

Rejected VE Proposals



VE Proposal #	VE Proposal	Savings	Formal Disposition
<b>VE Proposal #</b> P01-052  <b>Affected Parties:</b> RTD	<b>Proposal:</b> Eliminate emergency track guard rail project wide.  <b>Advantages:</b> Cost savings measure.  <b>Disadvantages:</b> Operations and safety issues.	<b>Initial Est. Savings:</b> \$400,000 <b>Future Est. Savings:</b> \$0,000 <b>Total Est. Savings:</b> \$400,000	Rejected.
<b>VE Proposal #</b> P01-015  <b>Affected Parties:</b> RTD	<b>Proposal:</b> Reduce signal system equipment by running Line of Sight (dark).  <b>Advantages:</b> Cost savings measure.  <b>Disadvantages:</b> Not reported.	<b>Initial Est. Savings:</b> \$20,000,000 <b>Future Est. Savings:</b> \$3,000,000 <b>Total Est. Savings:</b> \$23,000,000	Rejected.
<b>VE Proposal #</b> P02-005  <b>Affected Parties:</b> JeffCo	<b>Proposal:</b> Modify the alignment to stop at the Federal Center and build the extension to Jefferson County at a later date.  <b>Advantages:</b> Cost savings measure.  <b>Disadvantages:</b> Local Government concerns, Potential EIS/ROD challenges or requires EA evaluation as a	<b>Initial Est. Savings:</b> \$200,000 <b>Future Est. Savings:</b> \$0 <b>Total Est. Savings:</b> \$200,000	Rejected.

Rejected VE Proposals

<p><b>VE Proposal #</b> P01-103</p> <p><b>Affected Parties:</b> RTD</p>	<p><b>Proposal:</b> Modify the rail system to allow for single track operation with passing sidings for entire alignment.</p> <p><b>Advantages:</b> Cost savings measure.</p> <p><b>Disadvantages:</b> Not considered a viable solution for light rail operations between Auraria and Denver Federal Center due to headways and general operation.</p>	<p><b>Initial Est. Savings:</b> \$250,000,000  <b>Future Est. Savings:</b>  <b>Total Est. Savings:</b> \$250,000,000</p>	<p>Rejected.</p>
<p><b>VE Proposal #</b> P01-074</p> <p><b>Affected Parties:</b> Lakewood - RTD</p>	<p><b>Proposal:</b> Eliminate the Wadsworth Bridge and elevated station. Replace with a signalized grade crossing and an at-grade station to the east.</p> <p><b>Advantages:</b> Cost savings measure.</p> <p><b>Disadvantages:</b> Daily traffic volumes dictate a grade separation.</p>	<p><b>Initial Est. Savings:</b> \$6,000,000  <b>Future Est. Savings:</b> \$100,000  <b>Total Est. Savings:</b> \$6,100,000</p>	<p>Rejected.</p>
<p><b>VE Proposal #</b> P01-089</p> <p><b>Affected Parties:</b> RTD - Denver - Lakewood</p>	<p><b>Proposal:</b> Construct at grade track crossing at Kipling, Wadsworth and Sheridan</p> <p><b>Advantages:</b> Cost savings measure.</p> <p><b>Disadvantages:</b> Daily traffic volumes dictate a grade separation.</p>	<p><b>Initial Est. Savings:</b> \$1,000,000 to \$14,000,000  <b>Future Est. Savings:</b> \$200,000  <b>Total Est. Savings:</b> \$1,200,000 to \$14,200,000</p>	<p>Rejected.</p>
<p><b>Item #</b> P01-023</p> <p><b>Affected Parties:</b> Denver</p>	<p><b>Proposal:</b> Avoid a replacement of the Federal Blvd. Bridge by placing the alignment under the existing bridge.</p> <p><b>Advantages:</b> Cost savings measure.</p> <p><b>Disadvantages:</b> CDOT challenge with long term LRT operations impact when bridge would be rebuilt.</p>	<p><b>Initial Est. Savings:</b> \$4,600,000  <b>Future Est. Savings:</b>0  <b>Total Est. Savings:</b> \$4,600,000</p>	<p>Rejected.</p>

