



Draft Meeting Summary

Gold Line Local Governments Team

Tuesday, April 3, 2007

10:00 a.m.-12:00 p.m.

Adams County Economic Development building
12050 Pecos Avenue, Westminster, Colorado
Suite 200 (second floor)

Meeting Goals and Agenda

The meeting goals were to:

- Update the LGT on project activities, schedule, and recent developments
- Discuss the proposed LGT meeting schedule
- Review the approach and schedule for the April Issue Focused Teams
- Review Station Platform and Parking project criteria and preliminary recommendations for proposed locations

The meeting agenda included opening items; a project and schedule update; and preparation for the upcoming Issue Focused Teams (IFT), which will focus on station platforms and parking for Alternative 3 (EMU) and Alternative 7BB (Streetcar). The first portion of the meeting included a review of the presentation for the IFT orientation meeting on April 5, 2007. The second portion of the meeting included an LGT review of the proposed station platform and parking locations for the two Alternatives.

Meeting Handouts

- Meeting Agenda
- EMU Station Site Selection/Planning Criteria
- Streetcar Station Site Selection/Planning Criteria

Opening Items

Liz Telford, RTD FasTracks Gold Line Project Manager, and Julie McKay, RTD FasTracks Gold Line Team (Project Team), welcomed the Gold Line Local Governments Team (LGT). After introductions, Julie McKay reviewed the meeting goals and agenda.

Project Updates and Schedule

Liz Telford updated the LGT on the status of the railroad liability bill. On March 6, 2007, Senate Majority Leader Joan Fitzgerald and House Representative Claire Levy introduced Senate Bill 07-219. The bill would allow RTD to indemnify the Burlington Northern Santa Fe and Union Pacific railroads from liability for any incidents that occur in their rights-of-way (ROW). The bill is working its way through the state legislature, with the House Judiciary committee considering it next.

Liz Telford also updated the LGT on the Gold Line Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Since the January LGT meeting and February Agency Workshop, the Project Team has been working to optimize the project Alternatives. The EIS is still on schedule, with identification of a Preferred Alternative (PA) anticipated for this summer.

LGT Meeting Schedule

Liz Telford proposed the following schedule for future LGT meetings:

- The next LGT meeting will be in May or June, at the fourth decision-making milestone (recommendation of a PA) for the project
- After a PA has been recommended, the LGT will meeting monthly as the Project Team prepares the Draft EIS (DEIS)
- Between the DEIS and the Final EIS (FEIS) preparation, the LGT will meet on an as-needed or quarterly basis

After Liz outlined this schedule for future LGT meetings, the LGT indicated that it was comfortable with this approach.

Preparation for Issue Focused Teams: Station Platforms and Parking

This segment of the meeting focused on preparing for the upcoming IFT meetings and reviewing the station platform and parking project criteria and preliminary

recommendations for proposed locations. In introducing the subject, Liz Telford noted that project decision-making on station platform and parking locations is in its initial stage. Today's meeting and the IFTs will allow the local communities and public to review the Project Team's preliminary ideas and recommendations and provide input about them. The Project Team will then refine the preferred site plan alternatives. These will then be reviewed with the LGT and public in order select the preferred site plan alternatives for the DEIS.

IFT Meetings and Role of LGT Representatives

Andy Mountain, Project Team Public Involvement Manager, provided an overview of the IFT meetings. They will begin this Thursday night (April 5) with a kick-off meeting. From that point, approximately two meetings will be held each week through the end of the month. Thus far, 83 people have signed up to participate in one or more of the meetings.

Andy discussed the role of LGT representatives with the group. The LGT agreed to have a representative from each jurisdiction present at the April 5 orientation meeting on their local station area planning efforts. To prepare, Andy asked each representative to send him speaking points/slides for the presentation and confirmed the planning contact for each community. He will also follow up with the LGT representatives that will be presenting at the April 5 IFT meeting to finalize preparations.

Andy also reviewed the schedule and agenda for the IFT meetings that will take place after the April 5 orientation meeting. He encouraged all LGT representatives to attend the meetings that take place in their communities.

