

**NORTH METRO EIS
PUBLIC COMMENTS**



Comment	Source	Date Created
Todd has been involved in the East Corridor EIS and is interested in getting involved in North Metro. I gave him the web site address, and the times, dates and locations of the next two public meetings. He plans to attend one of those.	phone	Nov 2 2006 11:29 AM
+++++ owns a community retail center at 88th & Harlan in Westminster, adjacent to the mall, and supports the idea of the proposed station on 88th as it will help revitalize our retail center as well as other retail centers in the area and such a station may create a need for some new Transit Oriented Development and motivate business/owners to do a facelift on buildings, business, properties etc, in the area. Can you tell me of any recent decisions about that particular proposed station and where exactly on 88th it would/could be built? Thanks	website	Nov 3 2006 10:55 AM
While the DMU may be the "cheapest, I see no reason we do not deserve the same electrical technology that the other areas are getting. We pay the same taxes as these other areas, and deserve a quality project just as they got.	website	Nov 20 2006 5:50 PM
FastTracks is a terrible idea for the north metro area. Instead of making its way up the 1-25 corridor, FastTracks will interfere with many neighborhoods. It will reduce property values, create safety issues, increase neighborhood traffic, and won't address the underlying traffic issues of the north metro area.	website	Nov 20 2006 10:38 PM
I would like to request a copy of the DVD from the September meetings.	email	Nov 20 2006 11:20 PM
Scoping Process Educational DVD - I missed the September meetings and would love a copy of the DVD. How much does it cost? Thanks!	(none)	Nov 21 2006 10:20 AM
DVD - I would like a copy of the DVD from the scoping meeting.	(none)	Nov 21 2006 12:00 PM
Scoping Meeting: Please send me a copy of "virtual scoping meeting". If its already packaged send me the whole thing. All I really need is the summary of the public scoping meetings. Thanks! Debra +++++	email	Nov 21 2006 12:40 PM
Request for Scoping DVD - Please send me a DVD of the Scoping Sessions.	(none)	Nov 22 2006 8:20 AM
I just recieved you scoping booklet, and have read through it. If the railines are already in place for the North metro area through UPRR and others why will it take until well after 2008 to begin serving the North corridor? It appears that most of the people making this decision have NO idea of the magnitude of the congestion & travel time in our area! And, there appears to be no end to this congestion, more houses/apartment are going up everyday, so WHY will it take so long?	website	Nov 22 2006 9:18 AM

Comment	Source	Date Created
<p>Two comments/questions:</p> <p>1. Has anyone contacted the Colorado Department of Transportation to determine what their long range plan is for the north metro I-25 corridor? Do they have a long range plan for this? If so, is it similar to T-REX? Should we be looking at integrating light rail into any expansion plans which they may have for this section of interstate? Will the time tables align? I saw the plans on this web site which are for the northern I-25 corridor, but it looked as if they were specifically centered around expanding the interstate north of the metro area(i.e. north of the E-470 and I-25 interchange).</p> <p>2. Since Denver is not the first city to go through a mass transit expansion project such as adding light rail, are there any studies which have been done to show what the value of property is expected to do after the completion of a project such as this?</p>	website	Nov 22 2006 4:24 PM
<p>As a native Coloradoan and an 18 year resident of Thornton and Adams County, I am extremely concerned with the proposed North Metro Corridor vision of where and why this transit project must run through the heart of the Northeast Metro residential areas. I know of no one that lives in the Northeast area and Adams County that voted for this project to send a train through their backyards every half hour. People that live in the North Area moved here for a reason - to get away from the City and County of Denver and the Industrial and Commercial aspects that this region presents. If the goal of this project is to serve the people of the North Metro area then the people incharge of this project need to keep this transit area where it belongs - close to current transit areas along the I-25 corridor or maybe Hwy 2 or even Hwy 85!! When we decided to provide mass transit services on the south side of Denver, no one voted to run a train right behind thousands of residential neighborhoods. I did not vote for this project and I certainly dont like that my home value will decline dramatically because no one in their right</p>	website	Nov 22 2006 4:33 PM
<p>Dear Dave,</p> <p>Our home backs up to UPRR tracks between 128th and 136th Avenue(s). My first introduction to the impact of the proposed transit project was a \$25,000 debit assigned to the value of our home during a mortgage refinance in 2004, simply because of its proximity to the proposed mass transit project . As you might imagine, then ... my interest in the project is intense. I was unfortunately unable to attend either Scoping Meeting because of illness ... and only this week learned of the project's website through our Hunter's Glen Homeowner's Association newsletter. With the hope that it isn't too late to add for consideration several concerns, will you be so kind as to respond to the following?</p> <p>At the time FasTracks was approved by voters, I failed to see evidence that it included funding for east-west street improvements that will be required for access to the planned stations. In this part of Thornton, for example, any automobile requiring parking access to the planned station at 124th will, of necessity, use (1) 144th east/west between Colorado and</p>	website	Nov 26 2006 12:18 AM
<p>Why does it take so long to get this underway? We voted on it and it was to us the existing railroad tracks. They just opened up the line down south, why does this line take so long? Also, why are we going back to an alternative along I-25 or on Washington. We discussed this several yers ago at the meeting then, why are we doing it again?</p>	(none)	Nov 27 2006 10:15 AM

