are numerous, clear distinctions.</p> <p>(Operations/Technology) First, the travel time difference is glaringly obvious: 41 versus 25 minutes. While streetcars may attract users for neighborhood trips, the average commuter from the suburbs will not benefit much from the slower technology. In fact, many commuters will opt to continue to use the bus if they already ride transit. The streetcar alternative will do little to attract new transit riders from the commuter bases in the suburban neighborhoods.</p> <p>(Safety) Secondly, there is an obvious loss of safety with streetcars sharing the same portion of the right of way with vehicular traffic. Also, with 125 street crossings for the streetcar versus 16 for the commuter rail line, the quantity of conflicts will be greatly increased. (Operations/Technology) It is very clear why much slower operation and delay will occur with the street car technology.</p> <p>(Alignment/Technology) Although the alignment of the commuter RR may not provide a high level of neighborhood access, it is clear from your study that the benefits of highly efficient commute time will attract a significantly higher level of ridership, and hence customer satisfaction. Personally, I have been a strong supporter of public transit for over a decade, and would be very frustrated if our FASTTRACKS tax paid for streetcar technology between the suburbs and downtown. Streetcars are useful for short trips only, and hence should be restricted to corridors with a high percentage of commercial land use, such as Colfax Avenue. Fitting streetcar technology to a suburb to city line such as the Gold Line corridor would be a poor selection.</p> <p>(Cost/Funding) And finally, and possibly most importantly, it appears that RTD would be able to present a much more effective case to the FTA for winning matching funds for Alternative # 3. With much higher ridership projections and much more efficient travel times, it is readily clear why commuter rail is far superior to the streetcar for the Gold Line. (6,200 vs. 4,100 hours/day saved; and operating cost per user of \$2.24 vs. \$4.61 for the streetcar). The overall projected cost difference between the two alternatives is rather small, and may be considered as statistically insignificant.</p> <p>I sincerely hope that Alternative 3 is selected for the the Gold Line corridor.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my comment.</p>	<p>Feb 08 2007</p>	<p>website</p>

# GOLD LINE PUBLIC COMMENTS

## FEBRUARY 1-28, 2007



<p>BN/UP makes good sense. I will pray it gets approved. We have a good bus line down Ralston Road to downtown Denver.</p>	<p>Feb 09 2007</p>	<p>comment card</p>
<p>Gold Line meeting in Arvada 2/7/2007   My name is Ellis XXXX. I spent many hours helping pass out brochures and convincing people of Arvada why they should pass a tax increase for the Fastracks Gold Line. I think the mayor of Arvada summed up the sentiment of Arvadans quite well. We sold the people on the tax increase for a system equivalent to the RTD light rail lines from Denver south. I would hate to see RTD waste money on environmental studies and any other study for a streetcar line. That just isn't going to cut it for Arvadans because the express bus service is perhaps better than any option short of a transportation system utilizing the rail corridor. Regards, Ex</p>	<p>Feb 09 2007</p>	<p>email</p>
<p>Please do not spend more money researching the 'street car' plan. The street car is a joke drummed up to keep people in their jobs.</p> <p>The railroad and lightrail (if more funding is available) are my preferred alternatives. If we are left with the street car I prefer nothing.</p> <p>Jeanette XXXX</p>	<p>Feb 09 2007</p>	<p>email</p>
<p>Dear Gold line folks</p> <p>I was discussing the gold line with neighbors the other day, talking about the negotiations with the train companies. they wondered to whom we send letters in the legislature? I think it is State...K Jerry Frangis...correct or no?</p> <p>I must say that I think you all are doing a wonderful job of this process and I don't know how you have the patience to do this with John Q Public. Last weeks meeting on Federal , I found very frustrating with so many people just joining in the debate and taking so little responsibility to know any facts. Ah, well, if it is pertinent I vote to proceed with the original plan along the train tracks and the street cars. The two other plans seem way over budget, don't move very many people and are too invasive into our neighborhood.</p> <p>thanks much for all your good work, Annie XXXXX, XXXXXX</p>	<p>Feb 11 2007</p>	<p>email</p>

