

ALL VE Comments

| Value Engineering Proposal Comments from West Corridor Stakeholders, February 15, 2007 | | as of | | | |
|--|--|--------------------|---|--|--|
| VE Proposal # | Comment | Originating Agency | Source | | |
| General Comment | Following today's meeting (January 31, 2007), I have requested information from the cemetery superintendent regarding the number of grave sites in the westernmost 40 to 80 foot wide strip where the impacts would be expected. This information may not be specific, in that much of this area does not have headstones and was historically part of an area for paupers and indigent burials. | Golden | Letter from Steve Gleuck, Golden Planning January 31, 2007 | | |
| General Comment | To staff's knowledge, the Golden Cemetery was not closely reviewed for Section 106 impacts as a National Register eligible historic site, since the project was not encroaching. Please consult your NEPA team members regarding the EIS Record of Decision impacts affecting this historic resource. | Golden | Letter from Steve Gleuck, Golden Planning, January 31, 2007 | | |
| General Comment | The Golden City Charter requires voter approval to convey any property interest in the Cemetery. It is likely that the first such election that could occur would be November 2007, and it could be later depending on your schedule. Even if the voters approve, however, City Council is not obligated to convey such property interests. The voter approval is a minimum requirement. Council must also determine if it is in the best interests of the City from both a policy and fiduciary point of view. | Golden | Letter from Steve Gleuck, Golden Planning, January 31, 2007 | | |
| General Comment | To date this VE proposal has not been clear regarding the impact to the planned pedestrian bridge across US 6. If it would be your intention to eliminate RTD funding for such pedestrian connection, the City of Golden is strongly opposed to that change, as well. | Golden | Letter from Steve Gleuck, Golden Planning, January 31, 2007 | | |
| General Comment | Jeffco and Golden staff made a number of more technical design comments at this morning's meeting that I trust will be evaluated. While I understand that all reasonably potential VE alternatives must be evaluated, I trust that the project team will proceed very cautiously with the evaluation of this one. I will plan to schedule a study session meeting with City Council in the near future, if you continue to believe that this alternative (EOL Johnson Road) has merit sufficient to warrant their discussion. | Golden | Letter from Steve Gleuck, Golden Planning, January 31, 2007 | | |
| General Comment | We anticipate a strong role in the review of value engineering designs and decisions that will impact Jefferson County. We also expect to have sufficient time to discuss and review any analysis with appropriate staff, the City of Golden and the Board of County Commissioners. | Jefferson County | Jeffco Written Comments February 7, 2007 | | |
| General Comment | There was a significant design effort as part of the DEIS that allowed city staff to review and provide comments on 30% level drawings. This was followed up in the final design phase with 65% drawings where the city staff provided several hundred comments. The VE information we were provided and asked to comment on is little more than sketches and/or a couple of sentences describing the proposed action. There was more than enough information for the City of Lakewood to determine that we are adamantly opposed to some of the proposals, (removal of Lamar station and putting LRT under Wadsworth for example). However, in most cases the proposals are seemingly worthy of consideration. This does not mean we support them. It means we are willing to consider them as more information is developed. | Lakewood | Lakewood Written Letter to Rob Ball, RTD, February 13, 2007 | | |
| General Comment | The City of Lakewood expects the ability to review the proposals you move forward from VE as more fully developed drawings are prepared. The stated RTD intention to take the VE sketches directly to 90% drawings without review or input from the stakeholders is simply not an acceptable approach. | Lakewood | Lakewood Written Letter to Rob Ball, RTD, February 13, 2007 | | |