Rejected VE Proposals

<p><b>VE Proposal #</b> P01-056</p> <p><b>Affected Parties:</b> RTD</p>	<p><b>Proposal:</b> Modify geometry of bridge over the Consolidated Main Line to allow use of straight line precast girders on chords of the curve.</p> <p><b>Advantages:</b> Cost savings measure.</p> <p><b>Disadvantages:</b> Has CML railroad implications.</p>	<p><b>Initial Est. Savings:</b> \$500,000 to \$900,000  <b>Future Est. Savings:</b> \$100,000  <b>Total Est. Savings:</b> \$600,000 to \$1,000,000</p>	<p>Rejected.</p>
<p><b>VE Proposal #</b> P01-078</p> <p><b>Affected Parties:</b> Denver and UDFCD</p>	<p><b>Proposal:</b> Provide a closed conduit in lieu of City and County of Denver (CCD) maintenance facility removal to incorporate open channel outfall to the Platte River.</p> <p><b>Advantages:</b> Cost savings measure.</p> <p><b>Disadvantages:</b> UDFCD traditionally will not accept closed conduits and would not agree to provide funds for maintenance.</p>	<p><b>Initial Est. Savings:</b> \$1,000,000  <b>Future Est. Savings:</b> 0  <b>Total Est. Savings:</b> \$1,000,000</p>	<p>Rejected.</p>
<p><b>VE Proposal #</b> P01-085</p> <p><b>Affected Parties:</b> RTD</p>	<p><b>Proposal:</b> Run a dedicated fleet on the extension.</p> <p><b>Advantages:</b> Cost savings measure.</p> <p><b>Disadvantages:</b> Operations, maintenance and spare parts too large a challenge. Currently, there is a need to retrofit all new cars to work with existing vehicles. This proposal eliminates that need for customization.</p>	<p><b>Initial Est. Savings:</b> \$45,000,000  <b>Future Est. Savings:</b> \$1,000,000  <b>Total Est. Savings:</b> \$3,400,000</p>	<p>Rejected.</p>

Rejected VE Proposals

<p><b>VE Proposal #</b> P01-001</p> <p><b>Affected Parties:</b> Denver - RTD</p>	<p><b>Proposal:</b> Move proposed Auraria wye south to avoid reconstruction of the existing station and preserve the existing street and parking infrastructure.</p> <p><b>Advantages:</b> Cost savings measure.</p> <p><b>Disadvantages:</b> Would require additional ROW and other EIS/ROD impacts or EA evaluation as a minimum.</p>	<p><b>Initial Est. Savings:</b> \$4,000,000  <b>Future Est. Savings:</b>0  <b>Total Est. Savings:</b> \$4,000,000</p>	<p>Rejected.</p>
<p><b>VE Proposal #</b> P04-001</p> <p><b>Affected Parties:</b> Lakewood</p>	<p><b>Proposal:</b> Reconfigure 13th Street to reduce construction costs.</p> <p><b>Advantages:</b> Cost savings measure.</p> <p><b>Disadvantages:</b> Design to date provides for a minimum street width acceptable to COL and West Metro Fire .</p>	<p><b>Initial Est. Savings:</b> \$983,600  <b>Future Est. Savings:</b>0  <b>Total Est. Savings:</b> \$983,600</p>	<p>Rejected.</p>
<p><b>VE Proposal #</b> P01-045</p> <p><b>Affected Parties:</b> CDOT - Lakewood</p>	<p><b>Proposal:</b> Pull the track profile down at the Kipling Street crossing by using a thru girder structure.</p> <p><b>Advantages:</b> Cost savings measure.</p> <p><b>Disadvantages:</b> Steel prices and CDOT 400Kip loading places cost of TPG at an excess.</p>	<p><b>Initial Est. Savings:</b> \$26,600  <b>Future Est. Savings:</b>0  <b>Total Est. Savings:</b> \$26,600</p>	<p>Rejected.</p>
<p><b>VE Proposal #</b> P01-098</p> <p><b>Affected Parties:</b> RTD</p>	<p><b>Proposal:</b> Utilize slab on grade with thickened edges in lieu of slabs on stem walls for platform construction at stations.</p> <p><b>Advantages:</b> Cost savings measure.</p> <p><b>Disadvantages:</b> Grade and slope requirements for stations make this difficult.</p>	<p><b>Initial Est. Savings:</b> \$800,000  <b>Future Est. Savings:</b>0  <b>Total Est. Savings:</b> \$800,000</p>	<p>Rejected.</p>

