

Draft Meeting Summary

Agency Milestone Workshop

Conceptual Alternatives Screening

Tuesday, October 10, 2006

8:30 - 11:00 a.m.

FasTracks Regional Conference Room, Suite 700 (7th Floor)

Denver Post Building, 1560 Broadway, Denver

Meeting Goals and Agenda

This was the second Agency Milestone Workshop— a combined meeting of the Agency Working Group (AWG) and Local Governments Team (LGT) — for the Gold Line Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The meeting goals were to:

- Review the Agency Scoping Comments
- Provide an overview of input from the October 4 and 5 Public Meetings
- Present and discuss the Conceptual Alternatives Screening Milestones: Level 1 Screening and Results; Level 2 Screening and Results, including recommendation of proposed Alternatives for Level 3 Detailed Evaluation
- Prepare the Agency Working Group and Local Governments Team for the agency comment period

The meeting agenda included introductions; an update on the Agency Scoping Comments; an overview of the input gathered at the October Public meetings; presentation and discussion of the Level 1 and Level 2 Conceptual Alternatives Screening and Results; and an overview of the second agency comment period. Action items, next steps, and a list of participants are included at the end of this summary.

Preliminary Items

Louise Smart, RTD FasTracks Gold Line Project Team (Project Team), led introductions and reviewed the meeting agenda. She emphasized that the Project Team would like feedback on the Level 1 and Level 2 Conceptual Alternatives Screening Results. Today begins the second agency comment period for the EIS.

The other preliminary item was to finalize the meeting summary from the August 24, 2006, Agency Milestone (Scoping) workshop. The Project Team distributed a draft of the meeting summary to the AWG and LGT. Louise Smart noted that she

received one clarification to the summary and distributed written copies of it. The meeting summary will now say (page 9, first bullet point):

The BNSF Railway may have similar issues as those of UP. (Andy Amparan, BNSF Railway Company)

[Note: Andy Amparan also agreed to follow up to Tim Baldwin's request for clarification in writing.]

There were no additional comments or clarifications to the draft summary from meeting participants. Louise Smart confirmed that the summary is now final.

Update on Agency Scoping Comments

After the preliminary items, Liz Telford, RTD FasTracks Gold Line Project Manager, provided an update on the status of the Scoping comments received from the Cooperating and Participating agencies. The Project Team has compiled the comments. RTD and FTA are completing their responses to them.

Liz Telford noted that the Gold Line Purpose statement will change, as FTA directed RTD to remove the FasTracks language from it. The screening criteria will remain the same because the comments indicated support for them. RTD is still working to integrate the comments into the Need statement. The Project Team will distribute the comments and responses, including the revised Purpose and Need, to the AWG and LGT after they have been finalized.

Overview of Input from October Public Meetings

The second Public Meetings for the Gold Line EIS were held on October 4 and 5 in Arvada and northwest Denver, respectively. Andy Mountain, Project Team Public Involvement Manager, provided a preliminary overview of the comments gathered by the Public Involvement Team at those meetings and during the days immediately before and after them.

During Andy Mountain's report, he emphasized that the numbers he presented are preliminary and reflective of only those people who commented during this specific time period (September 30 - October 8, 2006). He also reminded the group that the numbers are not from a scientifically valid random sample and should be considered reflective only of what the Project Team heard from those members of the public that decided to submit comments during this time. The Project Team is still collecting public input about the Level 1 and Level 2 Conceptual Alternatives Screening.

Andy Mountain noted that a common question from the public has been, “Where did the alternative alignments through northwest Denver come from?” He reported that 40% of the public comments about alignments submitted during Scoping (before September 30) suggested an interest in identifying alternative alignments that would provide service to more densely populated areas. Some of these comments were made verbally during the August Public Scoping Meetings, although many were made in writing at the meetings and afterward through the project website and via email.

