



Website Comments
September, October 2008

Stakeholder Comments/Issues	Responses
<p>Awaiting feedback at later meetings before making further comments.</p>	
<p>I went to the meeting downtown on 9/25. The information presented was exactly what I wanted to hear. It was presented very well. Thanks!!! Some ideas that I have: 1. Since copper and steel prices are the most unknown and so huge, I suggest stock piling these materials as soon as possible. Use existing money now for this and reduce the size of projects or delay projects to make up for it. Buy enough for the entire project now. 2. I would like to see a plan that completes the entire original proposal even though it takes longer. 3. I really prefer option 4. Get the longest reach possible even if it's only a single rail solution. If the load gets maxed out, supplement it with express buses.</p>	<p>In an effort to control costs, RTD is considering purchasing materials and supplies prior to construction for items that can be stored for long periods of time, when the prices for those items are favorable to RTD.</p> <p>Thank you for your comments. All comments on the FasTracks options being considered by the RTD Board have been compiled. A summary of the comments received have been provided to the RTD board members.</p>
<p>When we do things halfway or reduce service to save money, we just decrease ridership. For instance, I used to take the BOLT to work at CU everyday, and I really enjoyed getting to relax on my way to work. However, when frequency decreased a few months ago, it became just inconvenient enough to push me into driving most days. To reliably get to campus by 12:00, I have to catch the bus at 10:00. Of course I'm going to drive! Then ridership goes down, which makes RTD cut service even more. I think it is essential that we complete the full FasTracks system as soon as possible. We need to do whatever it takes to provide the Denver metro area with convenient, reliable public transportation. I will gladly vote for a tax increase if that's what RTD needs.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. All comments on the FasTracks options being considered by the RTD Board have been compiled. A summary of the comments received have been provided to the RTD board members.</p>



Website Comments
September, October 2008

Stakeholder Comments/Issues	Responses
<p>I voted for FasTracks in 2004. As a transportation planner, I was thrilled that Denver was leading the county in this endeavor. That is why, as a planner, a RTD user and a tax payer I am appalled that RTD miscalculated FasTracks construction cost so much. I am well aware that the cost of construction materials, like steel, copper and concrete has increased at unheard of rates. However, based on the information I have gleamed, the construction costs put forth to the voters in 2004 were based on best case scenarios and inflation costs were based from economic data gathered during some of the best economic times the country had experienced in decades. That being said, I would support an additional sales tax increase, provided that RTD makes reasonable revenue assumptions. Have RTD calculated that we might be headed into a severe recession? If things continue to get worse, people will continue to cut back on discretionary spending. I caution RTD to be very conservative in their potential revenue reporting from a tax increase. The voters may cut you some slack and vote for this increase, but if you under budget again; the voters will not be so forgiving next time. I just moved from Houston, TX and the voters there still talk about how Metro mismanaged their tax money decades ago. Houston voters stilltalk about how Metro had to be reorganized because of the corruption and fiscal mismanagement. I am really looking forward to having a nice rail system that will allow me to travel across the region without a car for most trips. Please RTD, don't be like Metro and lose the support and trust of the very public you are suppose to serve.</p>	<p>The cost estimates and revenue projections for the FasTracks plan approved by the voters in 2004 was based on the best information available at that time. Those figures, as well as the financial plan for FasTracks were reviewed and approved by the Denver regional Council of Governments. In 2007, RTD prepared the first Annual Program Evaluation in order to understand the effect of rapidly increasing costs of construction and changing economic conditions on the FasTracks program and its financial plan. The Annual Program Evaluation will be conducted every year, so that the RTD Board, the local governments in the District and the public are aware of the potential effects of the economic and financial conditions that confront the program.</p>
<p>Given the financial difficulties occurring, I and many others I know would like to see the money allocated, focused on connecting to Denver International Airport from Union station.</p>	<p>In order to select an option for moving the FasTracks program forward, the RTD Board will consider how to best allocate funding in the most equitable way possible.</p>



