
Draft Meeting Summary

Gold Line Local Governments Team Fencing Meeting #4

Wednesday, December 10, 2008

2:00-4:00 p.m.

Arvada City Hall, 8101 Ralston Road, Conference Room 2D

Meeting Purpose: To review fencing recommendations for the Gold Line Corridor based on additional information gathered since the last meeting.

Agenda:

The agenda was as follows:

- Welcome and Introductions
- Review of Information Covered at the Previous Fencing Meetings
- Review of Fencing Types and Costs
- Updated Fencing Framework and Atlas
 - Review of recommendations
 - Subcommittee discussion and feedback
- Next Steps

After welcoming participants and conducting introductions, Scott Epstein recapped the information that was covered at the previous fencing meeting. He stated that the purpose of this meeting was to provide more information and clarifications on issues and questions that had come up during the previous fencing subcommittee meeting.

Scott then overviewed a handout that summarized various fencing types and their associated costs. Scott emphasized that the base costs can vary widely based on height, volume of fencing ordered and the ground quality where the fencing is installed. Liz Telford, Gold Line project manager, reminded the group that fencing around station areas is not covered under this fencing discussion; that each station area will have a fencing type that fits with the selected design template.

Scott stated that the project team has determined that high-tensile fencing is not likely to work in the Gold Line corridor. He said that it would not be cost effective, since less than 1,000 feet of high-tensile fencing would be recommended and volume has a big impact on cost. He added that post-and-cable fencing is very similar to high tensile.

The group reviewed and discussed maps depicting fencing recommendations for each segment of the corridor. The participants had the following questions/comments:

- After Scott Epstein reviewed a handout depicting a typical cross section along Jim Baker Reservoir, Dave Ruchman, RTD Board, questioned why there was always fencing on both sides of the Gold Line's tracks. Director Ruchman felt that it wasn't necessary to have fencing to separate the Gold Line right of way from the freight right of way. Liz Telford responded that the team is required to put fencing on both sides due to RTD's safety policies.
- Will Kerns, Jefferson County, commented that the fencing around Jim Baker reservoir may require extensive maintenance and could be expensive. Liz Telford replied that while it may be more expensive from an engineering perspective, the retained fill is actually far more cost effective because it prevents RTD from going outside the railroad right of way and needing to purchase portions of private properties along the alignment.
- Jenn Hillhouse, City & County of Denver, stated that she was under the impression that post-and-cable was included in baseline costs. Scott Epstein replied that the latest estimates show that post and cable is approximately 50% more than baseline costs.
- Dave Ruchman asked whether the fencing around station areas would be significantly better than the rest of the corridor. Don Ulrich, consultant project manager, responded that the team has budgeted for station-area specific fencing.
- Jenn Hillhouse asked whether RTD would cover the cost of post-and cable fencing for the 38th Avenue structure, and Scott Epstein replied yes, adding that the 38th Avenue overpass is considered a visually sensitive area.
- Scott Tempel, Adams County, commented that he would prefer for the fencing to be post-and-cable from I-76 to Federal in order to avoid having too many different types of fencing within a small area. The team agreed to reevaluate this area. Scott Tempel also added that it seems unnecessary to have fencing between the freight tracks and the Gold Line tracks. Don Ulrich responded that their main goal is to avoid trespassing within the right of way.
- In the area from Federal to Tennyson, Jenn Hillhouse questioned whether animals would be able to get across the tracks, since the team is recommending chain link for the south side of the tracks and post and cable for the north side of the tracks. Scott Epstein responded that it's not a concern since there isn't very much animal migration in this area.
- Kevin Nichols, City of Arvada, asked whether the project team would be willing to trade off the fencing costs at station areas for some other amenity if a municipality opted for a lower-cost fencing option around a station. Liz Telford replied that she wouldn't recommend it, since elements that aren't required for a project can be cut during value engineering.

- Kevin Nichols suggested changing the fencing between 58th Avenue and Lamar from post-and-cable to chain link in exchange for extending the post and cable fencing further west of Olde Wadsworth through the Arvada Historic District. The team agreed to look into this adjustment.
- Dave Ruchman questioned the team's recommendation of chain link fencing west of Olde Wadsworth. Liz Telford responded that since the area is not historic nor on a structure, the team is recommending the baseline fencing type. Director Ruchman requested that the team at least evaluate a different fencing treatment in this area.
- Will Kerns voiced concerns about closing off the illegal at-grade crossing at Estes Street since it's frequently used by residents to access Terrace Park, located to the south of the tracks. Liz Telford responded that adding a grade crossing at Estes would be cost prohibitive, but that there will be at-grade crossings to accommodate pedestrians at Carr, Garrison and Independence.
- Will Kerns stated that he would prefer post and cable fencing in this area to allow pedestrians to cut through the fencing and illegally cross the tracks at Estes. The project team voiced pedestrian safety concerns about having post and cable fencing at Estes, which could allow for easier trespassing. Kevin Nichols stated that he doesn't think it would be worth the risk to have post and cable in this area. Will Kerns also suggested building an underpass at Estes, but Liz Telford replied that this would raise significant issues with the railroads, since they would have to approve an underpass and it is not part of RTD's current railroad agreement.
- Kevin Nichols stated that he wouldn't want chain link fencing between Kipling and Miller Streets, since that area is part of Arvada's TOD plan. He felt that TOD areas should be at the same level of priority as historic areas and that these sections require special treatment. Steve Nguyen, City of Wheat Ridge, agreed with Kevin Nichols and stated that Wheat Ridge wouldn't want chain link in their TOD areas either. Both municipalities requested post-and-cable for their TOD areas. Scott Epstein responded that he would add TOD areas to the list of sections that qualify for post and cable.

Scott Epstein asked the group to email him with any further questions. He stated that the team would incorporate the committee's input into their evaluations before publishing the final Gold Line fencing recommendations in the Final Environmental Impact Statement. He then adjourned the meeting.

MEETING PARTICIPANTS

1. Scott Tempel Adams County
2. Kevin Nichols City of Arvada
3. Jennifer Hillhouse City and County of Denver
4. Will Kerns Jefferson County
5. Steve Nguyen Wheat Ridge
6. David Ruchman RTD Board
7. Don Ulrich RTD FasTracks Gold Line Team
8. Liz Telford RTD FasTracks Gold Line Team
9. Scott Epstein RTD FasTracks Gold Line Team
10. Megan Lane RTD FasTracks Gold Line Team