

September 24, 2007 - Public Workshop Comments, Celestial Seasonings, Boulder, CO

R e s p o n d e n t	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.	No	Yes. If NWR is to go ahead then it should be EMU powered for all the obvious reasons. How to achieve this without breaking the bank? DON'T ELECTRIFY THE BRIDGES! Leave them at their current height and just make sure the train is moving fast enough so it will have power from the overhead electric lines leading to each bridge, and the leading edge of the train will pick up the electricity as it exits the bridge. NYC subways have operated this way for years (and yes, the lights in the cars will temporarily go out [unless backed by an energy back-up]).						
2.	Yes, cost			No	Noise, horn blast		Noise	

September 24, 2007 - Public Workshop Comments, Celestial Seasonings, Boulder, CO

R e s p o n d e n t	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.	No, I will only support EMU technology	Yes, every meeting I have attended has said the same thing & none of it is fiscally responsible. Any transportation system that takes twice as long to reach its destination, i.e. train vs. bus transit on 36 from Boulder to Denver, has no hope of being successful.	Stop having meetings & start the process of finalizing the part of FasTracks in Denver that makes sense, i.e. to DIA. Then bring the other parts of the project back to the voters	Yes, finish the project to DIA; abandon the NW corridor except for bus rapid transit along 36 and on to Longmont-build stations in the median for fast entering and exiting.	It is a bad technology and will not solve any transportation issues - people will bring lawsuits	I read that DMU has to be chosen as Burlington Northern objects to electric trains near their tracks - why didn't RTD get an answer from the railroad before spending all the money getting this far and having no successful public input as to our ideas and concerns.		
4.		Yes I believe that commuter rail is not the most efficient use of FasTracks money. The funds should be utilized to improve BRT.		Cancel the planned Northwest Rail corridor				

September 24, 2007 - Public Workshop Comments, Celestial Seasonings, Boulder, CO

R e s p o n d e n t	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?
5.	No	Yes, so far it seems to be financially disastrous - over budget. A frightening impact on the Boulder and other community's sound impact, population and other congested traffic concerns.	We are already severely impeded by the trains noise be it at daytimes or 4 a.m. - Our sleep is constantly interrupted even at present. How is this going to improve our quality of life? I see no benefit to this transit project.	At this time I don't have the understanding of all options as possibilities. I would hope the experts would see the disaster from us, the residents.	All environmental issues - sound levels - for humans and animals, pollution, safety concerns	None	Peace and Quiet!	Peace and Quiet!
6.	No. The residents of NP are very concerned about noise and the impact of noise on property values. Currently the noise from the freight trains is intolerable to add 50 to 60 trips per day is insane.		There is a severe noise impact currently in our neighborhood. To add additional trips is insane. There are thousands of homes within a short 5 intersection crossing area. Freight trains rattle their horns all night. Property values have					

September 24, 2007 - Public Workshop Comments, Celestial Seasonings, Boulder, CO

R e s p o n d e n t	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?
			decreased. To add more trains with mitigation is crazy.					
7.	No - I didn't support this in the first place.							
8.	No!	Yes - I don't believe people will want to commute on a slow moving, diesel smelling, and inconvenient mode of transportation. Boulder is selling out to developers and special interests.						
9.	The noise will be awful! 10x the trains, 40 crossings/4 horns each time, same kinds of horns as now. Wow - impossible! Why	EMU - please, use electric commuter rail - less noise, pollution	It seems to me that the 36 corridor is far more important. I am concerned about noise w/ frequency of new rail use. What about traffic	Don't do the Boulder/Longmont portion yet	Noise, pollution, cost, fuel dependency in the future		Quality of life in Boulder. Congestion impact on drivers in Boulder. We are an aging population in	Sound impact, accidents, increased taxes w/ price overruns, consider more buses in bus only lanes