Website Comments
September, October 2008

Stakeholder Comments/Issues	Responses
<p>Fast Tracks was a scam perpetrated by construction companies and RTD to screw the people of the Denver Metro area. Lies have been told, false promises have been made. If the plan can't proceed as originally planned, it should be scrapped and a new proposal should be put to voters. I will do everything possible to make sure not a penny is spent on a system that will cater to the rich in Denver and leave everyone else out.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. All comments on the FasTracks options being considered by the RTD Board have been compiled. A summary of the comments received have been provided to the RTD board members.</p>
<p>Given the enormous pent-up demand for light rail within Highlands Ranch (where many potential riders gave up on Mineral due to lack of parking), I would think there's a strong case for finishing the SW corridor sooner rather than later. Although the plans still call for just an extra station at Lucent, your website "photo" shows the Erickson/470 site proposed a few years ago next to the Windcrest retirement community. Is the thinking to shorten the terminus and place it there or add it as an extra station before Lucent? What would need to happen to ensure the SW extension does not see further delays as the FasTracks program is drawn out as a whole?</p>	<p>An end-of-line station is planned for C-470/Lucent Boulevard with a 1,000 space park-n-Ride. An intermediate station, located near the southeast corner of the C-470/U.S. 85 Interchange is also being considered as part of this current phase of study. This intermediate station was included in the Southwest Extension Transit Corridor Planning and Conceptual Engineering Study (2002), but is currently not a part of the FasTracks plan that was voted on in 2004. While it is early in the project planning phase, the project team does not have plans to shorten the length of the extension at this time.</p>
<p>My preference for FasTracks Option 1 - 4. Very unsupportive Option 2 - 4. Very unsupportive (unless Boulder gets service, in which case 2. Somewhat Supportive) Option 3 - 1. Very Supportive Option 4 - 2. Somewhat Supportive Option 5 - 2. Very supportive</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. All comments on the FasTracks options being considered by the RTD Board have been compiled. A summary of the comments received have been provided to the RTD board members.</p>
<p>Please keep Boulder on the path to FasTracks. Fewer cars on the road is a good thing.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. All comments on the FasTracks options being considered by the RTD Board have been compiled. A summary of the comments received have been provided to the RTD board members.</p>



Website Comments
September, October 2008

Stakeholder Comments/Issues	Responses
<p>I looked at the power point presentation online since I missed the meeting here in Boulder. I just wanted to give my input on the 5 options. I think that Option #5 is the best option--provided we can get the funding for it. If not, I would like to voice my interest in Option #2 provided that either the US-36 BRT or the Northwest Rail are the chosen route. If neither of these are going to be chosen for Option #2, then I would prefer Option #4. Thanks for listening</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. All comments on the FasTracks options being considered by the RTD Board have been compiled. A summary of the comments received have been provided to the RTD board members.</p>
<p>I am a Boulder resident and rely heavily on RTD. I have family in Denver and travel via DIA very, very often. I am an extremely strong supporter of the light rail project and truly believe that it needs to include both Boulder and DIA. The buses from Boulder to DIA and downtown Denver are always full when I ride. I think that it is essential for quality of travel that we have the light rail as a serious option for Boulder commuters.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. All comments on the FasTracks options being considered by the RTD Board have been compiled. A summary of the comments received have been provided to the RTD board members.</p>
<p>We need/want fast track here in Westminster!! Please!!</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. All comments on the FasTracks options being considered by the RTD Board have been compiled. A summary of the comments received have been provided to the RTD board members.</p>
<p>Please keep plans for extending Light Rail to the Boulder area. I think it would be great for the entire area if more people could take advantage of light rail!</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. All comments on the FasTracks options being considered by the RTD Board have been compiled. A summary of the comments received have been provided to the RTD board members.</p>



Website Comments
September, October 2008

Stakeholder Comments/Issues	Responses
<p>Dear RTD FasTracks: Given the rising costs of the project, I would support a plan that would delay and/or eliminate the US 36/Northwest Rail. Currently, this corridor have extensive express bus service, which according to the FasTracks website may even be faster than the commuter rail for travel between Boulder and Denver. Likewise, I believe that the North Denver (I-25) commuter rail could be delayed/eliminated, and instead increased express bus service should be offered along this route. Of all of the FasTracks corridors, it seems to me that both of these routes will have the least benefit to the region as a whole, as they both already have access to the US 36/I-25 HOV lanes. Instead, I would rather see the I-225 light rail completed all of the way north to connect with the DIA rail, as this route currently lacks adequate public transportation (and in addition, it will complete the link from the DIA Rail to the Southeast Rail, which will help commuters avoid multiple transfers or the need to go to Downtown Denver in order to transfer to the DIA train). Thank you for your assistance with this project!</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. All comments on the FasTracks options being considered by the RTD Board have been compiled. A summary of the comments received have been provided to the RTD board members.</p>
<p>Why not impose a permanent gasoline tax to help pay for mass transit? Other communities with mass transit do it. If people are going to be selfish and use their vehicles instead of mass transit, then they should have to pay for it. And, those who are opposed to the tax and decide to cut down on their use of their vehicle and take mass transit instead...well, everybody wins then.</p>	<p>The RTD Board is considering every feasible option for additional revenue to fund the FasTracks program. At this point, the RTD does not have the authority to collect a tax on gasoline.</p>
<p>If I am reading the presentation correctly, RTD had assumed a 3.3% increase as materials cost escalation (page 6). This 3.3% increase was not the actual cost of materials cost escalation through the past several years. Is that correct? As a result, RTD have revised this 3.3% figure to the values on page 8 for the upcoming years. As the revised assumptions are extremely higher than the previous 3.3% value, do the previous years materials cost escalation justify this jump? In particular, what was the materials cost escalation for 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, and 2007? Thanks for your time and help on this and I look forward to seeing your email reply back.</p>	<p>Material inputs to construction have risen much faster than the Consumer Price Index (CPI) which the 3.3% was based on. From 2003 to September 2008, the inputs to construction rose 45% while the CPI rose just 19%. This comparison is relevant because many public agencies, including RTD, used the CPI to project future cost. Such an index worked well in the past, when there was little difference between the change in construction prices and consumer prices.</p> <p>Materials cost escalation for 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, and 2007 using the Producer's Price Index was 1.0%, 2.6%, 9.6%, 11.2%, 9.2%, 5.3% and 14.5%, respectively.</p>



