

## Draft Meeting Summary

# Gold Line Local Governments Team Fencing Meeting

Tuesday, October 14, 2008  
9:00– 11:00 a.m.  
CH2M Hill Denver Office  
1515 Wazee Street, Denver

### Meeting Purpose:

To begin to develop the framework that will be used to identify fencing recommendations for the Gold Line corridor.

### Agenda:

The agenda included the following items:

- Welcome and Introductions
- Presentation
  - Overview of FasTracks fencing strategy
  - Guidelines for Gold Line Subcommittee
  - Fencing framework & corridor tour
- Discussion
- Next Steps

### Presentation:

After providing a summary of the agenda and purpose of the meeting, Scott Epstein presented the FasTracks fencing strategy and types. He then overviewed the role of the LGT Fencing Subcommittee and described the fencing framework. He presented the areas that would be evaluated in the fencing decision-making process, as well as how RTD would arrive at its fencing recommendations. He then discussed each section of the corridor as it relates to land use and fencing. The participants had the following questions/comments for each section of the corridor:

#### 23<sup>rd</sup> Street to 43<sup>rd</sup> Avenue

- Tom Hoaglund, City & County of Denver, stated that Denver's top priority is the fencing along the elevated structure at 38<sup>th</sup> Avenue, since it will be one of the first things commuters see as they come into the station from DUS. He was concerned that fencing atop the structure would cause a visual impact, and he stated that the look of fencing will be of particular importance. He also mentioned a preference for post-and-cable fencing on the structure. He said that Denver isn't highly concerned about the fencing for the rest of the alignment, since most of the other areas where the Gold Line runs through Denver are industrial. Jonathan Spencer stated that they are anticipating a 4-foot high fence on that 38<sup>th</sup> Avenue structure.

### **43<sup>rd</sup> Avenue to 52<sup>nd</sup> Avenue**

- Again, Tom Hoaglund stated that he hopes RTD will pay particular attention to the fencing in areas where the alignment is elevated. He also mentioned that the City & County of Denver would prefer to renovate the existing pedestrian walkway for the 38<sup>th</sup> Avenue station in addition having RTD add another one at 41<sup>st</sup>. The Gold Line team responded that the railroads have indicated that they wish to remove the existing pedestrian bridge in order to construct the new one closer to the 38<sup>th</sup> Avenue station rather than having two pedestrian structures in the area.

### **Lamar to Wadsworth**

- The group agreed that Grandview is of particular concern for visual impacts. It was also agreed that this area poses potential privacy issues for residents. The team mentioned that RTD will need to construct a barrier on Grandview to prevent cars from going over the retaining wall.

### **Wadsworth to Olde Wadsworth**

- The Gold Line team stated that the Gold Line will be highly visible from Wadsworth to Vance since it will be on a hill without many buildings to block the view. The group discussed that this should influence the fencing recommendation.

### **Olde Wadsworth to Miller**

- Will Kerns, Jefferson County, was concerned about having fencing close off the pedestrian crossing at Estes Street. He added that this will make it difficult for pedestrians to access Terrace Park, located to the south of the railroad tracks. The RTD Team responded that Estes Street is not currently a legal pedestrian crossing over the railroad tracks. Jonathan Spencer explained that the only way to add a pedestrian crossing at Estes would be to have the municipalities build a bridge. Bob Manwaring, City of Arvada, added that Arvada would be more likely to build a bridge at Ralston Valley before they would consider constructing something at Estes. Will reiterated his concern that the fencing would block off the park from the neighborhoods to the north.

### **Miller to Ward**

- The team discussed that the neighborhood around the Ward Road station has very different land uses on the north side than it does on the south side and that RTD may want to evaluate two different fence types for this area.
- Will Kerns asked whether the fence would accommodate wildlife crossings, and Scott Epstein responded that the post and cable model can be built to accommodate wildlife. Will also mentioned that drainage ways are crucial areas for wildlife crossings and should be considered when making fencing decisions.

### **Next Steps**

- Scott Epstein asked that each municipality provide their comments on the fencing framework by October 29, 2008.
- Scott stated that he will follow up with the municipalities that were not in attendance at the meeting (Wheat Ridge and Adams County).

**MEETING PARTICIPANTS**

- 1. Bob Manwaring                      City of Arvada
- 2. Tom Hoaglund                      City and County of Denver
- 3. Rick Garcia                      Denver City Council
- 4. Will Kerns                      Jefferson County
- 5. Don Ulrich                      RTD FasTracks Gold Line Team
- 6. Jonathan Spencer                      RTD FasTracks Gold Line Team
- 7. Scott Epstein                      RTD FasTracks Gold Line Team
- 8. Megan Lane                      RTD FasTracks Gold Line Team