# GOLD LINE PUBLIC COMMENTS

## FEBRUARY 1-28, 2007



<p>The public meeting held in Arvada on Feb. 7th was informative. I agree with the EIS team's recommendation to move forward with studying the EMU alternative along the existing rail corridors. While I understand the need to include another alternative besides EMUs and "No Action," I reluctantly agree the streetcar alternative has to be carried forward. The two light rail alternatives of the four still under consideration are too expensive and have too many social / environmental impacts - too many homes / businesses must be "taken."</p> <p>I encourage RTD and the EIS team to work with government officials along the West Corridor alignment - from Adams and Jefferson counties, to Denver, Arvada and Wheat Ridge, in the negotiations with the railroads. I understand RTD is working to secure a right-of-way through the rail yards in order to locate a corridor for the Northwest and Gold lines, but I believe additional influence is available by bringing the local officials - both elected and appointed - into the negotiations.</p> <p>I believe RTD representatives when they say they envision rail service for the Gold Line along the original FasTracks alignment. I encourage RTD and the EIS team to put all the resources it can into securing a negotiated right-of-way with the railroads by July 1, 2007. If that means legislation by the Colorado Legislature to reduce or eliminate liability for the railroads, that must be secured THIS YEAR and not be delayed until the next legislative session in January 2008.</p> <p>If the streetcar technology / alignment becomes the preferred alternative within the Gold Line EIS, I will not support that result. I believe it is not a reasonable guided transit / rail alternative for Arvada and the northwest Denver metro area.</p>	Feb 12 2007	website
<p>If RTD is unable to negotiate a right-of-way / access through the rail yards for the Gold and Northwest lines, why not investigate using a North Line corridor - such as the UPRR-Boulder alignment and connecting back west with what appears to be a rail spur at about 60th Ave. or so that heads basically east and west.</p> <p>While this alternative alignment would take the Gold Line several miles to the east, if it alleviates the problem of getting through the rail yard, please explain whether this option can be pursued.</p> <p>If all three lines - Gold, North and Northwest - can share costs on the North alignment, getting the NW and Gold lines back west to where they need to be along that E-W rail spur may be economically and environmentally feasible. I understand RTD still would need to negotiate either with UP or BNSF railroads, and likely both, but this option seems viable since all the rail corridors that would be needed for such an alternative already exist. I understand the Gold Line would lose at least one transit stop in NW Denver, e.g., 38th Ave.</p>	Feb 12 2007	website

# GOLD LINE PUBLIC COMMENTS

## FEBRUARY 1-28, 2007



<p>Comment about Alternative 3 - EMU-BN/UP</p> <p>My wife has been going to the planning sessions, and she says this alternative depends on getting an agreement with the railroad to use the rail corridor.</p> <p>If this is the best option, it looks like it is to me given the number on commute time and ridership, why wouldn't RTD (or the City) use eminent domain to acquire the land? (The land could be acquired and then shared with the railroad.)</p> <p>See like if eminent domain could be used as rationale to take homes and businesses it can also be used to acquire the rail corridor.</p> <p>Seems like if this rationale</p>	<p>Feb 12 2007</p>	<p>website</p>
<p>I am a participant on the IFT for the area west of Federal. thank you for all the information you have shared with our neighborhood through this process and for the opportunity to give our feedback.</p> <p>I strongly support the rail alignment alternative over the streetcar alignment. Streetcar offers no benefits, especially as pertains to neighborhoods west of Sheridan, over the current bus system, but would have the downside of construction, loss of turn lanes/right of way, overhead wires, etc.</p> <p>Rail alignment would not directly serve north Denver, but would positively impact traffic by taking cars headed into downtown through our neighborhood off the street. We would not bear the burden in our neighborhood of construction, loss of right of way/turn lanes, etc. just to provide a commuting alternative to those who choose to live further away from downtown. it is the alignment approved by the voters in FasTracks, is faster, cheaper, and uses existing infrastructure.</p> <p>I've heard some argue that the addition of streetcars to our neighborhood will improve property values, stating that studies have shown as much. I suspect those studies compare property values of areas that have no current mass transit to the same areas after they gain mass transit. We already have adequate mass transit options in north Denver, so i would expect my property values to stay the same (at best) with the streetcar alternative.</p> <p>To gain access to the railroad right of way, I wonder why there has been no mention made of employing eminent domain? If we can seize private businesses and homes to make way for streetcars, why can't we force access to the railways for this clearly better alternative?</p> <p>What more can I do to show my support of the railway alternative?</p> <p>Thanks again for the opportunity to comment!</p>	<p>Feb 14 2007</p>	<p>website</p>