ALL VE Comments

| VE Proposal # | Comment | Originating Agency | Source | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|---|--|--|
| General Comment | Several of the VE proposals are quite vague; such as reducing length of decorative fence, simplifying the ballast wall design, and use of alternate materials for noise walls. The City of Lakewood is certainly willing to consider these things, but it involves a process of understanding what is actually being proposed. A yes or no response is not appropriate at this time. There are also proposals that directly contradict what has been negotiated in the Master IGA such as the use of asphalt for bike paths when city standards (that RTD agreed to follow) specify concrete. | Lakewood | Lakewood Written Letter to Rob Ball, RTD, February 13, 2007 | | |
| General Comment | In summary the City of Lakewood understands the need to cut cost and is willing to work with RTD to achieve this goal in a collaborative manner. We urge you to reevaluate how to move forward from this point to develop a true team approach to solving the problems we face. | Lakewood | Lakewood Written Letter to Rob Ball, RTD, February 13, 2007 | | |
| P01-001- move Auraria wye | Golden is concerned about the impact this change would have on any future direct connection to downtown or other corridors. We are opposed. | Golden | Golden Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| P01-002- remove 8th ave ghost station | This is a minimal savings but the likelihood of a future station is also minimal. Toss up. | Lakewood | Lakewood Meeting Jan 23, 2007 | | |
| P01-002- remove 8th ave ghost station | Okay without ghost station. Lakewood would support single tracks, but save the most money; don't build structures to accommodate future double track. | Lakewood | Lakewood Meeting Jan 23, 2007 | | |
| P01-002- remove 8th ave ghost station | We can support eliminating ghost station at 8th Ave. | Lakewood | Lakewood: e-mail on 1/26 | | |
| P01-002- remove 8th ave ghost station | This is a minimal savings but the likelihood of a future station is also minimal. City of Lakewood agrees to delete | Lakewood | Lakewood Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| P01-003- single track Fed Ctr-Jeffco | CDOT- Ok with proposal, wants to validate in ROWPA, keep right-of-way for two tracks in ROWPA | CDOT | CDOT Meeting Jan 23, 2007 | | |
| P01-003- single track Fed Ctr-Jeffco | 1. See comment on P01-009 2. What is the impact to headway operations? From 15 minutes to 5? Even less? 3. It has been mentioned that even with a single track, RTD would like to preserve the footprint of a double track within CDOT ROW for future LRT expansion. This will require special maintenance considerations. | CDOT | CDOT Written Comment February 5, 2007 | | |
| P01-003- single track Fed Ctr-Jeffco | Recommend that design decisions regarding the possibility of future second track be fully discussed with stakeholders, as well as operations issues (to relieve concerns about safety and efficiency of single track). We also need to know what headways could be maintained in the future with the passing track at Red Rocks station. | Golden | Golden Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| P01-003- single track Fed Ctr-Jeffco | Accepted the necessity to do this to save cost. They are interested in seeing the single track alignment. | Golden, Jefferson County | Jeffco/Golden Meeting Jan 18, 2007 | | |
| P01-003- single track Fed Ctr-Jeffco | Questions about where single track would begin (North of North Avenue) and will ROW stay the same (Yes). No other concerns. | GSA | GSA Meeting Jan 26, 2007 | | |
| P01-003- single track Fed Ctr-Jeffco | GSA is supportive of this recommendation if it does not limit or impact service availability to/from the Federal Center and it appears to be a huge cost savings which is good for the overall project. | GSA | GSA Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| P01-003- single track Fed Ctr-Jeffco | The County's concern with this proposal is that it will permanently reduce headways (or service delivery) to Jefferson County. RTD's previous decision to increase the headway from 5 minutes to 15 minutes will reduce expenditure on rolling stock. The single track proposal will eliminate infrastructure. Although the right-of-way for future expansion will be preserved, the costs of additional bridges and tunnels, as well as the engineering challenges, will preclude the provision of a second track in the future. The County is concerned that RTD has underestimated the ridership demand and that appropriate levels of service delivery will be precluded if this short-sighted decision is made. Before the design advances to preclude the double track, County staff would like to see an analysis that shows the maximum headways that could be provided with a single track. | Jefferson County | Jeffco Written Comments February 7, 2007 | | |
| P01-003- single track Fed Ctr-Jeffco | This is a good idea. No impact on service levels and a big money saver. | Lakewood | Lakewood Meeting Jan 23, 2007 | | |