September 24, 2007 - Public Workshop Comments, Celestial Seasonings, Boulder, CO

R e s p o n d e n t	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?
	do trains run all night		congestion w/ frequent rail crossings? Boulder already has many places where in town traffic locks up. Is the Boulder to Longmont leg necessary? Is the length of time it takes to travel from Boulder to Denver convenient for commuters?				general - consider ease for the elderly.	
10.	No	Favor electric					Check into lowering the tracks to clear all bridges and not block views, adds sound mitigation. Review what Reno, NV did to the main U.P. tracks to relieve	

September 24, 2007 - Public Workshop Comments, Celestial Seasonings, Boulder, CO

R e s p o n d e n t	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?
							congestion running through Reno's downtown area.	
11.	No	Yes. Better long-term design - fewer future problems to mitigate.	If cost is the issue, how about asking the voters for a raise? A poorly accepted solution will no bring long term benefits or encourage more projects.	Abandon or delay the project until money to do it right is available.				
12.			I'd like a quiet zone around the Diagonal and 47th area. The freight train noise (loudness and length of horns has gotten much worse this summer). Adding more trains will just make the noise worse. Please create a quiet zone.					

September 24, 2007 - Public Workshop Comments, Celestial Seasonings, Boulder, CO

R e s p o n d e n t	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.			Don't have station in Gunbarrel. Have congestion now.					
14.	No, when we voted it was for Electric!	I will support electric only!	Quit spending our money on task study groups and use it to buy an EMU!	Light Rail down the middle of the Diagonal Only.	No DMU			
15.	NO!!!! It is ecologically unsound! There is no consideration of the environmental damage. The rail will be so slow that few will ride it. It will create noise and soot. Only electric rail should be put down US 36. (Survey engineers could explain how to get down/up Davidson	Yes. It is stupid; Boulder voters thought the (crafty) RTD ballot on FasTracks was for light rail. The train is not wanted by Boulder voters! The savings by forgetting the Northwest Rail can more than pay for a light rail along 36.	RTD is wrong for not taking into consideration the GLOBAL WARMING and disappearance of corridor supplies.					

September 24, 2007 - Public Workshop Comments, Celestial Seasonings, Boulder, CO

R e s p o n d e n t	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?
	Mesa). That electric 36 route would be faster and carry more passengers and not hurt the environment.							
16.	If we want to get to EMU technology eventually (by 2025), I think it is better to restrict the size of the network and install EMU from the beginning. Building a good, but small, network is better than building a large network with inappropriate technology.	Disagree	Funding of quiet zones by RTD is critical, and needs to be done from the beginning. My concern is the sounding of horns, a noise pollution that will destroy public support for FASTRACKS.	Complete the corridor in two or more phases. Only go as far as current funding allows, This has added benefit of allowing RTD to learn from initial building phase. Later phases will be done better.	Noise from horns is key. Secondary, noise from engines. Quiet zones must be funded as a line item within RTD budget.		Where should growth occur per comprehensive plans of various communities. Stations should go where growth is wanted and space is available.	
17.	I actually think the whole project has been misrepresented.		I feel that this whole system is problematic - EMU or DMU - it doesn't				Horns and property values - noise pollution!	

September 24, 2007 - Public Workshop Comments, Celestial Seasonings, Boulder, CO

R e s p o n d e n t	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?
	"FasTracks" sounds like light rail which is what most voters thought they were voting for. I don't support either recommendation.		make much difference. The noise pollution is going to be enormous - 40 crossings! I feel that a system that had focused as highway improvements and dedicated bus lanes w/ hi technology buses would have been far better. What of bus capacity is even being used?					
18.	No-I have serious concerns about the environmental impact of the diesel emissions-- especially for those whose homes are along the line. I understand that the cost would be		I am still concerned with the noise impact and feel that we absolutely need to have quiet zones throughout the line!		Environmental impact to those living on the line			

September 24, 2007 - Public Workshop Comments, Celestial Seasonings, Boulder, CO

R e s p o n d e n t	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?
	higher with electric but I don't think you can compare that with the potential health risks.							
19.		Yes-electric trains are my preference						
20.	Yes, the equipment costs need to be minimized when looking at the overall budget crunch for doing the project. The investments should be concentrated in lower noise levels, especially at crossings. Quiet zones should be a paramount concern.			Serious consideration should be given to bus rapid transit and roadway dedication or improvements for buses.		The theory called "rail is sexy" will make people want to ride is erroneous. If capacity issues for lower density routes make rail a luxury then it should be scrubbed--all politics put aside--and a cheaper (bus)	Noise impacts to surrounding neighborhoods	Coordination with CDOT as it renovates highway and rail combined intersections (e.g., 63rd Street Diagonal Hwy). Grade separation overpass/underpass in a combined project could make sense.