Website Comments
September, October 2008

Stakeholder Comments/Issues	Responses
<p>Public transportation, especially light rail is a necessity in the Denver metro area. I want to see the light rail system completed as originally passed by the people, and ASAP.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. All comments on the FasTracks options being considered by the RTD Board have been compiled. A summary of the comments received have been provided to the RTD board members.</p>
<p>Invest in enforcement for users that don't pay the fare. Rather than charging for parking AND fare, if there was an investment in enforcement, more people may actually purchase their fare rather than just jumping on the light rail for free. If people have to pay parking and fare, they have been less likely to use the system. I think PPPs need to be pursued rather than asking taxpayers for more money.</p>	<p>RTD uses a "proof of payment" system for fare collection and enforces the system through inspection. While some people do abuse the system, the overwhelming majority of riders pay their fares. The revenue lost through non-payment of fares is not enough to address the increases in the cost of construction materials or declining sales tax revenues.</p>
<p>Attended meeting on 10-2 at City Park Westminster. Strongly believe only option is to build entire project by 2017. We can work out the finances etc. This would be a huge benefit for our metro area! Just do it! And don't get sidetracked by lesser solutions.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. All comments on the FasTracks options being considered by the RTD Board have been compiled. A summary of the comments received have been provided to the RTD board members.</p>
<p>TOD is my specialty and with that in mind. I am very supportive of plans 3 and 4. I support plan 5 as well, but acknowledge it may not be possible.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. All comments on the FasTracks options being considered by the RTD Board have been compiled. A summary of the comments received have been provided to the RTD board members.</p>



Website Comments
September, October 2008

Stakeholder Comments/Issues	Responses
<p>Option1- Can you explain the methods used to identify the shortened segments? Have other cities plans similar to FasTracks contain segments that were not tied to the "core" (Denver- Union Station) Option 2- Public nightmare-although this is an interesting long-term idea; Which "corridor" would be more valuable to develop (the one to the North, or the one to the south); If 1 "corridor" was managed by light rail, would the other corridor be home to an ultra-efficient bus system? In other words, would/could resources be pooled to maximize each system? Option 3- My main concern is that slower operations will discourage active ridership; My personal opinion is that the more regular and efficient the system, the more people will participate. Option 4- I think it will be difficult to convince the public that single track is viable. My initial thought was that less frequency would mean a decrease in ridership (and thus a decrease in asset utilization); If we are going to try to continue to apply for federal funding, we need to show success in the projects that we have already implemented (as you have already done, and therefore qualified for additional funding). Option 5- Like all of the options to increase revenue with the exception of sales tax increase. I am not sure the ultimate result of increasing sales tax... Would an increase in sales tax discourage spending in Denver? A suggestion would be to emphasize a focus on PPPs, Optimizing RTD (may be smart to get an external audit, just to quiet the grumpy ones), emphasize that we are forward thinking... Isn't spending during a recession good? I thought this was awesome. Loved the electronic participation, particularly the automatic response. Karen Morales presented the material articulately and she moderated well.</p>	<p>Please note that the options that have been presented to-date, are concepts to serve as the starting point for discussion. After the RTD Board selects an option as an approach to addressing fiscal issues, more analyses have been conducted to identify the end of line stations for each corridor. These initial concepts for the length and end of line stations were based primarily on ridership projections for 2035 and estimated costs.</p> <p>Thank you for your comments. All comments on the FasTracks options being considered by the RTD Board have been compiled. A summary of the comments received have been provided to the RTD board members.</p>
<p>Here's a theory - why not use eminent domain to take the railroad property that became too expensive to purchase and go back to the old costs and the old track plans? Everything I read says that the costs would have been lower if the railroad could have been purchased. Since the rail lines have a long term vision of moving east anyway, than why not use eminent domain on them?</p>	<p>RTD does not have the authority to exercise eminent domain over the railroads. Thank you for your comments. All comments on the FasTracks options being considered by the RTD Board have been compiled. A summary of the comments received have been provided to the RTD board members.</p>