**NORTH METRO EIS
PUBLIC COMMENTS**



Comment	Source	Date Created
<p>At 10:36 AM 11/29/2006, Nate Larson wrote: Mr. +++++, Thank you for copying me on your letter. I hope you will be able to make it to one of the next set of public meetings (tonight or tomorrow) for the project, where we'll be presenting more information about the alternatives.</p> <p>"Mark +++++r" To Nate +++++ - 11/22/2006 Subject Copy of Letter sent to North Metro EIS members</p> <p>Nate, Many members of our neighborhood are concerned about the proposed FasTracks transit route through the north metro residential areas. This a bad idea and will devalue home prices for everyone who backs up to this route. Please read my comments that were sent to North Metro EIS project today. I would welcome a response from your company at your earliest convenience.</p> <p>Regards, Mark +++++</p>	(none)	Nov 27 2006 10:15 AM
<p>Scoping Process Educational DVD Scoping Process Educational DVD - Please send me a copy of this DVD to: Mr. & Mrs. +++++ Thornton, CO 80602 Thank you.</p>	email	Nov 27 2006 8:10 PM
<p>How soon will the 136th/I-25 pnr lot be built? The Wagon Road pnr is over capacity now and the new lot is needed now. Can/will bus service from 136th be implemented early or in the very near term or do we have to wait for the findings of the rest of the EIS. This need seems straightforward and I don't know why it should get tangled up with what type of train will be used on the fixed-rail corridor. Thank you for your time.</p>	website	Nov 28 2006 9:37 AM
<p>1) need to keep Commerce City in the alignment. 2) I want to eliminate the I-25 and the Washington alignments. We need to keep Commerce City in the alignmnet. 4) I support EMU and DMU</p>	public workshop	Nov 29 2006 6:47 PM

**NORTH METRO EIS
PUBLIC COMMENTS**



Comment	Source	Date Created
<p>1) a. The BNSF ROW from Union Station would allow much better service to the National Western Complex b. This rail line belongs in the existing rail corridor north of sand creek c. DMU technology makes the most sense in that it is cheaper and would allow for possible connection to the future Front Range Commuter Rail to Ft. Collins and Cheyenne (et al)</p> <p>2) Light Rail on Washington St is too expensive. It would also appear to require numerous "at-grade" RR crossings which would probably require some street closures and many streets with bells, lights, and crossing gates. -Light rail on I-25 would also appear to be too expensive and not serve communities as well as the existing rail corridor.</p>	public workshop	Nov 29 2006 6:52 PM
<p>If we're going through Commerce City, I oppose that the only people that the rail will serve is Commerce City. There's nothing between Commerce City and Denver. We can serve more people in Thornton, Northglenn, Federal Heights, Westminster. Thornton goes all the way to 168th Avenue. The people are in these areas. Commerce City service is important.</p>	public workshop	Nov 29 2006 7:50 PM
<p>EMU - Catenary Systems/Under grounding electrical lines. Comfort of DMU, EMU and LRT Excellent Job! I will be term limited at the end of this year as an +++++ Board member. However, I would like to continue my involvement as a citizen, community activity and a columnist for the local newspaper. Keep up the good work! Dave +++++</p>	public workshop	Nov 29 2006 7:57 PM
<p>1) a. east/west feeds need to be sensitive to neighborhoods and traffic impact at RR crossovers. b. diesel impact for schools adjacent to RR c. usability/ridership interests will be improved and access to far north retail/entertainment.</p> <p>2) I remain convinced that RTD service improvements both n/s and e/w could accomplish transit problem solutions without expense of these alternatives.</p>	public workshop	Nov 29 2006 8:01 PM
<p>1) The City is very concerned about alternatives along Washington St and I-25. Problematic, expensive, ROW issues, safety concerns and costs all add up to a non-sustainable set of choices. Obviously, my bias is for the alignment to run through our city, for many reasons. Most of the proposals for alternatives here are safer and cost effective.</p> <p>2) Station planning for Commerce City is crucial with respect to TOD opportunities, and we are very interested in finding the right solution.</p> <p>3) Washington St and I-25 should be eliminated in Level 2 analysis.</p> <p>4) Good analysis and objectivity with regard to all of the alternatives being considered in Level 1.</p>	public workshop	Nov 29 2006 8:03 PM