September 24, 2007 - Public Workshop Comments, Celestial Seasonings, Boulder, CO

R e s p o n d e n t	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?
						alternative implemented.		
21.	Yes, it is a long term need and with EMU we cannot afford it.	No.	The focus on stations that will allow dense development is the only way this will have the ridership.					
22.	No	Should have told the public 30 mph on the ballot issue.	Faster!!					
23.	Yes, in that I would prefer DMU to no rail at all. In other words, I'd prefer EMU, but I'd also be happy with DMU if it helps to ensure that we get this commuting option.		I've heard that there is no federal funding to support this project. Is this true? How can federal transportation dollars be secured to help defray the costs?	Is it possible to secure federal funding to help support this project (DMU or EMU)?				

September 24, 2007 - Public Workshop Comments, Celestial Seasonings, Boulder, CO

R e s p o n d e n t	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?
24.	No!!! No need to go through neighborhoods. Keep it on the highways!	Don't want the noise, buses, etc. No walls in our beautiful valley. Fear it would bring our property vales down here in Gunbarrel.	I want to protect our wildlife.	None!				
25.			The noise analysis was done by averaging the sound over 24 hours. This is unacceptable. The trains are loud and more freight will be at night. Lower income communities like San Juan del Centro will be heavily impacted. This is an environmental justice issue.					Noise

September 24, 2007 - Public Workshop Comments, Celestial Seasonings, Boulder, CO

R e s p o n d e n t	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?
26.		I think it lacks vision for what is a project with a very long time frame. The US is just beginning to invest in renewable energy. Your data shows that electricity and diesel inflating at an equal rate which I believe is completely unrealistic.	I support an EMU system. I think that ridership will be much higher with a local based system with multiple stops rather than a system conducive only for long distance trips.	I think that RTD needs to address the budget issues both by evaluating spending and seeking more funds when necessary.	Quiet zones are absolutely necessary for Niwot and other communities along the tracks.	A strong supporting system of small buses as well as bicycle access for stations and parking.	Access for all.	Noise, pollution.
27.	No	Yes. Too many crossings interfere with traffic leaving Gunbarrel. Also too many horns at crossings. Diesel pollution!		Give the \$\$ back to the taxpayers and abandon the Longmont to Boulder section.				
28.	Yes-aesthetically better--no overhead electric lines. More practical initial cost. Other factors are similar.	No.	Areas near open space--visual impact of overhead lines would be very adverse. Get it done!		Study presented says air pollution is equivalent impact. Very important that this be carried through. What is the impact of reliance on fossil fuel in the long run? i.e., major cost increases?		Sound impact of horns, impact of traffic locally, such as where Pearl Street crosses the track at transit village. Safety	System needs to be easy to get to, easy to board, etc. so people will use it. Get cars off the road. Handicap access!

September 24, 2007 - Public Workshop Comments, Celestial Seasonings, Boulder, CO

R e s p o n d e n t	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?
							and delays.	
29.	Not only am I opposed to the entire FasTracks project, I am opposed to the fact that by using FTA numbers of 'O' moderate impact for noise. As a resident of a neighborhoods that is impacted, I resent the 'O' moderate impact.	I don't want either (EMU or DMU). If I had to pick one, then EMU.		Stop the entire NW corridor project and cut your losses!	None. You need a more in-depth study concerning noise.		Noise. No NW Corridor. If anything, run the train up 36 and re-grade the mesa.	Noise, noise, noise.