Between September 30 and October 8, the public submitted more than 280 comments. More than 30% of these comments related to the alignments under consideration. Three issues emerged that were the subject of nearly 2/3 of the comments collected:

- **Gold Line Alignment**— More than 30% of the comments received were about alignments. Of the comments received about alignments, roughly 80% indicated either opposition to an alternative (non-BNSF/UP) alignment or a preference for the BNSF/UP alignment. The remaining 20% of the alignment comments indicated support for an alternative (non-BNSF/UP) alignment. Most of this support comes from residents of northwest Denver who would like to further explore these alternatives.
- **Rail Technology**— About 17% of the comments received were about rail technology. These comments indicated a preference for Electric Multiple Unit (EMU) commuter rail technology by a 3:1 ratio to Light Rail Transit (LRT). This likely also suggests a preference for the BNSF/UP alignment. Few comments directly indicated a preference for Diesel Multiple Unit (DMU) commuter rail technology, while DMU was the subject of several negative comments. There was also some opposition expressed to LRT and streetcars operating on city streets.
- **Right-of-Way (ROW) and Property Impacts**— The third most common issue identified among comments was ROW and Property Impacts with roughly 11% of comments addressing it. Andy Mountain noted that the majority of these comments dealt with questions and concerns about potential property impacts along the non-BNSF/UP alignment alternatives.

The other issue areas that emerged were similar to those identified in Scoping— noise and vibration, aesthetic impacts, safety, and Gold Line integration with the FasTracks system (interconnectivity).

After Andy Mountain’s overview, participants asked the following questions:

- Rick Garcia, City and County of Denver: Has the preference for EMU, indicated by the 3:1 ratio of favorable comments about EMU to LRT, emerged in recent weeks? Response: Yes, this has been the case.
- Lorraine Anderson, City of Arvada: Do people prefer EMU because it is not feasible to operate LRT within the railroad ROW? Response: Many comments that elaborate on why they prefer EMU suggest that EMU is a logical replacement for LRT along the railroad alignment.

At the end of the discussion, Andy Mountain again noted the need to view this information as preliminary. The Public Involvement Team will continue to gather public comments on the Conceptual Alternatives through neighborhood meetings, listening sessions, and the project website.

Level 1 and Level 2 Conceptual Alternatives Screening and Results

Don Ulrich, Consultant Gold Line Project Manager, explained the purpose of this discussion, which is to present information about the Conceptual Alternatives Screening project milestones and solicit preliminary comments from Cooperating and Participating Agency representatives on them. The agency coordination milestones include:

- Level 1 Screening and Results
- Level 2 Screening and Results

This discussion will serve as the beginning of the formal agency comment period, which is outlined in the “Agency Comment Period” section at the end of this summary.

[Note: The “Gold Line Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Public Workshop #2 (October 5, 2006)” PowerPoint presentation is available on the project website at www.rtdgoldline.com.]

After Don Ulrich reviewed the Project Introduction and Agenda (p. 1-10 of the PowerPoint presentation, Tim Baldwin, Project Team Planning Manager, presented the Results of Level 1 Screening. He reviewed the goal of Level 1 (Fatal Flaw) Screening, the screening criteria, and the pre-screening assumptions. He also reviewed the remaining technology options: LRT, DMU, EMU, and streetcar (p. 11-18 of the PowerPoint presentation).

Transit Technology Options

At this point in the presentation, agency representatives discussed the remaining technology options. Their comments and questions included:

