

## September 20, 2007 - Public Workshop Comments, Highlands Masonic Center, Denver, CO

Respondent	Do you support this recommendation? If so, why?	Do you disagree with this recommendation? If so, why?	Do you have other comments about the recommendation?	Are there any other options that RTD should consider?	What other issues specific to DMU technology should the Environmental Evaluation address?	Other comments	What should the study consider as it examines stations and track alignment?	What other issues are important to you for the Environmental Evaluation?
1.	Yes. DMU are economical in diesel consumption, quiet write Tier II complaint diesel engines and last, the cost of EMU is nearly prohibitive.	NO.	One point which should be made is DMU are more quiet than diesel locomotives, and if the power goes out, an EMU train is dead in its tracks. If power goes out, DMU can continue to operate.					
2.	Very much so. Electrifying this corridor is simply not financially feasible. I would like this corridor up and running ASAP. It was presented as DMU from the beginning and that's what the timeline is based on.	Not at all.	EMU isn't as clean as a lot of people think. Can you bring this to more people's attention?	No. DMU is the only reasonable option.	Are the double Decker DMU cars a possibility?		Feeder bus routes to the station to reduce car traffic and pollution.	Quiet zones!

## September 20, 2007 - Public Workshop Comments, Highlands Masonic Center, Denver, CO

Respondent	Do you support this recommendation? If so, why?	Do you disagree with this recommendation? If so, why?	Do you have other comments about the recommendation?	Are there any other options that RTD should consider?	What other issues specific to DMU technology should the Environmental Evaluation address?	Other comments	What should the study consider as it examines stations and track alignment?	What other issues are important to you for the Environmental Evaluation?
3.	Yes, emphatically. I feel it is realistic from a financial standpoint, whereas the other is now. Also, possible extensions to points north would be easier.		The position concerns by many attendees are overblown. The DMUs are not some-belching pollution machines. Also, EMU is not zero emission. That electricity has to be generated somewhere, and odds are, it'll be a coal-fired plant. What about these neighborhoods?	Nope. Go with DMU.	Double-decker feasibility, in light of cost-sharing with the gold line and DUS.		TOD	Quiet zones. Corridor wide? If not, where?
4.			A. I love the concept of steel wheels on steel rails. ~10X as efficient (energy used to move a weight thru a distance) as rubber tires over concrete. B. I love the idea of regenerative braking. (RTD	But, I have read Weicher's 24 July 2007 letter to Marla Lien: Catenary-electrification expense is prohibiting high, for Denver-Longmont.	A. Build the track (to FRA standards). B. Forget about overhead electric. C. Use "straight" diesel cars for now. D. Live for the day when lightweight diesel-electric			

# September 20, 2007 - Public Workshop Comments, Highlands Masonic Center, Denver, CO

Respondent	Do you support this recommendation? If so, why?	Do you disagree with this recommendation? If so, why?	Do you have other comments about the recommendation?	Are there any other options that RTD should consider?	What other issues specific to DMU technology should the Environmental Evaluation address?	Other comments	What should the study consider as it examines stations and track alignment?	What other issues are important to you for the Environmental Evaluation?
			should stress this point to the public.) Combination: much lower operating costs.		hybrids will be here, that will include regenerative braking (energy-storage in on-board batteries._ Thirty years is a short period when considering public projects!			
5.	Only if it will have sufficient passengers using it to make it worth the cost. The RTD buses that run on 80th Ave. usually have very few passengers.		I would like to know if the new track will be built on the East or West side of the existing track? If it is on the East side, it wouldn't affect the houses that are on Tennyson that are North of 80th Ave.		Noise			

## September 20, 2007 - Public Workshop Comments, Highlands Masonic Center, Denver, CO

Respondent	Do you support this recommendation? If so, why?	Do you disagree with this recommendation? If so, why?	Do you have other comments about the recommendation?	Are there any other options that RTD should consider?	What other issues specific to DMU technology should the Environmental Evaluation address?	Other comments	What should the study consider as it examines stations and track alignment?	What other issues are important to you for the Environmental Evaluation?
6.	Yes, I would rather not have wires installed behind my house.			The DMU currently makes the most sense. Keep your options open for new technologies.	Emissions is the biggest deal		Private property along the rail. Do what's best for the neighbors in terms of where there is more space.	Horn noise!! I am a big supporter of the "quiet zone"! I'm at 94th/Wadsworth. A horn blowing 4-8 times per hour would turn a bearable nuisance into an unbearable nuisance. The "quiet zone" would actually make this added rail service a benefit for me and all others along the line due to less horn blowing than I currently have with 7/day.
7.		It defeats the whole purpose of FasTracks, i.e., to reduce pollution and improve quality of life. Significant negative impacts of this technology.	It makes no sense to me to spend \$600 million for a system the public rejects. Find a way to build the system the taxpayers approved in 2004.					