Website Comments
September, October 2008

Stakeholder Comments/Issues	Responses
<p>What RTD needs to do is collect fares from everyone that rides the light rail. The best solution is to install turnstiles. Currently a minimum of 30% do not purchase tickets. During peak commuting times nearly 40% - 50% don't pay. I know I've ridden for years and have observed how easy it is to skip paying the fare without getting caught. You never see anyone checking at peak times...it's too crowded and you don't have enough personnel to manage this anyway. With turnstiles nobody can get on the train without a ticket. Think of the subway system in NY. Get rid of your zones and just go back to a flat ride. It makes it so much easier and simple. Why screw your entire ridership just because of Douglas County? The mere consideration of cutting the C and D lines service to downtown and Union Station is ludicrous. The people that ride those lines are your original and longest standing customers. To have to switch trains at Broadway is not what anyone would call convenient. It seems that your selling out your long time customers to the Newbies along the I-25 corridor. You need to make this easy and convenient for people to use. Many of the proposals I've seen do just the opposite and will drive people away. Again install turnstiles insuring you collect fares from everyone that rides and you'll be amazed at the increased revenue.</p>	<p>RTD uses a "proof of payment" system for fare collection and enforces the system through inspection. While some people do abuse the system, the overwhelming majority of riders pay their fares. The revenue lost through non-payment of fares is not enough to address the increases in the cost of construction materials or declining sales tax revenues.</p> <p>Use of turnstiles to control access to stations, would not be practical at several light rail stations including the downtown stations, where controlling access would require closing sidewalks. Controlled access stations in systems such as New York, Washington, Atlanta and Chicago are feasible with subway and elevated stations where access points are limited.</p>



Website Comments
September, October 2008

Stakeholder Comments/Issues	Responses
<p>I live in Westminster near the Hwy 36 corridor. I use the express buses every day (usually the 108X, which runs through our neighborhood) to commute to downtown Denver. But my wife and I also use the buses to go to Boulder, Flatirons Crossing, and other locations. I supported FasTracks - gathered signatures to put in on the ballot, and advocated for the ballot issue's passage. But as I see the budget shortfall grow bigger and bigger, I think it's time to scrap the plans for a Denver-Boulder train, and put our area's share of the FasTracks revenue toward enhanced express bus service only. It is distressing to me to hear RTD officials targeting the northwest corridor for project cuts, and suggesting that funds be diverted to the Golden line and the DIA line. It's unfair to take funds away from our area, just to protect the federal funds that are available for other lines. But the reality is that the northwest corridor doesn't have the political clout to avoid significant cuts, so we need to decide how we want to prioritize and secure our fair share of the funds. I feel the way to do this is to extend the HOV/bus lane all the way to Boulder. The HOV lane works magnificently between Westminster and Boulder. My bus gets from the Westminster Center park-and-ride to Union Station in about 10 minutes every morning, and coming home in the evening it's only slightly longer. If bus riders had this kind of service available all the way to Boulder and from Boulder to Longmont, it would be better than the proposed train service could ever hope to be. This is particularly true if the train service is the watered-down, single-track version that has been discussed. Having also commuted for several years from Westminster to the Denver Tech Center area, I have come to realize that train service is overrated. As I mentioned, I used to get to Union Station in about ten minutes to catch the E Line train every day. But to travel about the same distance on the E Line, it would take me about 40 minutes! So I really believe the northwest corridor will be better served by an expanded HOV lane, and enhanced express bus service. This could include, for example, BX and L service on weekends, and more frequent B service on Sundays. Improvements could also be made to certain park-and-rides (like Broomfield) so the bus does not take so long to stop there. Please consider this plan as a way to provide the northwest corridor with a higher level of service, while still allowing us to do our fair share (and only our fair share) to address the budget</p>	<p>Funds are not being "diverted" from the Northwest Rail project or any other corridor to build the East Corridor and Gold Line. The West Corridor, East Corridor and Gold Line are included in the basic assumption for Options 1 - 5, because they are eligible for federal funding without impacting funds available for the rest of FasTracks.. Not building them to their full extent as they have been presented for consideration by the Federal Transit Administration would jeopardize the potential for federal funding.</p> <p>Thank you for your comments. All comments on the FasTracks options being considered by the RTD Board have been compiled. A summary of the comments received have been provided to the RTD Board members.</p>



Website Comments
September, October 2008

<p>shortfall. Please do not compromise our excellent bus service just to build a crappy, ineffective, single-track rail line that will be too slow and very unfriendly to RTD riders. Focus on the quality of service, instead of just getting a train up and running. If you do so, I think you will find that the northwest corridor is better served by enhanced bus service and an expanded HOV/bus lane. Thank you! Joe Schuele Westminster, CO</p>	
--	--