- Rick Garcia: Are the towers required for the EMU overhead wires similar to those for LRT? Response: The overhead wires themselves are a little taller and wider. There is 100 foot distance between the towers.
- Lorraine Anderson: One issue is the aesthetics of EMU within the community. Would EMU be as inviting to ride and as friendly to Transit-Oriented-Development (TOD) as LRT? Response: Liz Telford explained that this is both an impacts and a procurement issue. The EIS will conduct a visual impacts analysis of EMU (it is a little wider than LRT), including what the vehicles look like when they are parked at stations. The appearance and features of the EMU train will depend on the choices RTD makes when it procures the vehicles.
- Jody Ostendorf, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency: Will BNSF/UP allow EMU in the railroad ROW? Response: The EIS is moving forward with the assumption that BNSF and UP will allow EMU to operate in the railroad ROW. The study will include two new tracks for commuter rail operations in the railroad ROW in order to ensure FRA compliance. It is confirmed that UP will not permit LRT (non FRA compliant) operations in their ROW (see p. 11 of the PowerPoint presentation for the UP response letter).
- Rick Garcia: What is a typical scenario for RTD's relationship to the railroad ROW? Does RTD attempt to acquire or lease it? It is important to note that there is expense involved in acquiring ROW. Response: Liz Telford responded that RTD is looking at this issue from a FasTracks system level perspective and is currently involved in discussions with the railroads. There is no typical RTD scenario for leasing or acquiring railroad ROW.
- Bill Brunskill, Union Pacific Railroad: It is important to recognize and address the public's perception of DMU technology. It appears that the public inappropriately associates DMU technology with old locomotives.
- Steve Nguyen, City of Wheat Ridge: It would be useful to have more information to be able to compare LRT to EMU. Response: In a corridor of this length, the travel time differences between LRT and EMU are small (within a 5 minute range). The noise and visual impacts for LRT and EMU are also similar. EMU is wider than LRT and thus has more capacity per car. Cost is another issue. The nationwide trend is moving away from LRT because of its expense.

[Note: Unless otherwise specified, Tim Baldwin provided the answers to the above questions.]

To conclude this discussion, Don Ulrich suggested that the Project Team provide additional information that compares the different rail technologies. Workshop

participants indicated that this would be useful, particularly to compare noise, vibration, and emissions.

Level 1 Conceptual Alternatives Screening

Returning to the presentation, Tim Baldwin reviewed the Level 1 build Alternatives and screening results, focusing on those Alternatives that did not pass Level 1 screening (p. 19-29 of the PowerPoint presentation). He concluded his presentation by summarizing the eight Alternatives that passed Level 1 screening (p. 30 of the PowerPoint presentation):

- 3 EMU - BN/UP
- 4 DMU - BN/UP
- 6B LRT - Lowell/52nd
- 6BB LRT - Lowell/Ralston
- 6D LRT - Sheridan/Ralston
- 6F LRT - Lowell/BN
- 7A - EMU/Streetcar
- 7B Streetcar - Lowell/Ralston

The above Alternatives will be carried forward to Level 2 screening.

Liz Telford elaborated on the rationale for using 38th Avenue for those Alternatives that do not follow the railroad alignment. The Project Team identified four options for getting the Gold Line from Denver Union Station (DUS) to the west side of I-25: 1) adding a structure over I-25 at 15th Avenue; 2) tunneling under the river and I-25; 3) using the 20th Avenue High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) structure; and 4) using Wewatta as it turns into Park Avenue and travels under I-25 to 38th Avenue. Of these four options, the fourth one (Wewatta) would result in fewer impacts than the others.

In response to the Level 1 screening results, agency representatives asked questions and commented as follows:

- Rick Garcia: I am concerned about the northwest Denver community. Will there be property acquisitions with all of the alignments that travel through northwest Denver? Tim Baldwin confirmed that all of the Alternatives will have property acquisitions to some extent, although the goal is to have as few impacts as possible.
- Jody Ostendorf: What is the travel time for streetcars? Tim Baldwin clarified that the travel time for streetcars is approximately six minutes more, at a maximum, than the other technologies. Liz Telford added that additional travel time

modeling needs to be performed to include such factors as peak periods, congestion levels, and acceleration/deceleration.

- Jeanne Shreve, Adams County: During the Major Investment Study (MIS) was LRT in the ROW to DUS an issue or is this new? Liz Telford responded that RTD learned that the UP railroad requires FRA-compliant vehicles in the ROW during the EIS.

Level 2 Conceptual Alternatives Screening

Don Ulrich began his presentation by explaining that the Project Team assessed property impacts for Level 2 Alternatives by using parcel data. He noted that the goal of this level of evaluation was to be able to compare the Alternatives to one another and that indeed some of the Alternatives take more parcels than others.