# GOLD LINE PUBLIC COMMENTS

## FEBRUARY 1-28, 2007



<p>I'm concerned with a quality product and the legislative timetable. I would rather have RTD spend the time to deliver alternative 3 even if it takes a couple of years to obtain an agreement with BNSF to share their ROW than to put in streetcars. It may take some time to craft a bill. Get it passed. Get multi state insurance, but it will be worth it!! Keep up the good work. Mike XXXXX</p>	<p>Feb 14 2007</p>	<p>website</p>
<p>I attended the focus group a few weeks ago for the area between Federal and Sheridan. Unfortunately, I was unable to attend the recent public meetings due to work constraints. I have, however, read through the presentation posted on the website. I am curious to hear what was discussed, but my comments and questions are with respect to the characterization of public support that was given.</p> <p>Although I know that EIS is often an exercise in overgeneralization, I was fairly disturbed by the characterization of the public support for the different alternatives. While you have quantified cost, ridership, required ROW acquisition, etc., you simply list public support as "strongest" or "mixed".</p> <p>These are nonsense terms. What do they mean? What basis does the Gold Line Team have for attaching these connotative terms to an assessment of the public will in this case? Do you have any survey data to back up these statements? If so, why is it not presented?</p> <p>I personally believe that RTD has done a very poor job of informing the public in my area that a light rail line up 38th is even being considered and many of my neighbors are unaware of this until I discuss it with them. Consequently, any attempt to gauge public support of as yet ill-defined rail lines is disingenuous at best. Anecdotal evidence is proof of nothing, and these kinds of data should be excluded from your presentations unless you can quantify support in some meaningful way.</p>	<p>Feb 15 2007</p>	<p>website</p>
<p>The link below is for Resolution SJR07-013. The state legislators have decided to ask the federal govt. handle the indemnification issue. I don't think there was support to allow RTD to negotiate with BNSF on it's own. I want to congratulate RTD on their effort on the goldline portion of Fastracks system. The process was open and first class.</p> <p><a href="http://www.leg.state.co.us/clics/clics2007a/csl.nsf/fsbillcont3/B852827801DE29E9872572740063BA86?open&amp;file=SJR013_eng.pdf">http://www.leg.state.co.us/clics/clics2007a/csl.nsf/fsbillcont3/B852827801DE29E9872572740063BA86?open&amp;file=SJR013_eng.pdf</a></p>	<p>Feb 18 2007</p>	<p>website</p>

# GOLD LINE PUBLIC COMMENTS

## FEBRUARY 1-28, 2007



<p>With Alternative 3 - the electric commuter rail, it appears to follow the rail-right-of-way from Ward westward. Is there consideration for the potential to use this to further expand the line to connect downtown Golden with Arvada/metro-Denver? Of the options, alternative 3 seems to have that potential, and I would think that would make the alternative even more favorable - connecting up to Molson-Coors and to all the new downtown developments in Golden. And, can you take bicycles on electric commuter rails?</p>	<p>Feb 19 2007</p>	<p>website</p>
<p>What are the next steps for the indemnification of the rail lines? When will this go in front of the state legislature?</p>	<p>Feb 26 2007</p>	<p>website</p>
<p>I have looked at the remaining proposals and maps and they all possibly involve my house/property. How will this affect me? Will my property be in the way and possibly be apart of the demolition? The reason I am asking is because we would like to sell/rent our property and would need to know an estimate of when our property might be involved with this eagerly awaited project. As much information would be appreciated.</p>	<p>Feb 28 2007</p>	<p>website</p>
<p>If the EMU is not possible, more efficient busing system maybe, but not streetcars without trains.</p>	<p>Feb 28 2007</p>	<p>comment card</p>
<p>I'm all for the project -- the sooner the better!</p>	<p>Feb 28 2007</p>	<p>comment card</p>
<p>I would have like to see more information about ecological environmental impact. The poster with CO2 and NOx emissions was unclear. * Prefer the tracks!</p>	<p>Feb 28 2007</p>	<p>comment card</p>
<p>Stay with the railroad corridor. Please forget light rail and street car.</p>	<p>Feb 28 2007</p>	<p>comment card</p>
<p>Proposed Alternatives   I am strongly in favor alternative 7DD as the best choice. The second option for stations is also my favorite. It would provide the best service for Northwest Denver and the cities of Wheatridge and Arvada with the least impact. The fixed rail proposal does not seem as viable to me. It would effectively eliminate Northwest Denver and the city of Wheatridge.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Peter XXXXX          XXXXX Vrain St.          Denver, CO. XXXXX          -----</p>	<p>Feb 28 2007</p>	<p>email</p>

# GOLD LINE PUBLIC COMMENTS

## FEBRUARY 1-28, 2007



<p>Proposed Alternatives   I am strongly in favor of alternative 7BB for the Gold Line. The second option for stations is also my favorite. It seems both would provide the best service for the people of Northwest Denver and the cities of Wheatridge and Arvada. Your assessment of ridership seems ridiculously low in my opinion. Traveling city streets with more stations would definitely be more desirable than having to go longer distances to fewer stations. Many more people would be able to walk to a station instead of driving or taking a bus. The fixed rail proposal effectively eliminates service for Northwest Denver and the city of Wheatridge.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Peter XXXXX  XXXXXXXX Vrain St.  Denver, CO. XXXXX</p> <p>-----</p>	<p>Feb 28 2007</p>	<p>email</p>
---	--------------------	--------------