



VE Proposal #	VE Proposal	Savings	Formal Disposition
<p><b>VE Proposal #</b> P01-019</p> <p><b>Affected Parties:</b> Denver</p>	<p><b>Proposal:</b> Eliminate the Tennyson pedestrian bridge</p> <p><b>Comments:</b> Item will most likely be included in the \$5 million allotment for CCD Parks.</p> <p><b>Advantages:</b> Not reported.</p> <p><b>Disadvantages:</b> Not reported.</p>	<p><b>Initial Est. Savings:</b> \$400,000  <b>Future Est. Savings:</b> \$0,000  <b>Total Est. Savings:</b> \$400,000</p>	<p>Table for Further Study. Needs further discussion with stakeholders.</p>
<p><b>VE Proposal #</b> P01-022</p> <p><b>Affected Parties:</b> Denver</p>	<p><b>Proposal:</b> Eliminate all park pedestrian bridges.</p> <p><b>Comments:</b> Item will most likely be included in the \$5 million allotment for CCD Parks. Tennyson bridge is also included with this proposal.</p> <p><b>Advantages:</b> Not reported.</p> <p><b>Disadvantages:</b> Not reported.</p>	<p><b>Initial Est. Savings:</b> \$1,600,000  <b>Future Est. Savings:</b> \$0,000  <b>Total Est. Savings:</b> \$1,600,000</p>	<p>Table for Further Study. Needs further discussion with stakeholders.</p>

Denver - VE Proposal

<p><b>VE Proposal #</b> P01-005</p> <p><b>Affected Parties:</b> Denver - Lakewood</p>	<p><b>Proposal:</b> Defer construction of the four stations that are not directly associated with a park and ride facility.</p> <p><b>Comments:</b> All four non park-n-Ride stations will not be eliminated, although the elimination of Knox and Lamar stations are being tabled for further study. Cost estimate is for 4 stations, but RTD is only considering two. Local Government concerns. The Lamar station would be incorporated in the future as plans develop. Knox Station is very close to the Federal/Decatur and the Perry Station, diluting ridership and development potential at both.</p> <p><b>Advantages:</b> Lamar station currently has no redevelopment plans, the station would be incorporated in the future as plans develop. Knox station is very close to Perry station, diluting ridership and development potential at both; Reduces travel time; saves on construction and maintenance costs.</p> <p><b>Disadvantages:</b> Access from the neighborhood less convenient. EA Consideration. DRCOG grant for station access could be in jeopardy.</p>	<p><b>Initial Est. Savings:</b> \$8,000,000</p> <p><b>Future Est. Savings:</b> \$2,300,000</p> <p><b>Total Est. Savings:</b> \$10,300,000</p>	<p>Table for Further Study. Needs further discussion with stakeholders.</p>
---	--	---	---

Denver - VE Proposal

<p><b>VE Proposal #</b> P02-025</p> <p><b>Affected Parties:</b> Denver - Urban Drainage - CDOT</p>	<p><b>Proposal:</b> Change proposed structure type from post-tension CIP arch to 3 span precast concrete BT girder or Box girder structure.</p> <p><b>Comments:</b> This is an evaluation of a new bridge design at Federal Blvd. Changes from the 5 arch original design to a 3 arch design. This proposal would nullify 02-040 RTD looking at a precast Con span arch. The functionality stays the same. Width and length stay the same.</p> <p><b>Advantages:</b> Less specialized construction methods with more readily available materials. Less construction time. Less right-of-way needed. Fewer Utility conflicts</p> <p><b>Disadvantages:</b> Traffic flow during construction is affected more, but manageable. Look isn't as historical as originally proposed</p>	<p><b>Initial Est. Savings:</b> \$3,000,000</p> <p><b>Future Est. Savings:</b> <b>Total Est. Savings:</b> \$3,000,000</p>	<p>Accepted with Modifications.</p>
<p><b>VE Proposal #</b> P02-040</p> <p><b>Affected Parties:</b> Denver - CDOT</p>	<p><b>Proposal:</b> Replace arches at the proposed Federal bridge with five vertical columns</p> <p><b>Comments:</b> This is a different proposal for the Federal Blvd bridge. Part of the present design alternatives for the bridge. This proposal would nullify 02-025.</p> <p><b>Advantages:</b> Simplifies construction and construction phasing</p> <p><b>Disadvantages:</b> Look isn't as historical as originally proposed.</p>	<p><b>Initial Est. Savings:</b> \$200,000</p> <p><b>Future Est. Savings:</b> <b>Total Est. Savings:</b> \$200,000</p>	<p>Accepted with Modifications.</p>

Denver - VE Proposal

<p><b>VE Proposal #</b> P01-068</p> <p><b>Affected Parties:</b> Denver - Lakewood</p>	<p><b>Proposal:</b> Build privacy/noise fences on property line in lieu of noise walls along guideway limits</p> <p><b>Comments:</b> The walls recommended from the noise analysis are placed along the guideway and reduce noise to an acceptable criteria, but the visual impact is in direct conflict with the surrounding communities desire. This proposal would reduce the walls along the alignment to a ballast wall (approx 2' tall) with a fence on top and would construct a double sided wood privacy fence approx 8-10 feet tall along property lines. Although this proposal would not completely reduce the noise impacts to regulated levels, it may provide acceptable levels to property owner will achieving a consistent screening of the corridor. The Opt-out policy would need to be utilized. Future maintenance of the wood fences would be the property owners responsibility.</p> <p><b>Advantages:</b> Reduces visual impacts of the walls proposed along the guideway. Eliminates future wall maintenance cost for RTD.</p> <p><b>Disadvantages:</b> Doesn't reduce noise to acceptable levels in all areas. Requires the Opt-out policy to be implemented</p>	<p><b>Initial Est. Savings:</b> \$200,000  <b>Future Est. Savings:</b> \$0,000          (there are maintenance cost savings, will be forthcoming)  <b>Total Est. Savings:</b> \$200,000</p>	<p>Table for Further Study. Needs further discussion with stakeholders.</p>
---	---	---	---