September 24, 2007 - Public Workshop Comments, Celestial Seasonings, Boulder, CO

R e s p o n d e n t	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?
30.	No.	You should look at diesel electric which is a proven technology both in freight service and for many years in England and Europe.	You should eliminate as many grade crossings as possible to reduce conflicts with local traffic.	Diesel electric.				Noise
31.	Yes. Cost and visual.						Jobs/housing/commuter village. I think Gunbarrel would be a preferable site for the stop and would like to be involved in the process leading to that decision. I own a site in Gunbarrel suitable for a town center and see the importance of the Northwest Rail in proximity.	

September 24, 2007 - Public Workshop Comments, Celestial Seasonings, Boulder, CO

R e s p o n d e n t	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?
32.	No-mistake to stay with diesel for densely populated transit. Believe study results slanted unfairly in favor of diesel.	Yes. Disagree. Results slanted. Progress dictates a better solution. RR freight should also be using electric rail.	Ground based electric pick offs could be implemented without the use of overhead catenaries. Modification at grade crossing should be considerably less cost than rebuilding bridges.					
33.	No, the idea of a heavy rail system was not well thought out. These are too many impacts with the system. Stick to buses.		Please do not try to railroad us with talk about EMUs. They are twice as expensive as DMU. Anyone with an IQ equal to a turnip know RTD will never use EMU on the corridor so please stop wasting our time and focus the talk on the impacts	Buses! Stick to a technology you know something about.	Noise! Horns! Maintenance yards. Traffic delays at every crossing. Visual aspects, such as fences.		Noise from horns. ? Along tracks.	

September 24, 2007 - Public Workshop Comments, Celestial Seasonings, Boulder, CO

R e s p o n d e n t	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?
			DMUs will have.					
34.	No! As planned, I don't believe ridership will warrant cost. In addition, I m emphatically opposed to DMUs because of both noise and vibration.	Yes, see above.	Commute times will be too long. It is short sighted to eliminate EMUS due to cost, if system must be implemented, it should be EMUs!	Do nothing. Improve bus service!	Noise, vibration, pollution.		Easy to access stations as opposed to central stations in Boulder, Longmont and Louisville	
35.	Coincidentally, I am very concerned about whistle noise. What efforts are being made to reduce this noise? Also, what are the effects on traffic on Pearl, 55th Street, 47th Street, Valmont and others?		The economic analysis for DMU vs. EMU uses diesel fuel costs at \$2.52/gallon. Was a sensitivity analysis performed with diesel fuel costs as a variable? What is the best option with diesel fuel at \$10 a gallon (hold the electric costs constant at .85)	Yes, bring EMUs as far north as the budget will allow for now, then extend it in the future.				

September 24, 2007 - Public Workshop Comments, Celestial Seasonings, Boulder, CO

R e s p o n d e n t	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?
36.		Yes, I disagree. Prefer additional bus service.	Trains: pollute, will disturb my sleep. We already hear horns at: 1) Niwot, 2) Monarch, 3) 63rd, 4) Jay Road. Too expensive for what was originally voted for.	Make this a bus service tied into 36 corridor.	Horns at every crossing.	I see people riding the bus down Hwy 287, more would with buses, special bus lanes on 36		
37.	Yes, keeping the project rolling is important. Technology may change, if so we can shift on the fly.		Great job, Tim! I was embarrassed by a few (a minority) loud and rude guests.	No.	Quiet zones in every community that is part of FasTracks. Coach the communities toward implementation BEFORE construction (or as early as possible).			
38.	No-route should be down Hwy 36 where people live and shop.	No-noise pollution. May be cheapest way, but is poor quality.	Use light rail in areas where people need transportation.					
39.	No.	No.	No, no, no. Diesel trains, horns day and night, air pollution.	No.			Noise, air pollution	Clean air, no noise from horns.