Website Comments
September, October 2008

Stakeholder Comments/Issues	Responses
<p>Though I am unable to attend the public meetings scheduled for my district, I've reviewed the PowerPoint presentation on the five options RTD is considering for the future of FasTracks. I would like to say that Option 4 is the best option of the bunch. I feel that it does not alienate other corridors as Options 1 and 2 do. Option 3 didn't do enough in terms of developing each corridor, making me wonder, "Why bother at all?". And Option 5 will never fly with the voters or the legislature in these hard economic times. Therefore, I recommend Option 4 as the best of the five. Let's get as much infrastructure in place in as many corridors as we can now so that inflationary construction costs do not beat this project back any further in the coming years. We can manipulate service frequencies after the infrastructure is in place.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. All comments on the FasTracks options being considered by the RTD Board have been compiled. A summary of the comments received have been provided to the RTD Board members.</p>
<p>Though I am unable to attend the public meetings scheduled for my district, I've reviewed the PowerPoint presentation on the five options RTD is considering for the future of FasTracks. I would like to say that Option 4 is the best option of the bunch. I feel that it does not alienate other corridors as Options 1 and 2 do. Option 3 didn't do enough in terms of developing each corridor, making me wonder, "Why bother at all?". And Option 5 will never fly with the voters or the legislature in these hard economic times. Therefore, I recommend Option 4 as the best of the five. Let's get as much infrastructure in place in as many corridors as we can now so that inflationary construction costs do not beat this project back any further in the coming years. We can manipulate service frequencies after the infrastructure is in place.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. All comments on the FasTracks options being considered by the RTD Board have been compiled. A summary of the comments received have been provided to the RTD board members.</p>
<p>I feel strongly that all Light-Rail lines be built to the fullest extent. Extend the tax to accomplish this --- Light rail is an excellent mass-transit system; it's too bad it wasn't started 10 or 20 years ago. Thanks for your time and consideration.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. All comments on the FasTracks options being considered by the RTD Board have been compiled. A summary of the comments received have been provided to the RTD board members.</p>



Website Comments
September, October 2008

Stakeholder Comments/Issues	Responses
<p>I prefer the going for more funding we need to get this all done before 2017</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. All comments on the FasTracks options being considered by the RTD Board have been compiled. A summary of the comments received have been provided to the RTD board members.</p>
<p>Hello! First of all, THANK YOU for the wonderful train transportation you provide in the Denver metro that my family relies on. Secondly, I write to tell you of the importance of the light rail extension to Sky Ridge Medical Center (I believe you call it the "Southeast Corridor" to Lone Tree) to me and my family. My family moved to Ridgeway from California specifically because of the Ridgeway concept, of which the light rail extension was a HUGE PART. My wife is legally blind and does not drive. She relies on public transportation to do many things, both on her own and with our two little girls. The fact that she could walk to Sky Ridge, get on a train with the girls, and go to Denver for the day was a HUGE selling point of the Ridgeway neighborhood to us. We will use this system a lot and, in fact, purchased our home here in part based on the plans for the light rail extension here. Obviously, plans occasionally change, but we would like to help in any way we can to ensure that this extension is built. The extension will be hugely impactful (in a positive way) for many things: The development of Ridgeway as a commercial and transportation center, the accessibility of the incredible state-of-the-art Sky Ridge Medical Center to many more people, and the connection of people in our neighborhood (like my wife and others who can drive but choose not to) to the greater metro in an environmentally- and traffic-conscious way. Please let us know if there is anything we can do to help ensure that plans for a Ridgeway light rail extension proceed. Sincerely, Cory Cullinan</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. All comments on the FasTracks options being considered by the RTD Board have been compiled. A summary of the comments received have been provided to the RTD board members.</p>



Website Comments
September, October 2008

Stakeholder Comments/Issues	Responses
<p>I live in the Ridgeway community in Lone Tree. I am legally blind and don't drive. One of the reasons I bought my house in this area was because I was expecting good local light rail service and I'm very sad to hear that we're considering not building out the stop by the Sky Ridge Medical Center. I know priorities have to be weighed during this difficult time, but access to good mass transit seems critical for this community that is built on the idea that people should be able to get around without cars. The hope is to create a more dense housing infrastructure that will need the support of mass transit. I'm just writing to add my voice to the chorus to continue on the path to build out these additional stations.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. All comments on the FasTracks options being considered by the RTD Board have been compiled. A summary of the comments received have been provided to the RTD board members.</p>
<p>the options that extend buildout to 2034 extend the taxing period beyond the 2017 date presented to voters in 2004. That extension constitutes a tax increase and should be voted. It is disingenuous to say that the 2034 dates do not require new revenues.</p>	<p>Deferring completion of the FasTracks program to 2034 is a "pay as you go" approach that does not require an increase in the sales tax rate that RTD currently collects. Thank you for your comments. All comments on the FasTracks options being considered by the RTD Board have been compiled. A summary of the comments received have been provided to the RTD board members.</p>
<p>In review of all the options and taking into account anticipated regional growth, increased cost due to delay, as well as other factors, the only logical option is Option 5, which I would score as a "1" - very supportive. Option 3 is scored a "2", somewhat supportive, but will end up costing more than Option 5 will cost in current time \$\$'s. All other options are scored a "4" - very unsupportive.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. All comments on the FasTracks options being considered by the RTD Board have been compiled. A summary of the comments received have been provided to the RTD board members.</p>