Denver - VE Proposal

<p><b>Item #</b> P04-005</p> <p><b>Affected Parties:</b> Denver - Lakewood</p>	<p><b>Proposal:</b> Reduce bike path structural section, or as combined idea P04-006, defer the structural section completely within the RTD right-of-way for the Cities to pay-for and construct later.</p> <p><b>Comments:</b> Requires a look at materials and design. Proposal would change the bike paths from concrete to asphalt or other less expensive material. Change in materials is being examined. No other portion of this proposal has been accepted.</p> <p><b>Advantages:</b> Reduced cost of materials.</p> <p><b>Disadvantages:</b> Doesn't meet current city standards. Service life not as long. Can't handle maintenance vehicles as well.</p>	<p><b>Initial Est. Savings:</b> \$1,300,000 to \$2,000,000 (this # is based on overall proposal, not just change in materials)</p> <p><b>Future Est. Savings:</b>0</p> <p><b>Total Est. Savings:</b> \$1,300,000 to \$2,000,000</p>	<p>Accepted. Needs further discussion with stakeholders.</p>
<p><b>VE Proposal #</b> P01-054</p> <p><b>Affected Parties:</b> Denver - Lakewood - Jeffco</p>	<p><b>Proposal:</b> Use alternative materials for sound walls.</p> <p><b>Comments:</b> Current design is concrete. Formal proposal would change to Lexan or foam cored plastic/metal sandwiches, although these materials are questionable for Colorado. Materials will need to be looked at closely for application in this area. TBD through the Noise &amp; Vibration study and mitigation alternatives. Durability is an issue that must be looked at closely.</p> <p><b>Advantages:</b> Reduced cost of materials.</p> <p><b>Disadvantages:</b> Depends on materials selected.</p>	<p><b>Initial Est. Savings:</b> \$600,000 - \$1,200,000</p> <p><b>Future Est. Savings:</b>0</p> <p><b>Total Est. Savings:</b> \$600,000 - \$1,200,000</p>	<p>Table for Further Study</p>

Denver - VE Proposal

<p><b>VE Proposal #</b> P01-033</p> <p><b>Affected Parties:</b> Denver - Lakewood - Golden - Jeffco</p>	<p><b>Proposal:</b> Defer CCTV Cameras Until Homeland Security or Other Funds Can be Obtained.</p> <p><b>Comments:</b> RTD intends to have CCTV cameras in place on opening day, although the number and locations of cameras are being reviewed to be brought to a level consistent with the Southeast Light Rail. Infrastructure for additional future cameras would be in place on opening day.</p> <p><b>Advantages:</b> Cameras placed in strategic locations may be just as efficient as current plan. Similar evaluation was done on Southeast.</p> <p><b>Disadvantages:</b> May reduce security and needs further evaluation.</p>	<p><b>Initial Est. Savings:</b> \$1,700,000</p> <p><b>Future Est. Savings:</b>0</p> <p><b>Total Est. Savings:</b> \$1,700,000</p>	<p>Accept with Modifications</p>
<p><b>VE Proposal #</b> P01-060</p> <p><b>Affected Parties:</b> Denver</p>	<p><b>Proposal:</b> Defer construction of the Auraria wye and make the connection off the tangent track .</p> <p><b>Comments:</b> Eliminates a "short cut" for the trains at the Auraria station.</p> <p><b>Advantages:</b> Wye could be built in the future when absolutely necessary</p> <p><b>Disadvantages:</b> Limits operational flexibility. Bringing Light Rail vehicles on or off the line is more difficult</p>	<p><b>Initial Est. Savings:</b> \$6,000,000</p> <p><b>Future Est. Savings:</b>0</p> <p><b>Total Est. Savings:</b> \$6,000,000</p>	<p>Table for Further Study</p>

Denver - VE Proposal

<p><b>VE Proposal #</b> Staff 1</p> <p><b>Affected Parties:</b> Denver - Lakewood - CDOT</p>	<p><b>Proposal:</b> Leave Sheridan @ Grade and bring LRT over the top on a bridge</p> <p><b>Comments:</b> This alternative leaves Sheridan in it's current location and brings light rail over the top.</p> <p><b>Advantages:</b> Single span light rail bridge instead of three span highway bridge. Less impacts to traveling public during construction. Less ROW required due to Sheridan on and off ramps not being needed. Minimizes length of approach walls</p> <p><b>Disadvantages:</b> Utilities will need to be examined. Requires major redesign. Access from neighborhoods, Connectivity, Barrier in middle of park.</p>	<p><b>Initial Est. Savings:</b> \$4,000,000</p> <p><b>Future Est. Savings:</b>0</p> <p><b>Total Est. Savings:</b> \$4,000,000</p>	<p>Table for Further Study. Needs further discussion with stakeholders.</p>
<p><b>VE Proposal #</b> Staff 5</p> <p><b>Affected Parties:</b> Denver - Lakewood</p>	<p><b>Proposal:</b> Reduce linear footage of ornamental railing.</p> <p><b>Comments:</b> Ornamental railing would be kept to a minimum at each station and more of the simpler rail design would be used.</p> <p><b>Advantages:</b> Saves on material cost.</p> <p><b>Disadvantages:</b> Not reported.</p>	<p><b>Initial Est. Savings:</b> \$2,200,000</p> <p><b>Future Est. Savings:</b>0</p> <p><b>Total Est. Savings:</b> \$2,200,000</p>	<p>Table for Further Study. Needs further discussion with stakeholders.</p>