Rejected VE Proposals

<p><b>VE Proposal #</b> P01-077</p> <p><b>Affected Parties:</b> RTD</p>	<p><b>Proposal:</b> Utilize pier foundations in lieu of vault &amp; slab foundation for substations.</p> <p><b>Advantages:</b> Cost savings measure.</p> <p><b>Disadvantages:</b> Systems requires access for conduit runs at substations.</p>	<p><b>Initial Est. Savings:</b> \$200,000  <b>Future Est. Savings:</b> 0  <b>Total Est. Savings:</b> \$200,000</p>	<p>Rejected.</p>
<p><b>VE Proposal #</b> P01-036</p> <p><b>Affected Parties:</b> RTD</p>	<p><b>Proposal:</b> Use 20' Approach Slabs at Bridges.</p> <p><b>Advantages:</b> Initial cost savings measure.</p> <p><b>Disadvantages:</b> Redesign costs would negate savings.</p>	<p><b>Initial Est. Savings:</b> \$28,000  <b>Future Est. Savings:</b> 0  <b>Total Est. Savings:</b> \$28,000</p>	<p>Rejected.</p>
<p><b>VE Proposal #</b> P01-014</p> <p><b>Affected Parties:</b> RTD</p>	<p><b>Proposal:</b> Use Thyristor controlled substations</p> <p><b>Advantages:</b> Cost savings measure.</p> <p><b>Disadvantages:</b> Previously evaluated and determined not to be feasible due to rise in rail to ground potential.</p>	<p><b>Initial Est. Savings:</b> \$4,500,000  <b>Future Est. Savings:</b> \$100,000  <b>Total Est. Savings:</b> \$4,600,000</p>	<p>Rejected.</p>
<p><b>VE Proposal #</b> P01-061</p> <p><b>Affected Parties:</b> RTD</p>	<p><b>Proposal:</b> Eliminate TWC loop technology and use pole mounted push buttons.</p> <p><b>Advantages:</b> Cost savings measure.</p> <p><b>Disadvantages:</b> Manual systems; potentially impacts run time.</p>	<p><b>Initial Est. Savings:</b> \$600,000  <b>Future Est. Savings:</b> \$150,000  <b>Total Est. Savings:</b> \$750,000</p>	<p>Rejected.</p>

Rejected VE Proposals

<p><b>VE Proposal #</b> P01-076</p> <p><b>Affected Parties:</b> RTD</p>	<p><b>Proposal:</b> Eliminate redundant vital processors.</p> <p><b>Advantages:</b> Cost savings measure.</p> <p><b>Disadvantages:</b> Impacts systems safety from an operational standpoint; would impact major interlocks.</p>	<p><b>Initial Est. Savings:</b> \$370,000  <b>Future Est. Savings:</b> 0  <b>Total Est. Savings:</b> \$370,000</p>	<p>Rejected.</p>
<p><b>VE Proposal #</b> P01-083</p> <p><b>Affected Parties:</b> RTD</p>	<p><b>Proposal:</b> Revisit the requirement for redundant power feeds to single bungalows.</p> <p><b>Advantages:</b> Cost savings measure.</p> <p><b>Disadvantages:</b> Systems requirement for operations; redundant feeds are only at major interlocks.</p>	<p><b>Initial Est. Savings:</b> \$400,000  <b>Future Est. Savings:</b> \$0  <b>Total Est. Savings:</b> \$400,000</p>	<p>Rejected.</p>
<p><b>VE Proposal #</b> P01-066</p> <p><b>Affected Parties:</b> Lakewood</p>	<p><b>Proposal:</b> Eliminate four quadrant gates.</p> <p><b>Advantages:</b> Cost savings measure.</p> <p><b>Disadvantages:</b> Previously committed to in EIS; would require EA evaluation as a minimum. Neighborhood concerns.</p>	<p><b>Initial Est. Savings:</b> \$420,000  <b>Future Est. Savings:</b> \$160,000  <b>Total Est. Savings:</b> \$580,000</p>	<p>Rejected.</p>