Don Ulrich reviewed the Level 2 Alternatives and screening results, including providing a high-level comparison between the Alternatives on the UP/BN alignment, alternative (northwest Denver) alignments, and streetcars (p. 31-49 of the PowerPoint presentation). He concluded his presentation by identifying the seven Alternatives that passed Level 2 screening— 3, 4, 6B, 6BB, 6F, 7A, 7B— and the one Alternative that did not— 6D (p. 50 of the PowerPoint presentation). He noted that the two streetcar Alternatives are avoidance alternatives for NEPA purposes.

In response to the Level 2 screening results, agency representatives asked questions and commented as follows, focusing on the following two issues:

- Impacts of NW Denver Alternatives: Agency representatives asked for information and expressed concern about the neighborhood impacts of the Alternative 6 series of LRT alignments and Alternative 7 series of streetcar alignments. Property and right-of-way impacts were of primary concern. Concerns about traffic and street impacts were also significant.

Specific questions about Alternatives 6B and 6BB included:

Rick Garcia: Where are the property acquisitions for these two Alternatives? Don Ulrich clarified that there are no anticipated property acquisitions on Lowell, but there are a few (6) parcels identified for possible acquisition at station locations. After Don Ulrich pointed out the property impacts along the alignments, Chris Proud emphasized the importance of distinguishing between “property” and “ROW” acquisitions.

Lorraine Anderson: Can you realign these two Alternatives along I-76 and serve Pecos? Don Ulrich responded that this would be difficult, due to floodplain

issues and the existence of ponds in the area. He also noted that CDOT plans to widen the median, which would also be an issue.

Bob Manwaring, City of Arvada, also asked the Project Team to clarify the approach to Old Towne for these two Alternatives. In response, Liz Telford and Don Ulrich described the approach and explained the rationale for it.

- Travel Market: Agency representatives discussed the travel market served by the streetcar Alternatives (7A and 7B) and how this corresponds to the travel concept for the Gold Line corridor. The group discussed whether the Gold Line is envisioned as primarily a commuter corridor or whether it is also intended to provide local service and/or enable NW Denver access to the FasTracks system. Liz Telford noted that 1/3 of the travelers in the Gold Line study area stay within it for work trips. The travel market also includes commuters going downtown or to the north. These findings suggest that the Gold Line may meet many different kinds of travel needs.

At the end of the discussion, Louise Smart asked for the group's input on how the Project Team should move forward. Her first question to the group was, "Would you be comfortable if the DMU alternative was removed from further consideration?" Participant responses included the following:

- Perhaps it would be useful to have more information before this alternative is removed. I would like to know about DMU's efficiency and its emissions. This technology (compared to EMU technology) avoids visual impacts, so it may be good to retain it. (John Schwab, CDOT)
- I would be happy if DMU is removed from consideration. In Arvada, it would travel close to homes. The stations would be affected by noise and vibration. Removal of this alternative would avoid diesel smoke. The public perception is important, too. The community would view DMU as less than it deserves, especially when compared to LRT in the FasTracks vote. (Lorraine Anderson, City of Arvada)
- From Wheat Ridge's perspective, I agree [with previous comments]. (Steve Nguyen, City of Wheat Ridge)
- I disagree [with previous comments]. There needs to be a noise analysis. It will indicate that DMU noise impacts are not so bad. DMU is good for the North Metro corridor because it provides the opportunity for service expansion. The public perception [of DMU in the Gold Line corridor] may change with education. So, DMU should remain on the table as the study continues. (Jeanne Shreve, Adams County)