Comment	Source	Date Created
<p>1) a. Reviewing the proposed routes of the Fastracks and stations placement and different technology for the trains and being a Commerce City resident, b. I prefer the BNSF or UPRR alignment into Commerce City c. I would prefer EMU or DMU on the track alignment d. station at either 64th or 72nd in Commerce City.</p> <p>2) Same as above a. BNSF or UPRR alignment b. EMU or DMU on those tracks c. Station at either 64th or 72nd</p> <p>3) Eliminate the Washington Street and I-25 alignment</p>	public workshop	Nov 29 2006 8:06 PM
<p>1) Neighborhood access to transit lines and facilitating increased community access to library, rec centers, school, and other facilities.</p> <p>2) STATION LOCATION: My company owns mostly undeveloped land directly bordering the BNSF rail line for almost one whole city block. We are interested in offering space for a rail station that would allow access to the North Metro Corridor for the neighborhoods North of I-70. Community centers that either directly adjoin our area or are in close easy walking proximity include two rec centers, library, school and others. Our company has been located at the same property for 83+ years and have benefited by employing people living in the neighborhood since they began developing the area and we would like to offer area residents something back - easy transportation access to the entire metro line system and all the benefits that brings. Currently, we don't see accessibility for the Elyria/Swansea neighborhoods North of I-70.</p> <p>3) System accessibility for neighborhood quadrants (bordering I-25 & I-70) reducing the need for pedestrian traffic to cross major roadways.</p>	public workshop	Nov 29 2006 8:06 PM
<p>1) remove the washington street alternatives</p> <p>2) keep it along the rail line</p> <p>3) I approve of all eliminated options at this time</p> <p>4) connectivity among neighborhoods, businesses and other fastracks corridors</p>	public workshop	Nov 29 2006 8:07 PM
<p>I want it to go through the neighborhood. We need to serve the neighborhood. I-25 doesn't serve anyone but CDOT. I want tracks going through Commerce City so we are part of the service.</p>	public workshop	Nov 29 2006 8:08 PM
<p>Concur about LRT on Washington. I don't think Washington is a good idea. Less impact to follow the current RR line - too many crossings on Washington. Due to safety considerations, I am concerned with Washington.</p>	public workshop	Nov 29 2006 8:10 PM
<p>I believe we currently have a RR. It will serve all the community from Thornton. This is the best line. Use the existing RR line, UP & BN</p>	public workshop	Nov 29 2006 8:11 PM
<p>Are there ongoing negotiations with UP & BN? Operating agreements for sharing tracks? I would like to share costs and share tracks for commuter rail lines.</p>	public workshop	Nov 29 2006 8:13 PM
<p>I went to your first meeting in Thornton. What will happen after this meeting with what you hear? I want to support the 72nd station location in Commerce City. Thank you for having the meeting in Commerce City.</p>	public workshop	Nov 29 2006 8:15 PM
<p>RTD service here in Commerce City is horrible. We need to improve bus service in CC.</p>	public workshop	Nov 29 2006 8:15 PM

**NORTH METRO EIS
PUBLIC COMMENTS**



Comment	Source	Date Created
What are the infrastructure needs, comfort (roominess) and safety (crash) of LRT and DMU/EMU.	public workshop	Nov 29 2006 8:16 PM
I appreciate the analysis. Question about the budget to clarify that the \$419.8 million is for North Metro only. We get what we pay for. Consider the need for east-west access with stations in residential areas. Most new retail is being built around I-25.	public workshop	Nov 29 2006 8:20 PM
In incorporated Adams Cty only going to serve Commerce City nothing north. Need to serve everything towards Thornton. Use the existing infrastructure- suggest go to 168th. I-25 corridor- too much ROW to buy out. Using existing RR still serves purpose of serving Commerce City.	public workshop	Nov 29 2006 8:21 PM
HOA Rep and City Rep - Electric alts have overhead infrastructure /catenaries. Thornton area should consider compatibility with existing city regulations that currently do not allow above ground wires.	public workshop	Nov 29 2006 8:22 PM
1) Pollution from diesel. Number of parcel acquisitions. 2) Use existing rail lines but better station locations. 3) Light rail on Washington not feasible. Light rail along I-25 more feasible.	public workshop	Nov 29 2006 8:25 PM
Existing RR is best because it seems to have less impact on homes and businesses. I have a concern about DMU impacts of pollution. EMU vs DMU Environmental impacts. I'm concerned about 1 station at 64th/Colorado for Commerce City area. Consider a station closer to 72nd Ave. That area has social services, sheriff's etc. There's bus service there traveling east. How many parcels in Commerce City will be affected?	public workshop	Nov 29 2006 8:25 PM
Fast Connects will help to get people east-west	public workshop	Nov 29 2006 8:26 PM
East-west feeding is biggest concern. I still have concerns about the rail project in my backyard but if you can get people moving and making stations accessible then that would be important.	public workshop	Nov 29 2006 8:27 PM
noise, station area development and business opportunities. Willing to talk w/ neighbors and businesses in area to attend meetings, etc	public workshop	Nov 29 2006 8:28 PM
We have 45,000 people. Mobility is important, transportation alternatives are important. 74th/Colorado should be considered for a station. Appreciates having the meeting at Adams City High School.	public workshop	Nov 29 2006 8:29 PM
What's next? What's next for station issues and planning?	public workshop	Nov 29 2006 8:30 PM
South east areas has call-n-ride service that provides access to stations. Similar service should be provided in north area.	public workshop	Nov 29 2006 8:31 PM