## September 20, 2007 - Public Workshop Comments, Highlands Masonic Center, Denver, CO

Respondent	Do you support this recommendation? If so, why?	Do you disagree with this recommendation? If so, why?	Do you have other comments about the recommendation?	Are there any other options that RTD should consider?	What other issues specific to DMU technology should the Environmental Evaluation address?	Other comments	What should the study consider as it examines stations and track alignment?	What other issues are important to you for the Environmental Evaluation?
8.	No	The people of Globeville-Elyria-Swansea all ready have had and still have enough air emission from - elevate I-70 - Suncor Purina - and railroads - Exel	The EMU would add less air emission.					
9.	No	EMU	Swansea, Elyria & Globeville have been subjected to industry - I-70 - Noise, railroads, foul smells. All types of environmental problems. For at least 49 years that I can recall. Give us a break and a bit of respect - EMU for us					

## September 20, 2007 - Public Workshop Comments, Highlands Masonic Center, Denver, CO

Respondent	Do you support this recommendation? If so, why?	Do you disagree with this recommendation? If so, why?	Do you have other comments about the recommendation?	Are there any other options that RTD should consider?	What other issues specific to DMU technology should the Environmental Evaluation address?	Other comments	What should the study consider as it examines stations and track alignment?	What other issues are important to you for the Environmental Evaluation?
10.	Yes. DMU saves money! This is an existing rail corridor and I bet BNSF only use electric (overhead wire type) locomotives on the corridor... Also - future extensions of commuter rail (N. of Longmont) to Loveland, Ft. Collins, Cheyenne would be easier for DMU technology	No	Save money and use DMU!!					
11.	Yes! Important to stay on schedule and keep budget under control. In a perfect world electric would be nice but...							

## September 20, 2007 - Public Workshop Comments, Highlands Masonic Center, Denver, CO

Respondent	Do you support this recommendation? If so, why?	Do you disagree with this recommendation? If so, why?	Do you have other comments about the recommendation?	Are there any other options that RTD should consider?	What other issues specific to DMU technology should the Environmental Evaluation address?	Other comments	What should the study consider as it examines stations and track alignment?	What other issues are important to you for the Environmental Evaluation?
12.	No. DMU is an antiquated option now, and will be a dinosaur in another 8 years. This is absolutely the wrong choice for our children's future. Further pollution of our air and increased noise pollution is not worth the supposed "cost savings."		RTD needs to listen to the voice of the people instead of catering to whatever lobbyists they are listening too. The people are footing the bill -- we should get what we want. Where is the mayor on this? He is suspiciously quiet so far...	The cost for the entire system will be recouped in 30 years. Quit singling this line out - take into account the entire system.		TOD will be more difficult around DMU -- who wants to live by that? Our TOD plans for this station will be extremely difficult to sell.	The maintenance facility. Those neighborhoods will suffer negative impacts with these trains being stored & repaired there. Why should all metro Denver receive the benefits of electric and North Denver suffer with the pollution? We are paying for this as well!	

## September 20, 2007 - Public Workshop Comments, Highlands Masonic Center, Denver, CO

Respondent	Do you support this recommendation? If so, why?	Do you disagree with this recommendation? If so, why?	Do you have other comments about the recommendation?	Are there any other options that RTD should consider?	What other issues specific to DMU technology should the Environmental Evaluation address?	Other comments	What should the study consider as it examines stations and track alignment?	What other issues are important to you for the Environmental Evaluation?
13.	No to DMU -- I would have never have voted for FasTracks had I known DMU would be considered. Use EMU only, please.	Yes, one area of town should not be asked to carry the burden of DMU, all should be EMU, or none. The payback for the entire system should be considered, not line by line.	No DMU.					
14.	No. RTD should not decide on DMU on NW line until the environmental impact of the maintenance facility has been determined. RTD should make an effort to negotiate with BNSF about the bridge issue.	Disagree -- see above.	The format for this forum was terrible. People should be allowed to hear the comments and concerns of their neighbors. The group presentation was an attempt at a "sales job" for DMU and the presenter refused to answer any substantive questions. It seemed an attempt to "divide and					

## September 20, 2007 - Public Workshop Comments, Highlands Masonic Center, Denver, CO

Respondent	Do you support this recommendation? If so, why?	Do you disagree with this recommendation? If so, why?	Do you have other comments about the recommendation?	Are there any other options that RTD should consider?	What other issues specific to DMU technology should the Environmental Evaluation address?	Other comments	What should the study consider as it examines stations and track alignment?	What other issues are important to you for the Environmental Evaluation?
			conquer" which is not appreciated.					
15.	Yes! DMU seems to have a similar benefit on air quality as an EMU system. Diesel fuel technologies appear to be advancing pretty well. EMU vs. DMU = dirty coal vs. cleaner bio-diesel	No.	RTD-FasTracks is doing a stellar job at informing the public.					
16.	Yes. The DMU option is the preferred option for many reasons -- start up time, costs, local carriage provider, aesthetically much better	No. It has been carefully analyzed except for carbon footprint of both systems.	Delete the public evaluation shown on your charts. If the respondents have used both EMU and DMU you can use that data -- but as we known 99% of your unscientific people	Reduce # of stations. Dump the EMU option.	Improve gate crossing safety and reliability to reduce horn use. Soften ballasts (or ties) in industrial areas.	Run reversal DMU and EMU trial runs between Boulder-Denver open to the public.	Look at rail station at Transit Village in Subaco Western Australia. They have a web site or I can give you	

## September 20, 2007 - Public Workshop Comments, Highlands Masonic Center, Denver, CO

Respondent	Do you support this recommendation? If so, why?	Do you disagree with this recommendation? If so, why?	Do you have other comments about the recommendation?	Are there any other options that RTD should consider?	What other issues specific to DMU technology should the Environmental Evaluation address?	Other comments	What should the study consider as it examines stations and track alignment?	What other issues are important to you for the Environmental Evaluation?
			have NOT ridden on both these. You should delete that info in your final report to the public and the RTD Board.			Do double track only at stations throughout .	power point from them. Speed up the start date to reduce costs of vehicle damage and accidents and injuries along US36. Identify best possible connections to the 7 rail stations. Bike routes or e.g., HOT or a shuttle service.	

*\*Comments submitted by Kim Kucera on behalf of Judy Montero are attached.*