

GOLD LINE PUBLIC COMMENTS

MAY 1-31, 2007



Comment	Date Captured	Source
<p>Support for Alternative 2 - Transportation Systems Management; opposition to all other alternatives Ladies and Gentlemen:</p> <p>I am writing to take the unusual position of supporting a rarely-quoted option, that if I read the presentations correctly is still required to be evaluated as part of the Gold Line EIS, that of "Alternative 2 - Transportation Systems Management."</p> <p>Given that the only supported options remaining are either streetcaralignments, which while serving the greatest population, do so most inefficiently with little improvement over the status quo, or the commuter-rail alignment, which would travel over half its length through sparsely-populated light and medium industrial zones with little to no potential for mass transit use, I believe that the entire purpose and need of the Gold Line corridor is now highly suspect.</p> <p>Three of the five "need" statements seem to be at risk of not being met by either option. If you can only get two out of five, is the purpose being fulfilled?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Need for mobility improvements (improved travel time, travel options, and regional interconnectivity). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o One option represents improved travel time o The other option represents "regional interconnectivity" o Both provide travel options, but as the next bullet demonstrates, only the streetcar option provides it for other than traditional transit users * Need to serve both traditional transit users and new users. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The EMU commuter rail option is essentially a Park-n-Ride service only. It will not attract new transit users - it will only improve conditions for those that already drive, park, and ride. * Need to be cost-effective and ability to be financed within the FasTracks program. 	<p>May 02 2007</p>	<p>email</p>

GOLD LINE PUBLIC COMMENTS

MAY 1-31, 2007



<p>o While both options were listed as feasible with the FasTracks program, it is the cost-effectiveness of either that is highly suspect.</p> <p>o The EMU commuter rail option essentially replaces considerably less-expensive bus service to Arvada Park-n-Rides, and nothing else. It will be efficient from 6-8 and from 4-6, and nearly dormant in terms of usefulness at all other times. For the projected cost of the program, considerable if not exponential improvements in the bus system servicing the exact same population of morning and afternoon commuters could be made, while providing for flexibility to serve other populations with the same investment at other times.</p> <p>o The streetcar option is simply a very expensive bus, and while it does provide environmental benefits, that is the only incremental benefit visible. Is that cost-effective?</p> <p>For these reasons I take the unusual stance of supporting neither of the two remaining options. I believe the only useful options have been eliminated, and as such, the option of "doing nothing" or instituting a transportation management system (read: better buses) would be the most efficient, serve the greatest number, and serve the greatest number of non-traditional transit users. We need mass transit, not sprawl rail.</p> <p>Kind regards,</p> <p>Rob XXXXXX XXXXX neighborhood</p>		
<p>My name is Christie XXXXX, and my number here is xxx.xxx.xxxx, and I have a quick question dealing with the Gold Line. The original messages are a little confusing to me, so has it been approved or is it getting ready to be approved? According to the website, they know there is two options they are looking at. We are getting ready to sell our house, and I just want to be able to include some information. So if you could give me a call back, so that I can ask you a few other questions, I would greatly appreciate it. I actually work on Mondays, but I am off on Wednesday so I might try you again. Thank You.</p>	<p>May 04 2007</p>	<p>phone</p>