Comment	Source	Date Created
<p>1) Worried about impacts to horse boarding business near Steele and 78th. The owner is on disability and it is too big an impact on her livelihood. I am against this project because of potential impacts to my neighborhood. We don't want our neighborhood to change. I like the country life. If I wanted the city life I would have moved to the city. We like the seclusion.</p> <p>2) What if the UP says no? Where then? How about Dahlia from 88th north. There appears to be plenty of room near 88th/Welby for the rail.</p> <p>3)I'm worried about pedestrian safety crossing under the tracks. I don't think that underpasses are safe from a personal safety perspective. Especially in the area of Sky View School.</p>	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 5:29 PM
Using the existing rail road tracks, noise	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 5:39 PM
<p>1) Study the noise output for the different options proposed and then evaluate noise abatement alternatives.</p> <p>2) Noise abatement walls.</p>	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 5:47 PM
Hello, I spoke with a representative at the Nov 8 East Corridor meeting. I had hoped to be able to attend your meetings this week but was unable. The first comment I would like to have noted is that I feel it very important the the north corridor route through and stop at the 40th/40th station on its way to Union Station and not by-pass it on another set of tracks. Due to the 40/40 station connection to DIA and the Eastern neighborhoods I feel it would be very beneficial to commuters to the north corridor to be able to access this route from here and not have to travel to union station and back track up north. Second comment is general to the meetings, I would like to know if and when you will be posting meeting notes from the two meetings this week I was unable to attend. thanks, Patrick	website	Nov 30 2006 5:50 PM
<p>1) Commutor trains should not go through established residential neighborhoods, as would be the case if the UP track system is used. The train stations generate a lot of noise during the operating period. A desil engine would just add to the noise. The 125 option would be the best solution. It does not go through neighborhoods and would be closer to businesses.</p> <p>2)The UP track option should not be considered due to the noise factor.</p>	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 5:52 PM
<p>1) Presently, we hear the horns of the freight trains that travel along the railroad to the ease of Hwy 85. With trains adjacent to our homes, the noise level, frequency and hours in operating the horns of great concern to the quality of life.</p> <p>2) Locate the rail lines away from residential neighborhoods towards commercial development.</p>	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 5:58 PM

Comment	Source	Date Created
<p>1) Presently, we hear the horns of the freight trains that travel along the railroad to the ease of Hwy 85. With trains adjacent to our homes, the noise level, frequency and hours in operating the horns of great concern to the quality of life.</p> <p>2) Locate the rail lines away from residential neighborhoods towards commercial development.</p>	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 5:58 PM
<p>Don't oppose EMU or DMU. Curious about the right-of-way. Has it been secured? If and when it does happen, what kind of screening will they provide for land owners along that corridor? Concerned about visual and noise impacts. Not necessarily opposed to walls.</p>	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 5:59 PM
<p>1) Should transit be approved on the existing railroad tracks along the border of The Haven at York Street, I do not feel a station for people to park is a safe option for our neighborhood. The majority of our neighborhood consists of children and providing areas where they can access a transit system is dangerous. Additionally, we do not need or desire increased traffic in, through and around our neighborhood to come and park. I feel that there are plenty of places for stations to be that are not in or next to a neighborhood. Particular, areas that are next to the highways are better options (i.e. Northwest Parkway and York). I also do not feel that any alternative that involves overhead wires is a good option for any commuter rail running through and adjacent to neighborhoods. The aesthetic and noise involved is completely unacceptable and will greatly decrease property values.</p> <p>2) Less stations and less stops will increase transit time and reduce impact on neighborhoods.</p>	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 6:04 PM
<p>1) Impact on Property Values. I still have a house for sale in Minnesota as a result of a highway project. Nobody wants to purchase a house adjacent to a construction project, nor do they want a house backing to a new sound wall. Living along the highway was not an issue for us because of the many groves of trees blocking the view and refreshing the air. Now there is a wall that is an eyesore and the exhaust is not pleasant. I am not even able to sell my property at a price \$20k below what the county assessed it for during the 2006 tax process.</p> <p>Should a DMU or DLocomotive be put in place, I worry again about the added noise, air (I have kids playing in the back yard), and possible ground vibrations from passing vehicles. My lot is currently a very quiet and clean air property with great value. Throw a noisy train back there and this is what will happen:</p> <p>1- Taxed at a value higher than what I would be able to sell the property for because assessments do not consider the rail impact.</p> <p>2- Increased energy expenses. Would not be able to leave the windows open during fresh air opportunities because of the</p>	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 6:09 PM

**NORTH METRO EIS
PUBLIC COMMENTS**



Comment	Source	Date Created
1) effect of property values 2) Ideally have lines parallel I-25 and not use corridor with existing RR tracks 3) please don't eliminate the routes to include I-25 4) Noise, diesel emissions, safety	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 6:19 PM
1) Impacts on multi use trails in the north metro area including equestrians.	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 6:20 PM
Will there be any alteration/cancellation of existing heavy rail service?	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 6:34 PM
1) Affordability in building it, speed in getting it done, speed to downtown, high ridership, etc. 2) Reduce options, focus on UP/RR 3) Eliminate Washington Street option 4) Timing - sooner would be better	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 7:00 PM
IT comes down to money and maximum benefits at the least cost. Isn't it clear what you need to do - toss up between electric and diesel	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 7:06 PM
1) Where is greatest cost/benefit? Which alternative provides access o the most riders? 2)Concerned with the elimination of the FasTracks alternative. Many land use and community development decisions have been made based on this alignment.	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 7:08 PM
I prefer the use of the current railroad tracks by York. It will be covenient for more residents and getting more riders.	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 7:14 PM
Yes, to this most worthwhile project!! My wife [Donna] and I both support the DMU/EMU option.	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 7:15 PM
I think if it's kept in a business area (ie washington or I-25) like the current south line then the neighbors aren't annoyed. Downing to Mineral is well used. Also, is the goal to get Thornton people to downtown Denver or to other locations (larkridge, civic center)? that goal makes a big difference on where the line goes.	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 7:15 PM
2) The washington street alternative is poorly designed. It shouldn't be eliminated because the current idea is faulty		