- From an air quality perspective, there is a difference between diesel and electric power, even when taking power plant emissions into account. Until there are better engines, we need to stay with EMU or LRT. (Jim DiLeo, CDPHE)
- I would like to be able to compare different sources of pollution– in this case between engine and power plant emissions. We should not eliminate DMU until we have more information about pollution, noise, and vibration. This information is also important as it affects the public’s perception. (Jeanne Shreve)
- There is a distinction between local and regional air quality. I am concerned that the vehicle emissions [negatively] affect health. (Jim DiLeo)
- There needs to be a comparison of air quality impacts with more information before any conclusions are drawn. (Dave Beckhouse, FTA)
- Judy Montero’s office sent a letter to Mayor Hickenlooper, requesting that the City and County of Denver support EMU. Apparently, the Mayor’s office has sent a letter of support back to Judy Montero. (Crissy Fanganello, City and County of Denver)
- Why would we carry DMU forward if EMU is a viable option? Would it be because of the visual impacts [of EMU]? (Bob Manwaring, City of Arvada)

[Note: In response, Andy Mountain noted that the Project Team has received public input about the visual impacts of EMU. Don Ulrich and Liz Telford also noted the potential cost differences between the two technologies.]

- I would like to know how many [people here] have seen DMU. (Susan Martin, FTA)
- There is the potential for the development of clean coal technologies. These possible energy sources would need to be considered in relation to overall impact on resources, including the infrastructure needed for power generation. The Gold Line corridor has environmental justice issues and, for this reason, emissions are a concern. If the costs are comparable between the two technologies [EMU and DMU], EMU is preferred for the Gold Line. (Jody Ostendorf, US EPA Region 8)

To continue the discussion about how the project should move forward, Louise Smart next asked workshop participants for their comments on the streetcar alternatives. Their responses included:

- It would be good to ask the local communities how they view the relationship between travel time and access for the streetcar alternatives. (Jody Ostendorf)
- I like the idea of retaining this alternative for further consideration, although I visualize it as a “FasTracks II” approach. People in Arvada want more than “bus on rail,” although streetcars could be something for the future. For the Gold Line, streetcars are something that could supplement a commuter rail option. (Lorraine Anderson)
- I always thought about the Gold Line as a commuter corridor. If this concept has changed, streetcars could be the answer, particularly if they provide more stops than LRT. A streetcar option could provide increased access and opportunities for economic revitalization. It could also address the changing demographic in northwest Denver, although there may be resistance from those less welcoming of change. It would be valuable to have more information about streetcars. It also makes sense to consider this option for the “next round” of FasTracks. One concern is that travelers going from the west to downtown Denver won’t use streetcars. (Rick Garcia)
- My comments echo those of Councilman Garcia. I would also add that City and County of Denver staff have concerns about the traffic impacts to city streets of both the streetcar and LRT alternatives. (Crissy Fanganello)
- I agree with Lorraine’s comments. In addition, the streetcar routes feel more circuitous. I want to be able to ride the system to Denver International Airport. It feels like this would be a hassle on streetcar. I do not want to see transfers caused by changes in mode. EMU commuter rail is better for commuters. The main question seems to be how important is it to provide access to northwest Denver through the LRT or streetcar alternatives. I recognize the concerns that have been raised about how LRT and streetcars mix with traffic. (Larry Schultz, City of Wheat Ridge)
- Adams County would like to see a regional transfer station at Pecos. It would be great to have both streetcars and commuter rail. I would like to keep streetcars on the “FasTracks II” list, although I envision the Gold Line as a commuter line. (Jeanne Shreve)
- Because, according to the FHWA/FTA “Linking Planning and NEPA Guidance,” you can use the information collected in this study in the future, we should continue looking at a streetcar alternative. (Karen Good, City and County of Denver)

- [Development of] the study's Purpose and Need is iterative. It may be necessary to reexamine it, given the issue of northwest Denver access. Access to northwest Denver could also be used as a screening criterion. (Dave Beckhouse)

At the end of the discussion, Don Ulrich and Liz Telford noted that it would be useful to retain a streetcar alternative as a relatively cost-effective approach, particularly given rising construction costs. It would be a good option to have in order to manage the FasTracks Gold Line corridor budget and qualify for federal funding. It would also be useful to have additional information about travel times.

