



Northwest Rail Fencing Subcommittee Meeting Summary June 19, 2008

The second meeting of the Northwest Rail Fencing Subcommittee was held on June 19, 2008, at the Louisville Public Library. A list of meeting participants is included at the end of this summary.

Meeting Agenda and Overview

The meeting agenda included the following items:

- Welcome, introductions, and agenda review
- Review of activities since the first Subcommittee meeting
- Review of fencing type methodology
- Review of updated Fencing Framework, including preliminary recommendations, and Subcommittee discussion and feedback
- Next steps

Chris Quinn, RTD Northwest Rail Project Manager, opened the meeting. After introductions and an agenda review, Lissa Myers, RTD Northwest Rail Project Team, led the Subcommittee through the remaining agenda items. The majority of the meeting focused on reviewing the updated Fencing Framework, which included preliminary recommendations for fencing types for the Northwest Rail Environmental Evaluation. As Lissa reviewed the proposed fencing type recommendations with the subcommittee, she also visually referred to each section of the corridor using projected maps.

Meeting Materials

- Meeting Agenda
- Fencing Type Methodology (Proposed Fencing Types)
- Updated Fencing Framework

Summary of Subcommittee Discussion

The remainder of this document summarizes the subcommittee's discussion in the following manner: 1) General questions; 2) Section-specific comments; and 3) Next steps. (Note: This section includes revisions/clarifications to this summary submitted by Subcommittee members after the meeting. The Project Team also received additional written comments from Subcommittee members, which are separate from this document.)

General Questions

1. Is there a minimum number of wires required for the high tensile fence?
CDOW: Generally, less is better, but the more important aspect of this is the height of the fence (top) and distance between the bottom of the fence and the ground. For the tensile fences, 3-4 strands is standard.
2. Is there an example or picture of a Type IV high-tensile fence?
Not yet.
3. How were the Fencing Framework sections determined? Why not by mile markers?
Section boundaries were determined by changes in land use patterns.
4. What is the difference between Type II and Type IV fencing types?
Type II is where more human activity is expected because they are industrial areas.
5. Is RTD open to other fencing options/examples in addition to the ones identified thus far?
Yes, RTD would consider other options for each category, keeping in mind that some are more expensive than others (other options may not be cost-neutral). For example, RTD would be open to options other than the chain link fence for commercial/industrial areas.
6. Is cost information (per linear foot) available? This would be helpful in determining if other fencing options are available.
At this point in the project, there are too many variables (quantity purchased, installation, access/gates, etc.) to provide useful cost estimates. RTD first needs to know more design specifics.
7. What is the objective or intent for each fencing type that has been recommended for the different sections of the corridor, e.g. to prevent people from accessing for security reasons or to prevent accidents?
The Federal Railroad Administration has two major concerns: #1 trespass, #2 crossings. RTD's objectives are to prevent inadvertent crossings and accidents and also deter trespass (some data is available on trespassing accidents). Freight rail tends to have more security concerns, and commuter rail tends to have more safety concerns, but both are applicable in both situations.
8. Has RTD discussed fencing yet with the BNSF Railway?
RTD has not received a formal response from the BNSF about their fencing regime.
9. When will RTD identify access points (gates)? This is important for irrigation and utilities.
RTD anticipates developing this information in final design. RTD does a thorough job of assessing access, including involving first responders through a corridor fire life safety committee consisting of representatives from corridor communities and emergency responders.

Section-Specific Comments

The following comments were made by Subcommittee representatives during the review of each section of the Fencing Framework.

Adams County Section

Comment from Adams County representative: This area of Adams County is primarily industrial, so chain link fencing makes sense in all of the Adams County sections. [Before the recommendations for the EE are finalized, however,] we need to take a closer look at the residential areas that exist in the different Adams County sections.

City of Westminster

Comment from City of Westminster representative: The designated land uses [in the Westminster sections] seem appropriate.

Comment from City of Westminster representative: Westminster wants less fencing and is very concerned that chain link will be the predominant fencing treatment in Westminster and along the corridor. A low impact option is needed.

RTD comment: Alternative to chain link fencing treatment in commercial/residential areas is something for RTD to consider further.

City and County of Broomfield

Comment from Broomfield representative: Note that there is a difference between areas of “parallel” pedestrian activity (where no crossing is anticipated) vs. pedestrian “crossing” activity (in relation to the track). It may be important to make this distinction [when determining fencing treatments].

Comment from Broomfield representative: In general, Broomfield would prefer no fence or low impact/profile fence; however, we are generally comfortable with the recommendations, although we still need to check in with Open Space.

120th to Nickel

Comment from Broomfield representative: There is low income housing on the west side of the track in this area, a little bit to the east of the big white warehouse. [For the Fencing Framework] it would be good to drill down into this section a bit to identify the residential pockets.

Brainard to Dillon

Comment from Broomfield representative: [The Fencing Framework] needs to be modified to acknowledge existing and planned development in this area.

Comment from Broomfield representative: In the “Safety and Security” column of the Fencing Framework for this section, change the description to “increasing pedestrian activity in this area.”

City of Louisville

Comment from Louisville representative: In general, we are on board with the recommendations. We like the idea of avoiding the chain link fence; the strand fencing option is better.

Baseline to South Boulder Road

Comment from Louisville representative: Lafayette is planning a future development in this area, so mixed uses in this section will increase. Also, Louisville and Lafayette are planning to link trail systems in this area.

City of Boulder

Note: The City of Boulder's comments reflect input from the meeting in addition to post-meeting edits by the City.