Comment	Source	Date Created
<p>1) FasTracks will foster a more efficient transportation alternatives to the greater good of the North Metro area. The community will benefit from increased transportation options. Noise mitigation will be the primary environmental concern.</p> <p>2) Use the RR right of way.</p> <p>3) Forget about I-25 and Washington Street options are they are not cost effective options.</p> <p>4) Consider EMU's as electricity can be generated by alternative energy sources, DMU's would currently operate on fossil fuels.</p>	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 7:18 PM
<p>1) Safety and access, noise concerns seem to be an issue to some folks but I believe their concerns are greatly exaggerated given my observations of existing rail lines. Most folks that attend these meetings have negative views of the system and the silent majority that would likely favor DMU does not attend these meetings. A display should be created that illustrates the relative decibal levels associated with roadways, ballfields, freight rail, DMU, EMU, etc. I live within a half mile of the UPRR tracks and I look forward to the new rail service with great anticipation. Also provide a display that illustrates the time that a roadway requires closing for a typical crossing by a DMU/EMU unit.</p> <p>2) Plan for TOD at all stations for commuter convenience. Go with DMU!!!!!!Thornton Ordinance does not allow for overhead cantenary systems.</p> <p>3) The Washington Street corridor and I-25 corridor are obviously unfeasible in my inerpretation of the exhibits.</p> <p>4) School crossings/accesses, roadway crossings, trail crossings and related safety. Minimize all closures/relocation of</p>	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 7:20 PM
<p>Re-evaluate the cost to build along I-25. This can't be much more than the southeast lightrail that was just completed.</p> <p>Really don't want to see the I-25 corridor elimated due to the higher cost.</p> <p>Long term effects for property along the rr tracks. I live in Wadley Farms and have horses. It is not uncommon that a horse can get out of their corral or a horse property. Will the RR tracks be fenced?</p>	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 7:35 PM

Comment	Source	Date Created
<p>1) I would like to hear about some of the things that were learned when the existing Light Rail lines in the Denver area. (What worked & why, what didn't work & why, what would they do differently knowing what they know now, what were the surprises (and there are always surprises)?</p> <p>2) Given the poor performance (\$) of the existing toll-roads (NW Parkway) how much support would there be for future ones along I-25? Given that, would C-DoT be willing to give up some of its Right-a-Way along I-25 with the assumption that having the LR along I-25 would reduce the traffic volume enough so they wouldn't need to expand the highway in the first place?</p> <p>What was learned when Light Rail was built along South I-25? (costs, noise, parking or lack of, etc.)</p> <p>3) I don't think the Washington Street options are really viable. I don't think sharing space with cars is the best option. Too many chances for problems/accidents.</p> <p>4) How would derailments affect the schedules on RR-shared Tracks?</p> <p>How often will the feeder busses run (my home is between 2 plans), nights, weekends? (Right now I don't have either service!)</p>	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 7:36 PM
<p>1) Rail crossing and resulting congestion</p> <p>2) Ridership will be much higher along I-25, since folks from Broomfield will also use it. I don't agree with your current ridership analysis wherein using the existing tracks has higher ridership.</p> <p>3) I-25 corridor should not be eliminated.</p> <p>4) Impact on the current environment, traffic congestion due to rail crossing, noise impact on the existing homes.</p>	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 7:39 PM

**NORTH METRO EIS
PUBLIC COMMENTS**



Comment	Source	Date Created
<p>1) Safety related to crossings and noise is important but I understand that these can only be mitigated but not eliminated. I would like to see a breakdown of what the anticipated environmental impacts would be with the creation of these EMU or DMU units and the use of the tracks.</p> <p>2) I prefer the EMU as opposed to the DMU. The reason behind that is due to air pollution that I anticipate may be worse with diesel emissions. Unless there are options for the DMU units to provide a cleaner alternative. Reducing the reliance of foreign oil is very important to me.</p> <p>3) I would prefer to keep the costs reasonable so that other monies can be applied to supplement the North Metro project.</p> <p>4) Safety is a huge concern for me. Specifically the lack of options of rail traffic to DUS. If there is a any chance of mitigating the "all your eggs in one basket" would make me feel much better. Instead of a hub and spoke rail line or mobility option increase the rail possibility of a mesh such as lines to areas possibly DIA and along E-470.</p>	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 7:41 PM
<p>To combine the RR option with alternatives that connect to Washington - to bring closer to I-25 (around 136N or 128th) and avoid the impact on existing residential areas. I've drawn proposed suggestions on map tonight at 11/30/06 meeting.</p>	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 7:45 PM
<p>If an existing road such as 144th, has RR tracks that go over it, could you elevate the tracks to go over 144th so that the train conductor would not have to ring their bell or blow the horn each time they come to 144th? I realize the cost to elevate the tracks is substantial but this would also help to eliminate stops and possible collisions. I believe elevating the trains at each major intersection should be considered.</p>	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 7:45 PM
<p>1) When you have an alternative that will not personally involve, safety, property values, people's lives at their home, regardless of the cost, I can not believe you would not sympathize with them. Regardless of where I live or cost of this project, I would never vote to take the peace of a person's home.</p> <p>2) Eliminate invasion of personal homes.</p> <p>3) What's really important in life to each and every individual.</p>	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 7:46 PM