ALL VE Comments

| VE Proposal # | Comment | Originating Agency | Source | | |
|--|---|--------------------------|---|--|--|
| P01-003- single track Fed Ctr-Jeffco | We can support single track to Jeffco | Lakewood | Lakewood: e-mail on 1/26 | | |
| P01-003- single track Fed Ctr-Jeffco | This is a good idea. No impact on service levels and a big money saver. Go for maximum savings | Lakewood | Lakewood Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| P01-004- fed center spur | CDOT opposed to this item | CDOT | CDOT Meeting Jan 23, 2007 | | |
| P01-004- fed center spur | Is the proposed spur across US-6? Need to evaluate traffic operational impacts to Simms/Union. | CDOT | CDOT Written Comment February 5, 2007 | | |
| P01-004- fed center spur | GSA - opposed to this item | GSA | GSA Meeting Jan 26, 2007 | | |
| P01-004- fed center spur | GSA is not supportive of this recommendation as it would not provide an acceptable level of service to the Federal Center | GSA | GSA Written Comment February 15, 2007 | | |
| P01-004- fed center spur | This doesn't make any sense. The service needed to the Fed Center is 5 min frequency and to the Jefferson County Justice Center is 15 min. | Lakewood | Lakewood Meeting Jan 23, 2007 | | |
| P01-005- defer stations w/o parking | Denver willing to look at the elimination of Knox Station. (per Councilmember R. Rodriguez primarily; most other CCD personnel oppose) | Denver | Denver Meeting Jan 18, 2007 | | |
| P01-005- defer stations w/o parking | Denver does not support the elimination of the Knox Station. There are significant potential political, environmental justice, and neighborhood impact issues at stake in this item. The impact on access for the neighborhoods is not acceptable, nor is the loss of \$1 million of DRCOG funding Denver won for access improvements at the Knox Ct station. | Denver | Denver Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| P01-005- defer stations w/o parking | If Knox station is eliminated, residents cannot easily access the Decatur station. Community is opposed to eliminating Knox station. | Denver | Denver Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| P01-005- defer stations w/o parking | Denver was awarded nearly \$1 million from a DRCOG grant for pedestrian station access. That grant is in jeopardy if the Knox station is eliminated. | Denver | Denver Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| P01-005- defer stations w/o parking | Golden is opposed to eliminating neighborhood stations, and especially the Red Rocks CC station (if it was included on this list). | Golden | Golden Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| P01-005- defer stations w/o parking | Keeping the Lamar station is imperative. | Lakewood | Lakewood: e-mail on 1/26 | | |
| P01-005- defer stations w/o parking | The Housing Authority has purchased a 6-acre parcel at Lamar and is in the planning stages for a project. This is all based on RTD studies and assurances that there will be a station at Lamar. The COL have been working with the neighborhood for over one year to develop a land use plan for the properties adjacent to the proposed station, anticipating the Lamar stop. | Lakewood | Lakewood Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| P01-008- eliminate redundant platforms | If there are any in Lakewood we would be willing to consider. | Lakewood | Lakewood Meeting Jan 23, 2007 | | |
| P01-008- eliminate redundant platforms | If there are any in Lakewood we would be willing to consider. Garrison | Lakewood | Lakewood Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| P01-009- increase headways | At US-6/Johnson Rd, 7.5 minute headways will require a double right turn lane (WB to NB) to mitigate queuing and saturated right turn flows. Pls refer to RTD's/C-B's operational analysis report. | CDOT | CDOT Written Comment February 5, 2006 | | |
| P01-009- increase headways | Misunderstanding on whether this applied to the entire line; clarified it was just east of DFC. Wanted to know the likelihood of this VE item. | Golden, Jefferson County | Jeffco/Golden Meeting Jan 18, 2007 | | |
| P01-011- change MSE drainage | Want to review design. Make sure MS4 requirements are not affected. | CDOT | CDOT Jan 23, 2007 | | |
| P01-011- change MSE drainage | 1. Repercussions to MS4, BMP and CDPS requirements? 2. MSE wall drainage is critical to long-term performance. Impervious membranes can leak or be damaged by utility installation, request additional details on how these walls will last 75 years. 3. Would require hydraulics and materials review. | CDOT | CDOT Written Comments February 5, 2007 | | |
| P01-012- recycle excavation material | Specifications should provide limits defined by geotechnical. Is the proposal to lower current accepted Class 1 backfill material or is it to still meet current CDOT practice? CDOT would only accept Class 1 backfill. | CDOT | CDOT Written Comment February 5, 2007 | | |
| P01-013- move jeffco interlocking | Need further design information in order to comment. Could simplify area west of platform and save impacts to bike path and memorial garden. | Golden | Golden Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| P01-013- move jeffco interlocking | Golden and Jeffco both like the idea of shorter tail tracks because of the reduced impacts. | Golden, Jefferson County | Jeffco/Golden Meeting Jan 18, 2007 | | |
| P01-013- move jeffco interlocking | Wanted to understand this better and see the change in the tail track alignment. It was mentioned that one tail track would remain behind the station. | Jefferson County | Jeffco/Golden Meeting Jan 18, 2007 | | |