For the final component of the discussion, Louise Smart asked workshop participants, "What do you want the Project Team to think about as it packages the northwest Denver street alignments for Level 3 detailed evaluation? What matters to you?" Their responses included:

- Access to the northwest Denver stations and [maximizing] use of the system (Crissy Fanganello)
- Impacts to the character of the northwest Denver neighborhoods, including loss of landscape, and providing benefits to impacted areas (Karen Good)
- Regional connectivity, consistency with MetroVision plan (David Heller)
- Wetlands, streams, and other environmental impacts (Rena Brand, USACE)
- Minimizing travel time so that commuters get out of their cars, a system that is easy to use and provides incentives to do so (Steve Nguyen)
- An environmental document that is legally sufficient and defensible, evaluation of all alternatives with equal attention (Susan Martin)
- Serving the Arvada stations, minimizing property impacts, meeting the expectations of FasTracks voters (Bob Manwaring)
- Quick commuting time, access, and connectivity; impacts; and expectations of FasTracks (Lorraine Anderson)
- Meeting local planning goals, providing a regional system (Kevin Nichols, City of Arvada)
- The same issues identified by Crissy Fanganello and Karen Good; having travel time estimates to ensure that the alternatives are competitive; keeping faith with the FasTracks voters by staying as close to the original alignment and technology as possible; benefits to users of the northwest Denver alternatives, including consideration of a phased approach for them (Rick Garcia)
- Environmental impacts, including those to water resources; that a reasonable range of alternatives have been considered (Jody Ostendorf)
- Access, regional mobility, streetcar connectivity to the FasTracks system, whether the streetcar alternatives address regional needs (John Schwab)
- Economic impacts, including the need to look at which alternatives can bring the greatest economic benefits to the community (Rob Balmes, Jefferson County)

- Environmental impacts (Jim DiLeo)
- Access, perception of the user that this is “a good way to get where we are going,” cost-effectiveness to ensure federal funding, providing local service to northwest Denver as part of a regional system (Larry Schultz)

In sum, the following outcomes resulted from the discussion:

- There was general support from agency representatives, although not consensus agreement, for eliminating the Diesel Multiple Unit (DMU) technology Alternative from further study. The agency representatives who asked for a DMU Alternative to be carried forward into Level 3 evaluation wanted more information, including information about impacts, about this technology option for the Gold Line. Those who supported the idea of moving forward with electrified rail only (EMU/LRT) suggested that the electric technology option is closer to the FasTracks vision for the Gold Line that the public supported. They also expressed concern about the air quality impacts of DMU.
- Agency representatives supported carrying forward a streetcar alternative into Level 3 evaluation. The group indicated that more information on this alternative would be helpful. For example, it will be helpful to see if the streetcar alternative improves access for NW Denver residents to the FasTracks system and brings other benefits to the community, such as economic revitalization. The group also indicated an interest in streetcar service as a future supplement to the Gold Line— using the term “FasTracks II” to describe this possible approach.
- As the Project Team considers which alternative alignments (6 and 7 series) to carry forward into Level 3 evaluation, agency representatives asked the Project Team to consider the following: access; service to stations; ridership; travel times; impacts to neighborhood character and landscape; property impacts; providing benefits to impacted areas; FasTracks system connectivity; environmental (wetlands, streams) impacts; public expectations of FasTracks; compatibility with local plans; economic impacts; and cost-effectiveness.

To conclude the discussion, Don Ulrich noted that the next step for the Project Team will be to package and present the Alternatives to be carried forward into Level 3 Detailed Evaluation.