Comment	Source	Date Created
<p>1) Provide actual detail of the comparison process (see answer 3 below)</p> <p>3) I believe that the Washington st option can be eliminated.</p> <p>4) I generate viewgraph presentations for a living and am aware how information can be skewed to point to a desired result. The summary information presented had no backup data whatsoever so no independent analysis can be made by the audience- we must just believe the summary information presented. The most compelling reason for sticking to the railway option is cost. However, it was admitted that a more detailed cost analysis must be completed. In my view, the cost of running the light rail system on I25 can be (and as stated it was) estimated using actuals from the TREX project. I have relatively high confidence in this estimate. However, the basis used for estimating the cost of using the railway seems comparatively immature ("... we used the cost of similar projects including similar noise and safety mitigation techniques...") without any justification. In my business, I would put a very high risk factor on this cost estimate (based on the fact that there was no</p>	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 7:47 PM
<p>Downing to Mineral line - a separate line is better and in the middle of the road is not good. Could Washington be on the side?</p>	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 7:52 PM
<p>1) Noise, safety and decrease of our property values</p> <p>2) The only option that would work for multitudes of people to use the system is I25. They paid for the Light Rail down south so they need to pay the higher price for the north area also.</p> <p>3) Using Washington would garble up the traffic for motorists and upset more residents. Eliminate Washington I don't want my property values decreased as I back up to the tracks. I have already given up my totally unobstructed view of the mountains to hundreds of home built to the West. I absolutely do NOT want to see overhead lines behind my house, I do not want to hear the noise or feel vibrations. Eliminate the use of the tracks.</p> <p>The only option in my opinion is I25</p>	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 7:53 PM
<p>I had understood from Thornton that there was a commitment by UP/BN negotiation with RTD. What do you already have set up as an alignment?</p>	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 7:53 PM
<p>1) Can the horns be directional or can we have crossings with flashing arms to minimize the need to blow horn or to minimize noise impacts.</p> <p>2) Concerned about schedule slippage because some of the alternative on the table are harder to implement than staying on the existing RR corridor (UP). I am concerned about construction impacts from the Washington St alternatives and all other alternatives. I like the UP corridor because it seems easier to construct.</p>	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 7:53 PM
<p>Ms Allen in Haven Neighborhood - We live near RR. We currently hear the horns of the train east side of 85. We know that RR crossing has to sound horn due to Federal rules. What will we expect with noise? I-25 seems usable as an alignment and tie in with RTD bus station on 12th is a good idea.</p>	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 7:56 PM

Comment	Source	Date Created
Lives at 120th - as a retired person, I do not want to go to DUS then to DIA. Are you considering a dog leg to DIA? Is there a possibility to have a better link to East Corridor? Improve connectivity to other corridors.	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 7:57 PM
<p>1) Where are we going to find parking for these stations?</p> <p>2) Can the project be built in phases to accelerate the schedule or to get part of it working sooner.</p> <p>3) I am very supportive of this project. I would have liked to download meeting materials from the website before the meeting so I could have been prepared. I also didn't know what the meeting schedule was so I showed up at 5:30 instead of at 6:15 for the presentation.</p>	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 7:58 PM
We'd like to have a DMU - diesel - example running up and down the tracks to see how noisy it really is. No passengers, just a demonstration then we'd all get a sense of how it sounds.	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 8:00 PM
<p>1) Give greater consideration to the I-25 alternatives as the impact and neighborhoods would be lessened. There are no entertainment or businesses that would benefit using the existing rail lines through neighborhoods! I-25 throughout the metro area and the new north are developments that would benefit greatly.</p> <p>2) If we need to "shorten" the initial Fastracks, so be it if it doesn't negatively impact individual property owners!</p> <p>3) Are we at a stale mate with regard to CDOt and Fastracks along I-25? Are we wasting our time being here because the decisions have already been made? Negotiations are already going on with the railroads- you never really wanted to use I-25!!!</p>	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 8:06 PM
<p>1) Obviously, noise was a big concern for many of the people attending tonight's meeting (November 30, 2006). Is it possible to add additional underpasses or overpasses at street crossings to minimize the amount of signals that the trains will need to sound for the DMU and EMU solutions. I am aware that these changes will increase costs, but the additional overpasses required with the I-25 light rail solution are already budgeted into that solution (this is one of several factors that increases the cost estimates of the light rail alternative).</p> <p>2) Is it possible to combine some of the alternatives presented. I am not advocating combining the technology, but possibly modifying the location of some of the tracks to reduce the amount of track that runs close to schools and near neighborhoods.</p> <p>3) I didn't have any concerns with the elimination of alternatives at this point in time.</p> <p>4) First, ongoing operating costs are a concern. Fluctuating fuel costs vs. electrical costs should be addressed.</p> <p>Second, all of the alternatives presented are over the FasTracks budget. The lowest estimate was 10% over the \$400M budget. How will the cost differences be funded?</p>	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 8:09 PM