Website Comments
September, October 2008

Stakeholder Comments/Issues	Responses
<p>I attended the RTD FasTracks SW Corridor public scoping meeting Oct. 16 at the Highlands Ranch Metro District and made these comments verbally at the meeting. 1. Most important - PLEASE DO NOT LET RTD BUDGET CUTS NIX THE SW CORRIDOR EXTENSION. HIGHLANDS RANCH NEEDS THIS AND I WANT IT! 2. This is a great project and the sooner it's completed the better! 3. Regarding access to the 1,000 car park-and-ride: Any access that can be provided to the parking lot from Lucent Blvd. would be greatly appreciated to alleviate congestion at the intersection of Plaza and Lucent. A "turn-out" already exists on the west side of Lucent between Plaza and C-470, which now only provides a directory to home developers in HR. This is essentially obsolete since most of HR is now built-out. If this turn-out could be extended into the planned parking area, it would provide very efficient access for east-bound C-470 traffic immediately off of the southbound Lucent exit ramp. 3. Pedestrian access: The Lucent-Plaza intersection is NOT pedestrian-friendly and will only be worse with park-and-ride traffic. A pedestrian bridge over Lucent would greatly aid access to the Lucent/Avaya office buildings and the HR Town Center development. 4. The planned end-of-the-line station is well west of the Lucent- C-470 intersection and will be a rather long and unpleasant hike in our inclement winter weather. The closer the station could be located to Lucent Blvd (farther east), the better in order to shorten the hike to the Lucent/Avaya offices and HR Town Center.</p>	<p>An end-of-line station is planed for C-470/Lucent Boulevard with a 1,000 space park-n-Ride. An intermediate station, located near the southeast corner of the C-470/U.S. 85 Interchange is also being considered as part of this current phase of study. This intermediate station was included in the Southwest Extension Transit Corridor Planning and Conceptual Engineering Study (2002), but is currently not a part of the FasTracks plan that was voted on in 2004. While it is early in the project planning phase, the project team does not have plans to shorten the length of the extension at this time.</p>
<p>Have the FasTracks project standardized on a vehicle? I sometimes hear that diesel engines will be used on some legs of the project, and not electric ones. Later, I hear about the cost of diesel making it more cost-effective to do electric. What is the current thinking? Personally, I use the electric trains from Nine Mile down to the Convention Center on almost every weekday. They are quiet and clean. RTD have expertise in maintaining them. I cannot see where a diesel makes sense, as you would have to maintain two smaller, incompatible systems. There are no efficiencies of scale to make the system efficient and flexible. I am looking forward to the I-225 loop and the East Corridor to DIA. I sincerely hope that you continue with the current electric vehicles.</p>	<p>The selection of vehicles for the East Corridor and Gold Line are electrically-powered, commuter rail trains, also known as electric multiple units. These two corridors and the North metro and Northwest rail corridors have been operated as commuter rail, which is different from RTD's existing light rail service that you are familiar with. Commuter rail was chosen for these corridors because of their length, projected ridership and that they share rights-of-way with freight rail operations of the Union Pacific and Burlington Northern Santa Fe railroads. Diesel commuter rail vehicles have been used in the Northwest Rail corridor in order to be compatible with BNSF operations and requirements. Due to the recent increase in the cost of diesel fuel, the use of electrically powered commuter rail vehicles in this corridor is being re-assesed.</p>



Website Comments
September, October 2008

Stakeholder Comments/Issues	Responses
<p>I would like to suggest a modification and combination of two of the options presented into a new option. 1) Goal is to build the entire FasTracks Program in the shortest time possible. 2) If funding is not sufficient to build the entire FasTracks Program by 2017, then use the concept in Option 4 and on the North Metro Corridor do not stop at 112th Ave. either go to 124th and the Eastlake Station or if funding not enough that go to 104th Ave. and make all of the improvements to the south side of 112th Ave. and have the initial end of line station be at 104th Ave. with the grade separation at 104th Ave. 3). Obtain additional revenues to complete the FasTracks Program by the following: a) ASAP getting the approval of the State Legislature to ask the voters to extend the Stadium Sales Tax for FasTracks and have a vote by Nov.2009. b) Work with the Blue Ribbon Panel on recommendation to improve funding for transportation and with a part for transit for the State of Colorado and take the initiative to the voters for approval. c). Work with the Colorado Congressional delegation as they work in Congress on the new surface transportation act to get new funding for transit in the act and funding for projects like FasTracks and funding to make up the 3.2 billion dollars short fall.</p>	<p>The RTD Board is considering many funding options including the two that you suggested. Thank you for your comments. All comments on the FasTracks options being considered by the RTD Board have been compiled. A summary of the comments received have been provided to the RTD board members.</p>
<p>Please don't cut the SW extension to Lucent. Ridership will go up on the SW line if you build it. I can never get parking at Mineral on weekdays, or I would ride the SW line more. If you have to cut or postpone the four car station upgrades, do that.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. All comments on the FasTracks options being considered by the RTD Board have been compiled. A summary of the comments received have been provided to the RTD board members.</p>
<p>I believe the rail system must be finished in all its branches. We can go without artwork and use smelly diesel trains if we have to, but we MUST finish Fast Tracks. I am willing to pay higher taxes to accomplish this. Our neighborhood got rail first because the Santa Fe tracks go north-south through it. People who don't have Light Rail yet don't know what they are missing. If we don't build it Metro Denver will be unlivable in a few years with gridlock everywhere. What about letting the contract out to a private outfit like T-Rex? They finished ahead of schedule and under budget. Bureaucrats often waste time and money.</p>	<p>RTD is committed to pursuing a public private partnership to help to fund the East Corridor and Gold Line. Under this approach a private contractor would operate and maintain the serve and vehicles in those corridors. The RTD Board will also consider use of a design-build approach, as was used for the T-Rex project for other FasTracks corridors.</p> <p>Thank you for your comments. All comments on the FasTracks options being considered by the RTD Board have been compiled. A summary of the comments received have been provided to the RTD board members.</p>