September 24, 2007 - Public Workshop Comments, Celestial Seasonings, Boulder, CO

R e s p o n d e n t	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?
40.	No! I live 1 1/2 miles away from existing diesel train tracks and my house vibrates when trains go by. I voted for <u>light</u> rail and I define that to be not diesel locomotives.	Do we need more dependence on petroleum products?	Ask us to vote again! This time give us the choice of light rail electric, diesel or <u>nothing</u> .	Wait for more money.				
41.	Yes-it is the most practical. I just wish it could happen tomorrow.		I've ridden commuter rail in many cities and I know how well it works. Diesels are going to be cleaner and quieter as time goes on. We should not demand EMU technology right now. We need to just get the trains running!		There needs to be a plan in place to mitigate any diesel fuel spills that may happen.	Grade crossings need to be protected so that horn noise is reduced. This approach also makes the crossings safer. Figure out how to do this!	I have heard that there was to be a station at about 63rd and Arapahoe in east Boulder, but that station was eliminated. I think that a station should be at that location.	Be sure that Boulder residents can get to the Transit Village. Could Special Transit be contracted to run a jitney service? Could RTD make some routes that are more direct from North Boulder to Transit Village?

September 24, 2007 - Public Workshop Comments, Celestial Seasonings, Boulder, CO

R e s p o n d e n t	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?
42.	Yes, most cost effective at this time.				Noise mitigation, grade crossing safety		Multiple stations in Boulder and Longmont. Local bus service to stations.	
43.	No! No! No! No! No! FasTracks implies fast tracks, not a 30 mph choo-choo. Under EIS guidelines, RTD is supposed to consider all alternatives. You never considered the Hong Kong Airport Express model.	I hat the fraud you've pulled on the public. The EIS hearings charade to satisfy the feds you've gone through the motions of taking public comments all of which RTD ignored.	Resubmit FasTracks as a vote to the public. Be honest. Call it a choo-choo, with a bus add-on. See if anyone votes for it if you're honest.	Re-submit it for a vote by the public. Get federal funds for a Hong Kong Airport Express style train.	Make it quiet	Be honest to the public. Call the project SLOTracks.	The alternatives! Copy the Hong Kong Airport Express.	Provide a fast, convenient alternative to cars, not a 30 mph choo-choo.

September 24, 2007 - Public Workshop Comments, Celestial Seasonings, Boulder, CO

R e s p o n d e n t	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?
44.			Biggest concern is noise.					Noise. Boulder and Boulder County need to become quiet zones.
45.		I think for the future long term investment in environment, the electrical would be a more sound decision.					Environmental impact. Noise.	
46.	Yes, lower cost and no wires.						Noise. Horn blowing at grade crossings is a major concern of mine. Current commercial trains are very loud and increase in traffic could make living near grade	Noise, noise, noise.

September 24, 2007 - Public Workshop Comments, Celestial Seasonings, Boulder, CO

R e s p o n d e n t	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?
							crossings very unpleasant and have extremely negative effect on property values.	
47.	Yes, the visual impact of FasTracks (extra lines, extra trains, fences) will be damaging enough to our countryside. Electric lines are associated with EMU and would be visually devastating. DMU is the lesser of the evils, visually.			We do not support FasTracks due to the visual impacts of which DMU would have less impact. We support the option of 'no action.'	Run the least amount of trains possible.	Please analyze the noise impact at our unique location. Thank you. (We love the train now-- it is hard to imagine 70 per day)	Please make a special effort to look at our unique property. We have a beautiful 1913 home with significant historical features. Our property is a horse property with direct access to open space. Not only will the new line and fencing cut off	

September 24, 2007 - Public Workshop Comments, Celestial Seasonings, Boulder, CO

R e s p o n d e n t	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?
							<p>our access to open space, destroying our use as a horse property, it will also destroy the entire nature of our quiet and private country homestead. This property deserves and requires special attention--it truly is unique in Bolder County. Thank you.</p>	

September 24, 2007 - Public Workshop Comments, Celestial Seasonings, Boulder, CO

R e s p o n d e n t	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?
48.	From a cost standpoint for the RTD, it is OK. However, we (the neighborhood) are very concerned with noise associated with this rail line. Although we support the line, we strongly encourage the implementation of quiet zones.		With the cost savings associated with using the DMUs over EMUs, we suggest adding necessary warning systems to accommodate a Quiet Zone at crossings near residential areas-- such as Jay & Diagonal, Independence Way & Diagonal, 47th (where the track crosses 47th near the foothills underpass).	If you are going to use DMUS, please consider implementing Quiet Zones.			Noise! Especially in the Boulder area where the grade crossings are located adjacent to many residences. Horn noise in particular and frequency of horns with this new source.	
49.			It is reprehensible that you've averaged the noise data over a 24-hour period. Trains don't honk over a 24-hour time frame, so that is irrelevant					

