



Commuter Rail Maintenance Facility (CRMF) Environmental Assessment (EA) Public Workshop Summary

Date of Contact: 1/22/2009
Meeting: CRMF Public Workshop
Presenters: Rick Pilgrim, URS; Nadine Lee, RTD; Cody Wertz, GBSM
Number of Attendees: 65
Purpose: Review Project and Introduce New Options

Meeting Summary

Cody Wertz, a member of the CRMF project team, welcomed workshop attendees to the CRMF public workshop to introduce the new options under consideration for the CRMF and acknowledged the elected officials in attendance, including many RTD Board Members. He also described the various methods available to the public for submitting comments:

- Verbally at the workshop
- Electronically at the on-site computer comment stations
- Written on the comment forms provided during the workshop
- Email at crm@rtd-fastracks.com or bmf@rtd-fastracks.com
- Online at the FasTracks website (www.rtd-fastracks.com)
- Phone at 303-299-2000

Cody introduced Nadine Lee, RTD CRMF project manager, who welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked people for coming. Nadine introduced URS project manager, Rick Pilgrim, who gave the project update presentation.

Rick Pilgrim began the workshop presentation with a brief project overview and outlined the goals of the meeting, which were to update the public, neighborhoods and stakeholders on the CRMF project, gather public input and provide information on how to stay informed on the Environmental Assessment (EA) process. Rick proceeded to outline the workshop format, consisting of the presentation, followed-by a question and answer session and, if time allowed, additional opportunity for the public to review the project exhibits and interact individually with the project team.

The next portion of Rick's presentation reviewed the specific items that are required to be evaluated in an EA, and he provided a step-by-step description of the CRMF EA process. He followed this description with a detailed breakdown of the CRMF project history.

Rick then proceeded with a detailed overview of the two CRMF options currently under consideration, Option A and Option B. His description included the reasons why the Fox North site (Option B) warranted further consideration, likely scenarios following the selection for each option, a map of the two potential CRMF sites and a map of the

potential Bus Maintenance Facility (BMF) sites under consideration if Option A (advancing the Platte site) is recommended to move forward in the process.

Rick and Cody concluded the presentation by previewing the next steps and the anticipated schedule for the CRMF project. They then restated the avenues available to the public for submitting their comments, reiterated the importance of public involvement in the EA process, and began the question and answer portion of the workshop.

Verbal Comments and Themes

Prior to the question and answer session, the project team provided several items for the public's consideration when formulating comments:

- What are the advantages of Option A?
- What are the disadvantages of Option A?
- What are the advantages of Option B?
- What are the disadvantages of Option B?
- What environmental interests do you have comments about?

Members of the public asked specific questions of Nadine, Rick and Cody and the presenters were able to address all of the workshop attendees' questions on-site. Major themes included:

Option A: Option A was not verbally endorsed by any workshop attendees. The reasons cited were related to land use and planned development surrounding the Platte site and the need to relocate the BMF, if Option A were advanced. Attendees wanted assurance that the existing BMF site would serve RTD's future needs. General support was communicated for Option B.

Option B: Numerous members of the public expressed a preference for Option B due to cost savings, industrial zoning/land use, eliminating the need to relocate the existing BMF and personal preference. A few stakeholders expressed the desire for more information regarding Option B, such as traffic analysis, and will reserve their endorsement of locating the CRMF at Fox North (Option B) until more information becomes available.

Other Issues: Some concern was expressed regarding the feasibility of Option B and the public wanted assurance that no fatal flaws would be revealed in the EA process. One comment expressed concern regarding the costs associated with re-evaluation of the CRMF options and another comment focused on the confusion caused by the various ongoing corridor studies and the difficulty in understanding which project will be addressed by which study. An interest in revitalizing the former Denver Post site was also expressed.