ALL VE Comments

| VE Proposal # | Comment | Originating Agency | Source | | |
|--|---|--------------------------|---|--|--|
| P01-013- move jeffco interlocking | The County encourages any design (other than the reinstatement of the middle of the campus location) that would reduce the impacts to the Memorial Garden. County staff would like to see an analysis that shows this idea's impacts to the headways. | Jefferson County | Jeffco Written Comments February 7, 2007 | | |
| P01-019- eliminate Tennyson ped bridge | Suggestion is to eliminate this item since Tennyson is included below. Tennyson is the most important of the park bridges according to Denver. | Denver | Denver Meeting Jan 18, 2007 | | |
| P01-019- eliminate Tennyson ped bridge | Tennyson Pedestrian Bridge: Denver would very much like to see this bridge remain. The Parks lands in this area will be impacted by the construction and operations of this light rail line. Suggestion is to eliminate this item since Tennyson is included below. Tennyson is the most important of the park bridges according to Denver. | Denver | Denver Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| P01-019- eliminate Tennyson ped bridge | The pedestrian connectivity provided by a bridge at Tennyson St. is critical to the community and was a key element of the environmental process. Parks is willing to pay for a share out of the \$5 million mitigation fund, but since we have not seen construction estimates for the bridge, it is not possible to agree on an amount to share. Denver believes the \$5 Million Parks funds were not a part of the construction budget but rather were mitigation for impact on the parks. | Denver | Denver Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| P01-019- eliminate Tennyson ped bridge | Prefer to see pedestrian connections maintained. | Golden | Golden Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| P01-020- use high strength bridge concrete | CDOT concurs | CDOT | CDOT Written Comment February 5, 2007 | | |
| P01-021- move walkway to bridge center | Need more design information in order to comment. | Golden | Golden Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| P01-021- move walkway to bridge center | Are there fire, light, safety concerns City would like more explanation. Please contact Lakewood Fire. | Lakewood | Lakewood Meeting Jan 23, 2007 | | |
| P01-021- move walkway to bridge center | This is a good idea that Lakewood supports | Lakewood | Lakewood Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| P01-022- eliminate park ped bridges | Denver wants all the ped bridges to remain, but is willing to discuss cost sharing with RTD. | Denver | Denver Meeting Jan 18, 2007 | | |
| P01-022- eliminate park ped bridges | The ped bridge at Hooker St would replace an existing RR crossing, so eliminating this bridge is not acceptable. Again, depending on cost, we are willing to absorb a share of the cost of this bridge from the \$5 million. The ped bridge and underpass at Wolff is the lowest priority of the three. We can probably live without that one, but a large opening should be provided under the tracks so a crossing can be implemented at a later date (the opening should be sealed on both ends to prevent homeless people from living there). | Denver | Denver Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| P01-022- eliminate park ped bridges | It is not clear which bridges are included in the \$1.6 Million. Is Tennyson included? | Denver | Denver Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| P01-022- eliminate park ped bridges | Prefer to see pedestrian connections maintained. | Golden | Golden Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| P01-030- redesign tangent diamonds | Denver has no issues with this. | Denver | Denver Meeting Jan 18, 2007 | | |
| P01-030- redesign tangent diamonds | Denver has no issues with this. | Denver | Denver Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| P01-032- relocate Indiana TPSS | Sight distance impacts to Indiana traffic? | CDOT | CDOT Written Comments February 5, 2007 | | |
| P01-032- relocate Indiana TPSS | Lakewood supports this. | Lakewood | Lakewood Meeting Jan 23, 2007 | | |
| P01-033- defer CCTV | Make sure the infrastructure for the cameras is in place for the future. If so, then no issues with this item. | Denver | Denver Meeting Jan 25, 2007 | | |
| P01-033- defer CCTV | Raised a concern about security at the Govt. Center if cameras were deferred. | Jefferson County | Jeffco/Golden Meeting Jan 18, 2007 | | |
| P01-033- defer CCTV | This should be referred to the Fire/Life Safety Group. | Lakewood | Lakewood Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| P01-034- reduce ballast requirements | Denver has no issues with this. | Denver | Denver Meeting Jan 18, 2007 | | |
| P01-034- reduce ballast requirements | No issues; just wanted to understand what it meant. Golden okay with this item. | Golden, Jefferson County | Jeffco/Golden Meeting Jan 18, 2007 | | |
| P01-034- reduce ballast requirements | Have you looked at using wood ties? What is RTD considering to reduce costs? | Lakewood | Lakewood Meeting Jan 23, 2007 | | |