September 24, 2007 - Public Workshop Comments, Celestial Seasonings, Boulder, CO

R e s p o n d e n t	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?
			and manipulative on your part! Be honest about the premise/data.					
50.	No.	Yes. Lifecycle cost analysis uses unrealistic assumptions for the cost of fuel. Within 30 years, peak oil will cause diesel prices to greatly exceed the inflation rate assumed in the cost analysis. Although both air quality impacts are moderate, EMU has less environmental impact. No consideration is given to viability of sole DMU provider. DMU is noisier at stations and below 79 mph. This is the majority of the time spent traveling. EMU has less environmental impacts. The cost to purchase ROW outright from BNSF was not investigated. A risk analysis has not been performed.		Evaluate life cycle cost using realistic future fuel price (peak oil effects). Consider outright purchase/condemnation of BNSF ROW. What are clearances of existing bridges along corridors? What has RTD done to confirm BNSF assertions regarding clearance requirements?	Viability of single supplier of DMU railcars? Hold harmless for service levels on diesel-powered commuter corridors. If diesel fuel cost skyrockets after DMU begins service, then service frequency cannot be reduced because of higher fuel costs.		Each station must reduce UMT. Since most pollution around stations is produced by cars, reduce or eliminate parking to mitigate environmental impacts.	More information must be provided for implementing Quiet Zones. Travel times for Express Trains must be provided for travel from Boulder to Denver and back.

September 24, 2007 - Public Workshop Comments, Celestial Seasonings, Boulder, CO

R e s p o n d e n t	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?
		Risks of DMU: diesel fuel supply shortages; skyrocketing fuel costs; predictability of operating costs vs. capitol costs. The project team is not providing enough information in quiet zones. How many quiet zones has the Fed Railroad Admin approved? How long does the process take? How much does the process cost?						
51.	No, I think FasTracks was positioned and marketed to the public that is different than the reality of the rail project now. I am opposed to diesel for its noise and lack of travel time benefits from taking a bus from Union Station to	As a voter I was sold on Light Rail. I thought light rail would be on 36 and was not informed/educated that the system would be using existing rail lines.	The train noise is so bad currently from our home that I cannot open our windows at night because the train blowing wakes me up and I can't go back to sleep. I am opposed to more noise, more trains, more pollution, more people, more traffic and all of	Look into the trains being used in Asia and Hong Kong. Surely in the 21st Century, we could get faster and quieter trains.	Noise, pollution, lack of travel time benefits	Please do not support DMU as a recommended technology	N/A. I want this effort derailed and cancelled.	Keeping Boulder away from the fray of the negative impacts of this rail system.

September 24, 2007 - Public Workshop Comments, Celestial Seasonings, Boulder, CO

R e s p o n d e n t	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?
	Boulder. I feel the public deserves a REVOTE, a do-over.		the negatives this project is brining. It is a waste of too much money.					
52.	No	Yes. Despite the cost, I am in favor of EMU because of: fewer emissions, less noise, faster service, and lower operations expenses.	I feel EMU is the more forward-looking choice. I would rather limit the scope of the project and construct the best system we can design, rather than reducing the quality to increase the service area. If we build the system based on the current proposal, I think we will be constantly trying to upgrade.	Initially scale down the scope of the project			How to serve the greatest number of people in the most efficient manner. While building a quality product.	Looking at the impact over more than 30 years.