Comment	Source	Date Created
If Fastracks and CDOT would cooperate to use existing right-of-way on I-25, maybe CDOT would not need it to expand the road because people would be riding the train. Also, existing park and rides could be used and expanded.	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 8:10 PM
<p>1) Future employment opportunities and access to northern suburbs and communities</p> <p>2) Halthcare development options/needs - station to station access.</p> <p>School kids riding the systemn after hours Re: Baby Boomers will need healthcare.</p> <p>3) Security - cross jurisdicitonal boundaries of several municipalities.</p> <p>4) All communities to have input not just those where the locations have been designated - ie. Will Westminster or Northglenn have an input formally in the process other than RTD Board of Dirctors?</p>	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 8:12 PM
<p>1) Using the RR corridor will greatly impact the homes next to the corridor. I do not want a tall wall blocking my view. I do not want electrical wires blocking my view. I don't want continuous noise in my back yard or my house.</p> <p>2) I am not sure - I wish they would use the I-25 corridor instead - the problem is the cost. If they would lower the bed the rails are on rather than using the existing raised bed it would eliminate some of the view problems.</p>	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 8:13 PM
<p>1) Less Stations = Less Ridership</p> <p>2) Identify station locations for each alternative</p> <p>3) I'm tired of hearing complaints about everyone who lives next to the tracks. We need more diverse input!</p> <p>4) Appreciation of Poperty cost to transit. Everybody talks about the "cons"</p>	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 8:16 PM
<p>1) We do not want increased traffic coming to our neighborhood to park. Light rail should be kept along I-25 where traffic is already expected and planned for. There are HUGE safety issues with fast traveling transit crossing through neighborhoods and by schools. Businesses would be better served with alignment along I-25. Keep the transit along the highway!</p> <p>If DMU/EMU is selected, stations should absolutely not be placed in or directly abutting neighborhoods! Keep stations at major intersections where highways are. Do not put stations near schools where children could potentially board. Do not put stations in our abutting neighborhoods where children could board.</p> <p>2) OK with eliminating the Washington Street alternative.</p>	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 8:19 PM

**NORTH METRO EIS
PUBLIC COMMENTS**



Comment	Source	Date Created
<p>1) One of the main issues that came out of this meeting seemed to be community impact (noise, stations, parking in residential) vs very high cost (I-25) More work with CDOT, including political abd public pressure on them should be tried.</p> <p>2) As a retired person who is not commuting to work, I question the destination of the North Metro Line to be Union Station only. It should intersect the future DIA line (40th St. Station?) so the North Metro Line could also serve as a viable means to/from DIA.</p> <p>3) I think the contest is between the RR and I-25. Washinton Street is a poor compropose (expensive but still a big residnetial and safety impact) and I wouldn't object to seeing it eliminated.</p> <p>4) I'm about 70 years old. I'd like to see this darned thing finshed while I'm still alive.</p>	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 8:20 PM
<p>1) There is a lot of east/west commuting in this area because our only major arterials into Denver are I-25 and Washington. Please be sure to provide convenient and frequent east/west bus service to the stations so that we don't have to drive to the stations. It would be sad if I had to get in my car to drive 1.4 miles to the station because of a lack of bus service. I'm sure you're planning for this eventually. We are suburbanites, but TODs offer us some opportunities to create a sense of community where none currently exists. The only "community" near my area is around the King Soopers shopping center at 136th and Colorado. Creating people and pedestrian friendly places around stations to which we can be drawn even if we're not going downtown Denver would be an asset for us.</p> <p>2) Consider the option of combining different parts of the options and having a line that might run up Washington part of the way, then move over to the UP RR Boulder line and then maybe back to Washington, or something like that. That might alleviate some of the impact on homes, but minimize the choking of Washington's auto traffic which will still will be carrying mo</p>	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 8:21 PM
<p>1) Property value depreciation - too narrow a space for tracks in many areas. 2) I-25</p>	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 8:22 PM