ALL VE Comments

| VE Proposal # | Comment | Originating Agency | Source | | |
|---|--|--------------------------|---|--|--|
| P01-045- thru girder at Kipling | With new CDOT team coming into place the 400 Kip issue needs to be revisited. CDOT needs to justify and show where this is adopted policy. | Lakewood | Lakewood Meeting Jan 23, 2007 | | |
| P01-053- reduce bridge parapet height | 1. Top of parapet should be some minimum distance (1'-0) above top of ballast. Fencing must be provided to provide a splash guard, contain debris. 2. Only standard CDOT guardrail should be utilized on structures with vehicular traffic. | CDOT | CDOT Written Comment February 5, 2007 | | |
| P01-053- reduce bridge parapet height | Both agencies just wanted clarification of item. No major concerns. | Golden, Jefferson County | Jeffco/Golden Meeting Jan 18, 2007 | | |
| P01-053- reduce bridge parapet height | Aesthetic issue. What will process be for working to resolution? | Lakewood | Lakewood Meeting Jan 23, 2007 | | |
| P01-053- reduce bridge parapet height | Aesthetic issue. What will process be for working to resolution | Lakewood | Lakewood Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| P01-054- alt materials for sound walls | Consult with CDOT maintenance regarding material type if within CDOT ROW. Alternative materials in CDOT ROW will need to conform to CDOT standards for noise as well. | CDOT | CDOT Written Comments February 5, 2007 | | |
| P01-054- alt materials for sound walls | Want to make sure materials are durable. Materials will need to be looked at closely for application in this area. | Denver | Denver Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| P01-054- alt materials for sound walls | Need further design information in order to comment. Need commitment to include stakeholders in this discussion. | Golden | Golden Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| P01-054- alt materials for sound walls | Want to make sure materials are durable; Just concerned about aesthetics on 6th Avenue neighborhood. Concerned about visual impacts. | Golden, Jefferson County | Jeffco/Golden Meeting Jan 18, 2007 | | |
| P01-054- alt materials for sound walls | This directly effects many Lakewood citizens. What is the process to work this through to resolution? Seems like it would be more expensive than concrete. | Lakewood | Lakewood Meeting Jan 23, 2007 | | |
| P01-054- alt materials for sound walls | This directly affects many Lakewood citizens. What is the process to work this through to resolution? We are inclined to be supportive, but need more information. | Lakewood | Lakewood Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| P01-059- lengthen track circuits and reduce boundary blocks | Will it lengthen the time the gates are down? No. Lakewood okay with item. | Lakewood | Lakewood Meeting Jan 23, 2007 | | |
| P01-060- defer Auraria wye | Accepting this item is discouraged by Denver. The operational issues and flexibility are a concern. | Denver | Denver Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| P01-060- defer Auraria wye | Need to see more details about how the elimination of the Auraria Wye will affect the existing street system and light rail operation. This proposal removes the capability for West Corridor trains to easily and directly access downtown, a reversing movement through the Station at 10th & Osage would become necessary. Denver has consistently asked for direct access capability to be built in. Deletion of the wye is not acceptable | Denver | Denver Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| P01-060- defer Auraria wye | See prior comments. This change prevents any future connection from West Corridor to other corridors | Golden | Golden Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| P01-060- defer Auraria wye | This limits operational flexibility to run West Corridor trains through downtown. This is not an issue of simply savings. There are major operational costs that will occur in the future and significant opportunity cost. These need more consideration. | Lakewood | Lakewood Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| P01-068- privacy fence instead of noise walls | Will listen to community members affected. Noise impact mitigation primarily affects 13th Ave corridor through Lakewood; however, there are also two sections in Denver - W of Sheridan, and between Perry and Knox. | Denver | Denver Meeting January 25, 2007 | | |
| P01-068- privacy fence instead of noise walls | Will listen to community members affected. | Denver | Denver Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| P01-068- privacy fence instead of noise walls | Seems problematic based upon noise dynamics as well as EIS commitments, and not a significant savings. Golden is opposed at this time for areas west of I-70. | Golden | Golden Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| P01-068- privacy fence instead of noise walls | The Two Creeks/Eiber Neighborhoods were extremely unhappy with the privacy fence. This is something that needs to be worked out with the neighborhood. What is the process? | Lakewood | Lakewood Meeting Jan 23, 2007 | | |