September 24, 2007 - Public Workshop Comments, Celestial Seasonings, Boulder, CO

R e s p o n d e n t	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?
			Remodeling and repairing is usually much more expensive than doing it correctly in the beginning.					
53.	I agree that DMUS make sense for the first implementation of the northwest line due to the cost of bridge/overpass construction. I hope that RTD will consider plans to rebuild these bridges/overpasses for EMU as they are replaced over the next 20 to 30 years and look into federal funding to pay for this expense as part of	I am concerned about the speed/acceleration of trains of the current proposal. For this to be a good investment and something that will be used, the average speed of the train will need to improve greatly. See Europe/Japan on what can be done. I am skeptical of American rail commuter technology and that it is the best available.	Put money into building fast high quality tracks and overpasses to enable trains to travel very fast and smoothly/quietly. Maybe the EMU will have to wait, but building second rate tracks will be a costly mistake to fix.	Mag Leu Train (Example of Shanghai Airport Train) or dedicated fast bus line along track or light rail.			Noise pollution due to train horns. Build overpasses which do not stop traffic or require trains to sound their horn.	

September 24, 2007 - Public Workshop Comments, Celestial Seasonings, Boulder, CO

R e s p o n d e n t	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?
	the road reconstruction.							
54.	No.	<p>Yes. The selection of DMU doesn't meet the objective of the FasTracks program to minimize negative impacts to the community. Therefore, electric power is the only option. If EMU is too expensive and the BNSF Railway must be shared, the shared line FasTracks should be cancelled. The voters should be informed exactly what is possible in the proposal. Offering a proposal of electric power trains and later eliminating the possibility is too deceiving to the voters. I vote No to the preliminary technology recommendation of the DMU.</p>		Eliminate the line with shared track that can not be used for EMU.	Noise, property values, busses, air pollution, speed. EMU technology.		Cancel the program as being not feasible before spending more money. The voting public will not support DMU.	Pollution. Environmental impact. Replacement of coal fixed power plants with concentrating solar power electricity generating plants is essential to the environment. We already have suitable roads, investigate busses as a temporary solution.

September 24, 2007 - Public Workshop Comments, Celestial Seasonings, Boulder, CO

R e s p o n d e n t	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?
55.	No. Electric is much better. Even your own preliminary analysis says this much. Cost is the main issue and should have been considered prior to this time.	See previous answer.	Meeting-workshop not planned. No microphone or speakers. Little separation between talking visitors and the presentation. Your planners could have done a better job to separate the public process than they did with this poorly planned meeting.		Impacts on wildlife when developing new corridors. Impacts on residential areas and developing businesses and industrial areas.		Wildlife, residential areas, noise, etc...New development and its impact.	
56.		Electrics in the long run make sense because electricity will eventually "?" from non-fossil sources. So, spend more now to get ready for the future-even if this delays the opening day for train rides. Go Electric!						
57.	Yes. DMU-cost is less, other impacts are the same.			Locomotive "?" using second hand equipment.				

September 24, 2007 - Public Workshop Comments, Celestial Seasonings, Boulder, CO

R e s p o n d e n t	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?
58.			The meeting was a fiasco-Noisy! The speaker could never be heard by most of the audience. Members of the audience could not hear each other. Very Poor Planning! A Waste of time, money, and potential good will. Will planning for the railway be better than the planning for this meeting?					
59.	No.	Yes. From that EMU via third rail. If its good enough for Metro-North in Westchester County, its good enough for us. Has not been considered.	1. Investigate other electrical options and/or hybrid (diesel/electric rail cars) options. 2. Look at European trains i.e. Switzerland, Germany- see what they are doing.					

September 24, 2007 - Public Workshop Comments, Celestial Seasonings, Boulder, CO

R e s p o n d e n t	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?
60.		No. It completely defeats the initial purpose. FasTracks was supposed to be a cleaner alternative to mass transit. Diesel isn't what I voted for.			Proper research should have been completed before this went to vote. We bought a concept that couldn't even be accomplished from the get-go.	It appears that members of RTD and the city are more concerned with having their names be a part of a huge city project than the impact it will have on the citizens they are supposedly taking care of.	The impact will be huge. Despite data using information from other stations, I will be 100 yards away from idling buses and trains. The diesel pollution will go from nearly 0% to who know what.	Noise. What about that impact on the residents of Steel Yards? Years of construction noise and then endless years, foot traffic, through-streets, parking issues, safety issues, on and on and on. So terribly disappointing.