Website Comments
September, October 2008

Stakeholder Comments/Issues	Responses
<p>Appears duplication with the West, Gold, Northwest, US 36 and North corridors with single arms. I would think a loop like the I-225 would be more cost effective and a serve the areas equally well. I also foresee a loop along C-470 connecting Southwest and Southeast.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. All comments on the FasTracks options being considered by the RTD Board have been compiled. A summary of the comments received have been provided to the RTD board members.</p>
<p>I am totally, 100% supportive of Option #5. I think any option that falls short of delivering the whole program is not sufficient. I am all for paying a little more sales tax or whatever we have to do to get this system. Public transit is, in my mind, the best way to mitigate problems such as air quality, greenhouse gas emissions and global warming, and traffic congestion. More efficient transit such as FasTracks will be necessary to entice more people out of their cars and onto public transit! Options 3 and 4 would be the next best thing, or any option that will at least build out the entire program eventually. I am somewhat supportive of options 3 and 4, but it appears that option 4 would have the I-225 corridor ending at 13th Ave. I would think that if you're going to shorten that corridor at all, it needs to go at least as far as Fitzsimmons. I see that option 3 would have it end at the Aurora City Center, so if you're not going to build that corridor all the way to Fitzsimmons, you might as well end it at the Aurora City Center. Please let me know if there is anything I can do to promote FasTracks. If we need to vote again for another increase in sales tax, I will vote yes and do what I can to encourage others to do the same. Thanks! Spencer</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. All comments on the FasTracks options being considered by the RTD Board have been compiled. A summary of the comments received have been provided to the RTD board members.</p>
<p>I would like to submit a vote for option 5.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. All comments on the FasTracks options being considered by the RTD Board have been compiled. A summary of the comments received have been provided to the RTD board members.</p>



Website Comments
September, October 2008

Stakeholder Comments/Issues	Responses
<p>Two comments... 1. FasTracks is obviously a very big project. However, I don't think most people understand the scale. Could you make a comparison of the size, problems, etc., between FasTracks and other projects? For example, how does this compare to Boston's "Big Dig"? 2. This project affects much more than completing FasTracks. In the real estate ads, convenience to rail/bus lines is included as a selling point. So, would it be possible to show the value of a rail line to a particular community? This may become more important when it comes time to sell a tax increase. In the presentation tonight, there wasn't any comment about how communities are affected. It needs to get done - now we need to hear the reasons why. I think a complete rail system is an investment in the whole region. It should be something we can be proud of.</p>	<p>Every project is unique, and RTD is leveraging best in industry resources to assure FasTracks is delivered in the best possible manner.</p> <p>The following link is to an article that describes the contribution of light rail to property values in the Denver region: http://www.denverpost.com/news/ci_10850014</p>
<p>Wouldn't the turkey plant be a better place for the RTD terminal location in Longmont? The turkey plant have a very large parking lot (over two city blocks) and is located adjacent to the train tracks and appears to be a better location to redevelop. Also, vehicle access as well as pedestrian access is much better at this location. If the RTD terminal is located at this site the redevelopment would also serve in revitalizing the Main Street Downtown District which the City and the LDDA have been trying to do for over a decade now with no success. You might consider partnering with the City at this location in an effort to reduce your costs. Maybe the City can contribute to some of the cost, at least the cost of the terminal structure. The turkey plant have and is laying off workers. This may be an opportunity for you, the City and the turkey plant owners.</p>	<p>As the Northwest Rail project progresses additional analysis have been conducted for station planning including finalizing the locations for stations.</p> <p>Thank you for your comments. All comments on the FasTracks options being considered by the RTD Board have been compiled. A summary of the comments received have been provided to the RTD board members.</p>
<p>Please do not base the need for building out the Northwest Corridor on current ridership, as the levels will be affected by having the option of Fastracks. I work with people who must utilize medical facilities in Denver and the need for a direct trip to Denver, and Fast Tracks will address these needs.</p>	<p>The options were developed using projected ridership for the year 2035.</p>