Agency Comment Period and Next Steps

In addition to the comments provided during the workshop, Cooperating and Participating Agencies also have the opportunity to provide comments in writing within 15 calendar days. Liz Telford and Louise Smart reviewed the key procedural aspects of the second agency comment period:

- Comments are due by Wednesday, October 25, 2006. Louise Smart and Julie McKay will send a reminder to the AWG and LGT as this deadline approaches.
- Agencies are requested to provide additional comments on the Conceptual Alternatives Screening recommendations, although they may also comment on other issues.
- Agencies should submit their comments (on their own letterhead or on the comment form, which was distributed at the meeting) to Louise Smart (shortsmart@aol.com); or Mail to: Louise Smart, CDR Associates, 100 Arapahoe, Suite 12, Boulder CO 80302; or Fax to: Louise Smart 303-442-7442. [Note: After the workshop, Louise Smart and Julie McKay distributed an Excel spreadsheet version of the comment form to the AWG and LGT, respectively. It would be helpful, though not required, if agencies could provide their comments on this form.]
- Agency representatives are requested to provide one set of written comments for their agency. Comments from different agency officials and staff should be consolidated.
- Louise Smart will compile and organize the agency comments. She will then forward them to RTD, the Project Team, and FTA for review.
- The next Milestone Workshop (the third combined meeting of the AWG and LGT) will be held in January 2007. Julie McKay and Louise Smart will confirm the date, time, and location with both groups. This workshop will focus on the detailed evaluation of the Alternatives.
- The fourth Milestone workshop will be held in late February/early March 2007.
- Additional LGT meetings may be scheduled as study information becomes available. [Note: After the workshop, the next LGT meeting was scheduled for October 30, 2006.]

Action Items

In addition to the "Next Steps" identified in the previous section, following is a summary of the Action Items identified during the workshop:

- The Project Team (Louise Smart and Julie McKay) will distribute the agency Scoping comments and RTD/FTA responses, including the revised Purpose and

Need, to the AWG and LGT after they have been finalized. (Note: They were distributed by email to both groups on October 27, 2006.)

- The Project Team will provide additional information to the AWG and LGT that compares the different rail technologies, including comparative information on noise, vibration, and emissions as part of the Detailed Evaluation process.

Meeting Participants

- | | |
|-------------------------|--|
| 1. Lorraine Anderson | City of Arvada |
| 2. Tim Baldwin | RTD FasTracks Gold Line Team |
| 3. Rob Balmes | Jefferson County |
| 4. Mark Baudermann | RTD FasTracks Gold Line Team |
| 5. Angela Brand | RTD FasTracks Gold Line Team |
| 6. Dave Beckhouse | Federal Transit Administration |
| 7. Bob Boot | RTD FasTracks Gold Line Team |
| 8. Rena Brand | U.S. Army Corps of Engineers |
| 9. Bill Brunskill | Union Pacific Rail Road |
| 10. Jim DiLeo | CO Department of Public Health and Environment |
| 11. Crissy Fanganello | City and County of Denver |
| 12. Rick Garcia | City and County of Denver |
| 13. Karen Good | City and County of Denver |
| 14. David Heller | Denver Regional Council of Governments |
| 15. Genevieve Hutchison | RTD FasTracks Gold Line Team |
| 16. Jeff Lieb | The Denver Post |
| 17. Bob Manwaring | City of Arvada |
| 18. Susan Martin | Federal Transit Administration |
| 19. Julie McKay | RTD FasTracks Gold Line Team |
| 20. Andy Mountain | RTD FasTracks Gold Line Team |
| 21. Steve Nguyen | City of Wheat Ridge |
| 22. Kevin Nichols | City of Arvada |
| 23. Jody Ostendorf | U.S. Environmental Protection Agency |
| 24. Chris Proud | RTD FasTracks Gold Line Team |
| 25. Mike Ramsey | Federal Railroad Administration |
| 26. John Schwab | Colorado Department of Transportation |
| 27. Jeanne Shreve | Adams County |
| 28. Larry Schultz | City of Wheat Ridge |
| 29. Julie Skeen | RTD FasTracks Gold Line Team |
| 30. Louise Smart | RTD FasTracks Gold Line Team |
| 31. Liz Telford | RTD FasTracks Gold Line Team |
| 32. Don Ulrich | RTD FasTracks Gold Line Team |
| 33. Ashland Vaughn | RTD FasTracks Gold Line Team |