Overview of Station Platforms and Parking

Don Ulrich, Project Team Project Manager, introduced the presentation for the April 5 IFT orientation meeting. He requested LGT feedback on it.

After Don reviewed the presentation slides about the project's background and Alternatives, Mark Leese, Project Team, reviewed the planning process, station design criteria, planning principles, EMU technical criteria and examples, and streetcar technical criteria and examples. Specifically, he noted that the design criterion for the streetcar is different than that for the EMU.

During the discussion, LGT representatives made the following comments:

- Will Kerns, Jefferson County, asked if a bike path alignment had been identified for the project.

- In response, Liz Telford clarified that a bike path alignment is not included in the Gold Line project.
- As a follow up, Will noted that Fast Routes, a Jefferson County bicycle advocacy group, is interested in an alignment adjacent to the Gold Line. Jeanne Shreve, Adams County, suggested that it would be useful for the local jurisdictions to get together to discuss bike path connections.
- Karen Good, City and County of Denver, suggested that it would be helpful to show the location of the station platforms in relation to the BNSF/UP rail ROW, particularly at 38th Avenue, Pecos, and Sheridan.
- Lorraine Anderson, City of Arvada Council, asked why there are only three streetcar stops in Arvada. She suggested that there should be a station at Arvada Plaza because population density in this area is comparable to north Denver and there is a need for access at this point. She also expressed concern that, without a streetcar station, the area would experience the residential property impacts without realizing the benefit of accessing the system.
- In response, Liz Telford explained that the analysis of the streetcar alignment concluded that 13 is the optimal number of stations for it. It is possible that the station locations can be considered further, although adding more may negatively affect ridership. For example, the analysis considered as many as 18 streetcar stations, but ridership fell too much.
- As a follow up to Lorraine's question about whether the analysis considered bus service in Arvada, Liz confirmed that the Project Team conducted several model runs on it.
- Will Kerns suggested that this issue (number of streetcar stations) could be addressed operationally. There could be optional streetcar stops whereby passengers would indicate if they want to get off. Otherwise, the streetcar would keep going.
- In response, Liz Telford noted that this is an option, although it can adversely affect operational predictability. This approach is more feasible in peak hours.
- Lorraine Anderson asked whether RTD has examined Portland's electronic messaging system that provides passenger information. Liz explained that RTD is looking at this feature for the FasTracks system, but is not examining it specifically in the Gold Line EIS.

- Lorraine Anderson suggested that the presentation include station examples other than those in Longmont.

At the end of the discussion, the LGT indicated that it was comfortable with the presentation and approach to the IFT meetings.

[Note: The presentation delivered at the IFT orientation meeting can be found on the project's website at http://www.rtd-fastracks.com/gl_12]

LGT Review of Preliminary Station Platform and Parking Locations

After the presentation and discussion, LGT members reviewed the preliminary platform and parking locations that were displayed as overlays on aerial maps of the two Alternatives. Mark Leese and Renee Martinez-Stone, Project Team, described each station area and identified the criteria the Project Team took into account when determining the proposed placement of the platforms and parking areas.

During the LGT's review of Alternative 3, LGT members made the following comments:

- City of Arvada representatives confirmed that a crossing at Lee Street exists today. (Kipling)
- City of Arvada representatives asked whether a pedestrian underpass is an option here. (Kipling)
- Bob Manwaring, City of Arvada, will send roadway access drawings for this area to Renee Martinez-Stone. (Kipling)
- The Project Team confirmed that the 200 parking spaces planned for opening day are in addition to the parking spaces that currently exist in Olde Town. (Olde Town)
- Kevin Nicholas, City of Arvada, asked if a parking structure was a possibility for Olde Town. The Project Team indicated that it is considering this option, although questions remain about financing it. (Olde Town)
- City of Arvada representatives and the Project Team discussed access to 56th Avenue as it crosses Wadsworth. (Olde Town)
- The Project Team confirmed that the number of parking spaces at the Sheridan station is 200 for opening day. (Sheridan)