Website Comments
September, October 2008

Stakeholder Comments/Issues	Responses
<p>After reviewing the current options available I would like to say that Option #5 would be the best alternative. I think that it is very important to keep building and stay close to the original fast-track plan but definately try to minimize the costs on ticket fares and parking. As a regular Lightrail user, I would not see the benefit in riding if it were to cost me more annually than the cost of driving my car. I think that the importance of finishing the project is high, citizens need this esp. in this economic time.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. All comments on the FasTracks options being considered by the RTD Board have been compiled. A summary of the comments received have been provided to the RTD board members.</p>
<p>How do I find out if my minority, disabled veteran owned small business is on the Bidders List? Thanks.</p>	<p>Use this link to get to the "Doing Business with the RTD" page on the RTD website: http://www.rtd-denver.com/Business/do-business-with-rtd.htm</p> <p>Scroll down, then click on: RTD Bidders List</p>
<p>I attended a FasTracks meeting in Highlands Ranch. I believe Option 5 is the only viable option since it serves the transportation needs on the entire metro area. However, in searching for additional revenue have you thought of combining with CDOT to raise the gas tax. The people who use the most gas should help the rest of us seek alternative forms of transportation to reduce energy usage and also lessen the ozone layer in Colorado. It was mentioned that RTD could also allow a business to come in and build one part of the tracts. The RTD representation mentioned there was interest in this and the private group through they could make a profit which would certainly help alleviate the burden on the tax payers. The problem with the other options is that if something is half done people will claim it is not convenient for them to ride it and again without a build out it does little to help with our pollution problems. Thank you.</p>	<p>The options were developed using projected ridership for the year 2035. Thank you for your comments. All comments on the FasTracks options being considered by the RTD Board have been compiled. A summary of the comments received have been provided to the RTD board members.</p>
<p>Lets get it built now, the longer we continue tio wait the more prices will escalate. we need the additional public transportation options yesterday it needs to quit being put off till tomorrow.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. All comments on the FasTracks options being considered by the RTD Board have been compiled. A summary of the comments received have been provided to the RTD board members.</p>



Website Comments
September, October 2008

Stakeholder Comments/Issues	Responses
<p>I want to encourage RTD to seek to find the funding and complete Fast Tracks. The change in economy makes this an imperative plan. The need for good accessible public transportation effects economics, tourism, abilities of the poor and disadvantaged, environment all of which effects every citizen's quality of life. Thank you. Carol Wildebrandt</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. All comments on the FasTracks options being considered by the RTD Board have been compiled. A summary of the comments received have been provided to the RTD board members.</p>
<p>The 2008 General Election, when only Denver's school tax initiative passed, shows that in this economic climate, it is unlikely that voters will approve a sales tax increase. Moreover, a sales tax is regressive; it penalizes low to moderate income residents. I recommend that RTD consider a revised option: finish the corridors under construction, finish the Gold and East lines, and finish one additional corridor that shows the most benefit for the cost. Stop work on studies for the other corridors, except to explore where additional commuter bus or BRT may be cost-effective. Scale back the Union Station project or find more private financing for it. I believe the NW Corridor should be dropped from FasTracks unless developers or local governments are willing to shoulder the cost to pay for it. Much of the route overlaps the US 36 BRT anyway. If one more rail corridor is to be completed, it should be the one with the best cost-benefit ratio. It should show high potential to qualify for FTA New Starts funding. Also, RTD must look at bus transit as a cost-effective alternative to rail transit when doing the cost-benefit analyses.</p> <p>Combined with HOV/HOT projects funded by CDOT or others, bus transit may be the best alternative along I-225 and I-25 north of Denver until the economic conditions improve. Also, RTD promised better bus service in the 2004 FasTracks proposal, and many of us are still waiting impatiently for that to happen. Again, I think it is unrealistic for RTD to think voters will pass another sales tax increase. RTD needs to be prepared to pursue an option that does not depend on it. Asking local governments to increase property taxes may also be unpopular, but at least property owners can deduct property taxes from their Federal income tax liability, unlike sales taxes. It's also less regressive than sales taxes. One final note: there is a good reason why FTA requires cost-benefit analysis for New Starts funding. I think if RTD had done a more realistic and rigorous cost analysis to begin with, you wouldn't be in this situation. This comment is my personal opinion as a resident, transit supporter and rider. It does not reflect the views of any government agency or organization. Thank you.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. All comments on the FasTracks options being considered by the RTD Board have been compiled. A summary of the comments received have been provided to the RTD board members.</p>



Website Comments
September, October 2008

Stakeholder Comments/Issues	Responses
<p>Dear Sir/madam..I'm a graduate student at UCD..I'm required to submit a report to my professor about RTD Fastracks project..Trying to figure out alternatives to the Project revenues..I would like, if it possible to know how much money the project is short, considering the total cost of 7.9 billion till 2017..I really apprecaite your response... Best Regards...</p>	<p>The budget for the FasTracks plan approved by the voters in 2004 was \$4.7 billion. The current projected cost estimate for the FasTracks program is \$7.9 billion. The difference between those two figures (\$3.2 billion), in broad terms, could be considered to be the budget "shortfall."</p>