Following the meeting, the City also submitted this statement: The City of Boulder cannot support one or more HTF designs without specifics of those designs (height, number of strands, etc.). The six-strand type I HTF fencing illustrated in the "methodology document" would be acceptable for non-agricultural applications. At this point the majority of fencing adjacent to the rail right of way and city of Boulder OSMP lands is ten-strand HTF.

Note: In general, City of Boulder would prefer high-tensile fence, for all City of Boulder sections where a fence is required. This ensures consistency in fencing treatment throughout the City of Boulder section and addresses issues associated with both natural resources conservation and aesthetics.

Baseline to Arapahoe

Comment from City of Boulder representative: We are conceptually okay with the recommendation in this area, with the preference that RTD carefully consider the sufficiency of existing fencing and clarify their intent to avoid double fencing.

Arapahoe to Boulder Creek

Comment from City of Boulder representative: Dry Creek is a wildlife corridor in this section. [We would like RTD to] use a wildlife friendly HTF design in this area. We have checked with City transportation staff and they would be comfortable with this.

Boulder Creek to Foothills Parkway

Comment from City of Boulder representative: In this area, similar to the Arapahoe to Boulder Creek section, we have a preference for high tensile fencing.

Foothills Parkway to SH52 (three sections)

Comment from City of Boulder representative: Again, in these three areas, we concur with the recommendation and reiterate the City of Boulder's preference for high tensile fence.

Comment from City of Boulder representative: In these three sections, the gates and access for ditch maintenance will be important, given the presence of livestock in these areas.

Comment from City of Boulder representative: There are existing fences in these three sections, although some may be substandard. [As the project moves forward,] City of Boulder Open Space would like to work with RTD to avoid two fences, which are not desirable.

Boulder County

Comment from Boulder County representative: It would be helpful to have clarification regarding RTD's "no fence" option. At a previous meeting, subcommittee members asked whether a fence was necessary if an Open Space program already has a "no trespass" policy in place for the adjacent property.

Comment from Boulder County representative: Although Boulder County would support a "no fence" option if it was offered, the high-tensile fence alternative is acceptable. In fact, there is already high-tensile fence on the majority of Boulder County Open Space properties that are adjacent to the rail line.

Longmont

- No specific comments on the three Longmont sections were provided at the meeting.

The City of Longmont submitted the following post-meeting comments: The preference is for 7-wire high-tensile industrial/commercial fencing along the rail corridor within Longmont. Longmont staff would also agree that in portions of the rail corridor that are not directly accessible by bicyclists or pedestrians should remain unfenced if possible. [Longmont] sees this as a cost-savings to the project as well as decreasing the overall impact to protected open space and wildlife adjacent to rail corridor.

Next Steps

The group identified the following next steps to conclude the Fencing Subcommittee process for the EE:

- Subcommittee members will further review the Fencing Framework and provide additional feedback to the Project Team by Monday, June 30.
- Specific areas for feedback include:
 - 1) Information contained in the "Design Issues" section of the Framework- does the information included in the safety/security and environmental columns accurately describe the section? If the information needs to be clarified/modified, please provide details for this purpose;
 - 2) Proposed Fencing Type (category) recommendation- is the recommendation appropriate? If not, what needs to be added or changed? Why?
 - 3) Example (option) - in this section of the Framework, Subcommittee members can



indicate whether they have a preference for the fencing option, noting that some options would require additional local funding. The Project Team will then record this preference in the Framework so that it can be carried forward into final design. *Please see Page 4 of the Fencing Methodology to see the examples (options) that are available for each fencing type (category).*

- After June 30, the Project Team will incorporate the feedback from today's meeting and subsequent feedback received (per the above) into the Fencing Framework. The Project Team will then distribute the revised version to the Subcommittee.
- At this point, there are no plans to have a third Subcommittee meeting. However, after distributing the revised Framework, the Project Team will check in with the Subcommittee to see if additional steps are needed to finalize the document for the Environmental Evaluation.
- The Project Team will update the Northwest Rail Governments Team at its meeting on Tuesday, June 24. The Project Team will provide a list of Subcommittee representatives, so that Governments Team members can contact their Subcommittee representatives about the proposed fencing type (category) recommendations and examples (options).



NW Rail Fencing Subcommittee Participant List

RTD

1. Wendy Wallach Wendy.wallach@jacobs.com
2. Chris Quinn Chris.Quinn@rtd-fastracks.com
3. David Genova David.genova@rtd-denver.com

City of Louisville

4. Ember Brignell brignue@ci.louisville.co.us

Boulder County

5. Ernst Streng estrange@bouldercounty.org

City of Broomfield

6. Debra Baskett dbaskett@broomfield.org

City of Boulder

7. Brett Walker walkerb@bouldercolorado.gov

City of Westminster

8. Dave Downing ddowning@ci.westminster.co.us

Adams County

9. Stacey Dickson sdickson@co.adams.co.us

CDOW

10. Claire Solohub Claire.solohub@state.co.us

CH2M HILL

11. Laura Dreher Laura.dreher@ch2m.org

Northwest Rail Project Team

12. Lissa Myers Lissa_myers@urscorp.com
13. Jeff Dawson Jeffrey_dawson@urscorp.com
14. Kim Proia kim_proia@urscorp.com
15. Kelly Maiorana Kelly_maiorana@urscorp.com
16. Julie McKay

36 Commuting Solutions

17. Audrey Debarros Audrey@36commutingsolutions.org