**NORTH METRO EIS
PUBLIC COMMENTS**



Comment	Source	Date Created
<p>1) The effect of the property values immediately surrounding the tracks. Note that while in a city environment being near trains is a good thing, but in a residential suburban environment, it is not.</p> <p>2) Running the larger trains along I25 was not discussed, and seems to be a much more reasonable solution. Light rail makes little sense along that corridor. A blended solution of Washington Street light rail in limited ranges (to serve local business access), and multi unit trains along I25 makes the most sense. Even better would be to run along the east side of I25 so that it would be easy to share stations with limited Washington Street light rail runs.</p> <p>Coordination with CDOT was presented as "not possible" tonight. This political issue must not be allowed to continue. CDOT and RTD MUST work together to form a cohesive plan.</p> <p>Cost estimates must also include potential revenue to local businesses. By having light rail run up Washington Street, it becomes an asset to local businesses, allowing an easy interconnection between commercial and retail outlets. It also would</p>	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 8:23 PM
<p>Consider a tunnel at Rocky Top Middle & Ballfields school due to school safety. Children would not use a pedestrian bridge so do a tunnel.</p>	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 8:23 PM
<p>1) What are the trends in property value changes for existing light rail/EMU/DMU corridor? Environmental and noises differences between EMU and DMU?</p> <p>2) I would be very hesitant to eliminate the I-25 corridor light rail option. If it is do-able in the southern area of metro Denver, it is certainly do-able in the north metro area.</p> <p>3) The presentation tonight (11/30/06) seemed to heavily favor the EMU or DMU options. I would like to see more detailed analysis and pros and cons of the I-25 corridor option. Operational costs need to be factored in for the long-term costs as we compare the pros and cost of each option.</p>	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 8:24 PM
<p>Hunter's Glen resident - Narrow bottleneck - 10 ft to track. Safety features - planning</p>	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 8:30 PM
<p>Concerned about the noise. My back yard faces west. Concerned about the property value, the view and the noise. I-25 is better alignment as less people will be affected and more businesses will benefit.</p>	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 8:31 PM
<p>Currently lives in Commerce City and having a house built 1,000 ft from RR tracks (1 mile from Rocky Top). Concerned about sound at crossings and whistles blown. How will noise levels be mitigated?</p>	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 8:33 PM
<p>Tom of Hunter's Glen - lives 100 ft from tracks. Why was the west side of tracks on UPRR chosen? Why not east side? There is a large sewer main located on the west side.</p>	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 8:34 PM
<p>Lives in Haven Neighborhood near RR. Who and how many people are going to be riders? They should be the ones to pay for it. Commutes to business from east of York to business located at 88th and York (east/west arterial) and will be impacted by trains at at-grade crossings. I am concerned with child safety and impact to all commuters as opposed to those who use the Rail line. I prefer I-25 alignment.</p>	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 8:34 PM

**NORTH METRO EIS
PUBLIC COMMENTS**



Comment	Source	Date Created
If Washington Street alignment is considered, why can't CDOT and RTD Fastracks do the same as TREX? Why not up here? It will make good viable sense. Has there been consideration to mix routes with all the alignments?	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 8:36 PM
Need clarification on initial cost analysis of utilizing existing tracks. How much is included to mitigate noise and other impacts?	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 8:36 PM
Safety and noise concerns. All for moving alignment to I-25 to make sure 800 homes aren't impacted. I-25 a better option due to less impacts to neighborhoods. How serious of an alternative is it? Is it just lip service to be suggesting I-25 as an alignment?	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 8:37 PM
All the alternatives seem to be more than Fastracks budget. Where does the differential come from?	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 8:38 PM
Safety & schools - What will be done to mitigate?	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 8:38 PM
Gene - What is the goal of this project? To get people to DUS or to promote development within Thornton and for people to move within the area?	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 8:39 PM
In full support of using existing UPRR route. Interested in seeing other routes too. Going with existing tracks benefits more people faster. Need additional stations too.	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 8:40 PM
Since I-25 cost twice as much as other corridors; Greeley/Brighton route would be happy to pursue along UPRR corridor up to Brighton.	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 8:41 PM
Colorado Rail Car - manufacturer of diesel rail cars. Diesel & hybrid/fuel cells. In 15 years when NMC is built they will be making a hybrid that will use fuel cells. EMU/DMU are same level of noise and emissions. Passed out literature to attendees.	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 8:42 PM
Lives at 115th/Holly is Safety, terrorism at DUS being considered. Get external lines outside of DUS for safety.	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 8:43 PM
A lot of information on Capital Cost - are operational costs considered when evaluating technology?	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 8:44 PM

Comment	Source	Date Created
<p>Comments on diesel vs electric: Ideas drawn from Wes +++++ (The +++++), by Paula +++++ If you've been following the discussion about alternative fuels, you know that switchgrass may be the top contender for a biodiesel crop. If all 400,000,000 acres of agricultural land in the U.S. were converted to growing switchgrass for biodiesel, at the highest per acreage estimate of 20 tons/acre, the U.S. would be able to run for 2 yrs. Then we would be out of biodiesel. The biodiesel option is very popular with farmers and congresspeople for obvious reasons. It would guarantee a buyer for 100% of their crops.</p> <p>We are technological fundamentalists - this is a problem because where logic ends, fundamentalism takes over. We've relied on technological solutions to all our economic and environmental problems in the past, and creative technology has answered many of our needs.</p> <p>During the last 10 years, we have burned 25% of all the petroleum ever burned on earth. During the last 22 years, we've burned 50% of all the the petroleum ever burned on earth.</p>	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 8:45 PM
<p>TREX - were any areas that went through as many housing districts - right through schools, neighborhoods - does it really make sense to use existing alignment?</p>	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 8:46 PM
<p>Bob Wadley Farms Costs - I-25 vs. UPRR Not considering the depreciation of properties and environmental impacts. High cost for I-25 what we're not considering is depreciation of property values and depreciation of environmental enjoyment quality of life.</p>	public workshop	Nov 30 2006 8:47 PM