- Jeanne Shreve, described Adams County's plans for the Federal and Pecos station areas. The County plans for 56 Avenue to serve as a spine from Federal to Pecos. At Pecos, the County is looking at a grade separation project with the freight railroads, landfill issues, and access to 62nd Avenue and the west side of Pecos. The County is undertaking a nine-month Transit-Oriented-Development (TOD) study. (Federal and Pecos)
- Rick Garcia, City and County of Denver Council, expressed concern about the location of the 38th Avenue station. He expected it to be located farther south, so that it would be closer to the 38th Avenue redevelopment. He also expressed a desire for this station to more directly serve the Elyria Swansea community. (38th Avenue)
- Karen Good, City and County of Denver, discussed additional issues that City staff considered in working with the Project Team on this station. City staff considered how to best serve the local neighborhoods, including Quigg Newton and Globeville. City staff also considered bicycle, pedestrian, and bus access to the station. Engineering issues also significantly influence the location of this station. (38th Avenue)

Note: The above comments are not necessarily comprehensive of all of the comments that LGT members made during the discussion of Alternative 3. Additionally, during the "walk through" of Alternative 7BB, the group informally divided into smaller groups to discuss specific station areas with one another and members of the Project Team. For this reason, no comments from the LGT's review of Alternative 7BB are included here.

Next Meeting and Action Items

The next LGT meeting is anticipated for late spring or early summer, after the IFT meetings have concluded and when the Project Team is ready to recommend a Preferred Alternative for the Gold Line EIS. It will take place as part of the sequence of meetings for the project's fourth decision-making milestone.

The following Action Items were identified during the meeting:

- The Project Team will incorporate the LGT's feedback into the presentation for the IFT meetings.
- Each LGT representative presenting at the April 5 IFT kick-off meeting will send Andy Mountain speaking points/slides to be incorporated into the presentation.

- Andy Mountain will follow up with the LGT representatives that will be presenting at the April 5 IFT meeting to finalize preparations.
- Bob Manwaring, City of Arvada, will send roadway access drawings for the Kipling station area to Renee Martinez-Stone.

Meeting Participants

- | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1. Skip Fischer | Adams County, County Commission |
| 2. Jeanne Shreve | Adams County |
| 3. Kevin Nichols | City of Arvada |
| 4. Bob Manwaring | City of Arvada |
| 5. Lorraine Anderson | City of Arvada |
| 6. Patty Lorence | City of Arvada |
| 7. Shelley Cook | City of Arvada |
| 8. Rick Garcia | City and County of Denver, Council |
| 9. Stephanie Syner | City and County of Denver |
| 10. Karen Good | City and County of Denver |
| 11. Crissy Fanganello | City and County of Denver |
| 12. David Heller | DRCOG |
| 13. Will Kerns | Jefferson County |
| 14. Larry Schulz | City of Wheat Ridge, City Council |
| 15. Steve Nguyen | City of Wheat Ridge |
| 16. Sally Payne | City of Wheat Ridge |
| 17. Dave Beckhouse | Federal Transit Administration |
| 18. Wally Pulliam | RTD Board, District L |
| 19. Liz Telford | RTD FasTracks Gold Line Team |
| 20. Bob Boot | RTD FasTracks Gold Line Team |
| 21. Susan Wood | RTD FasTracks Gold Line Team |
| 22. Don Ulrich | RTD FasTracks Gold Line Team |
| 23. Julie McKay | RTD FasTracks Gold Line Team |
| 24. Tim Baldwin | RTD FasTracks Gold Line Team |
| 25. Mark Leese | RTD FasTracks Gold Line Team |
| 26. Renee Martinez-Stone | RTD FasTracks Gold Line Team |
| 27. Jonathan Spencer | RTD FasTracks Gold Line Team |
| 28. Angela Brand | RTD FasTracks Gold Line Team |
| 29. Ashland Vaughn | RTD FasTracks Gold Line Team |
| 30. Andy Mountain | RTD FasTracks Gold Line Team |
| 31. Jeff Leib | Denver Post |