GOLD LINE PUBLIC COMMENTS

MAY 1-31, 2007



<p>Dear Liz Telford,</p> <p>Am I correct in assuming that Senate Bill 07-219 has passed both chambers and is awaiting the Governor's signature? Thanks,</p> <p>Keith XXX XXXXX Neighbors xxx.xxx.xxxx</p>	<p>May 14 2007</p>	<p>email</p>
<p>21 May 2007</p> <p>Ms. Liz Telford, AICP Gold Line Project Manager Manager of Corridor Planning — Environmental RTD FasTracks Team 1560 Broadway Suite700 Denver, CO 80202</p> <p>Dear Ms. Telford,</p> <p>The organizations signing this letter have a long-standing common interest in the development of a successful Gold Line/NW Rail transit station in the vicinity of W. 38th Ave. We have been, and will continue to be, involved in the Gold Line EIS process. According to the accelerated schedule for the Gold Line EIS, preferred alternatives will be announced in June or July of this year. With the passage of Colorado Senate Bill 07-217 we assume that the EMU option will go forward as the preferred technology choice. While we certainly do not wish to impede the progress of the EIS, we nevertheless believe that it will be premature to select a preferred alternative for the 38th Ave. commuter rail station site this summer. We therefore ask that the Gold Line preferred alternative announcements describe the 38th Ave. station site as between W. 37th and W. 44th Avenues, the precise preferred location to be determined. Our thinking is as follows:</p> <p>The main criterion for the 38th Ave. station is that it should have sufficient convenience, commodiousness, and amenity to inspire large-scale use by the residents of NW Denver. Passengers reaching the station by all methods — on foot, by bicycle, in cars, and in busses — must be successfully accommodated. The new station will alter existing connections and relationships among the surrounding neighborhoods, and it will create new connections; it is reasonable to aim for the maximum benefit from these changes. The new station's placement relative to W. 38th</p>	<p>May 21 2007</p>	<p>email</p>

GOLD LINE PUBLIC COMMENTS

MAY 1-31, 2007



<p>Ave. will be significant, because 38th is the principal east-west artery of NW Denver. The existing bus network is a valuable asset which should not be degraded. We are confident that RTD shares our general objectives.</p> <p>The City of Denver has plans and funding for a “station-area study” of the vicinity surrounding the possible locations for the 38th Ave. station. That study, with the participation of interested local residents and business owners, will analyze the complex ramifications of various station sites, as well as the potential for Transit Oriented Development — a factor influencing ridership. Scheduled to begin in the fall of 2007, the station-area study will assemble information essential for the evaluation of the various station alternatives. We will ask the City to begin the study this summer. It seems sensible for RTD to wait until the study is completed before determining the preferred site alternative. This order of events promises to help us sidestep unnecessary contention over the matter. It is possible that RTD is considering too narrow a range of alternatives for the station placement.</p> <p>We look forward to a continued productive collaboration with RTD in the development of the Gold Line and NW Rail.</p> <p>Very sincerely yours,</p> <p>Hod XXXX, President XXXX Neighbors</p> <p>Tim XXXX, Chairman xxxxx XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX Committee</p> <p>Keith XXXX, President XXXX Neighbors</p>		
<p>In light of the cooperation between CDOT and RTD on the TREX right of way I would like to see a piggy back onto the RTD Northwest (& Gold Line) Rail right of way a bicycle path from down town along the present railway under I-25 extending at least to around 64th ave. and Pecos.</p> <p>This would get bicycles out of down town past I-70, I-76 and Clear Creek and would connect to the existing Clear Creek and Little Dry Creek bicycle paths. This would provide safe access from down town to Golden and/or west Arvada and would connect to Westminster as well.</p>	<p>May 29 2007</p>	<p>website</p>

GOLD LINE PUBLIC COMMENTS

MAY 1-31, 2007



<p>Gold Line station near 38th Gold Line EIS</p> <p>Official comments: Please accept the enclosed diagrams as official comments from a Prospect area stakeholders group committed to minimizing the negatives and maximizing the positives of the proposed FasTracks program.</p> <p>The benefits we see to the Highland/Sunnyside neighborhoods is good access for bike/pedestrian users to the main station area, and good signalized traffic access to an easily accessible park n ride area currently owned by CDOT off Park Ave West and 38th capable of holding about 400 cars and substantial additional development.</p> <p>From the Prospect perspective this alternative eliminates bridge infrastructure costs and facilitates connections to the light rail corridors (SE, SW, W, Central) and provides a high level of service to local users.</p> <p>We would appreciate your comments in response. Thank you. Tom XXXX, Manager XXXX Development Group XXX-XXX-XXXX</p> <p><i>NOTE FROM PROJECT TEAM: If you would like to view the files that accompanied this comment, please email info@rtdgoldline.com.</i></p>	<p>May 30 2007</p>	
--	--------------------	--