ALL VE Comments

| VE Proposal # | Comment | Originating Agency | Source | | |
|---|---|--------------------------|---|--|--|
| P01-068- privacy fence instead of noise walls | Supports the proposal and offered to assist RTD with outreach to the public. How would the RTD Opt Out policy work with this? The City of Lakewood is hiring an architect to work with Two Creeks/Eiber neighborhoods to assist in this process. Lakewood would also like to partner in the outreach program for noise barriers. Lakewood contact would be Rodger Wadnal. Lakewood would like to see a map of where the privacy fences would go, as it seems it will only work in about 30% of the area. RTD will need to work with the Fire Dept on location and spacing of openings in fence. Lakewood would like a third concept to be considered - a 42' wall on top of the ballast wall. | Lakewood | Lakewood Meeting January 30, 2007 | | |
| P01-068- privacy fence instead of noise walls | This is something that needs to be worked out with the neighborhood. City of Lakewood opposes this approach. What is the process? Location of sound walls can have legal implications, potential claims for damages. | Lakewood | Lakewood Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| P01-069- simplify ballast wall design | Need further design information in order to comment. Need commitment to include stakeholders in this discussion. | Golden | Golden Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| P01-069- simplify ballast wall design | Jeffco and Golden will need more information on this item. | Golden, Jefferson County | Jeffco/Golden Meeting Jan 18, 2007 | | |
| P01-069- simplify ballast wall design | What is the current design? How does it tie into the noise issues? | Lakewood | Lakewood Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| P01-073- shift fed blvd station pocket track | This might create different impacts to park than existing plan; additional ROW required? How will it fit with design of Federal bridge? Will the bridge drainage, MS4, 4(f) or park impacts change? | CDOT | CDOT Written Comment February 5, 2007 | | |
| P01-073- shift fed blvd station pocket track | Denver has no issues with this. | Denver | Denver Meeting January 18, 2007 | | |
| P01-073- shift fed blvd station pocket track | Denver is very interested in seeing more detail regarding this proposal because it may address some of the station planning, layout, access and redevelopment concerns. Denver hasn't seen any plan sheets defining this alternative layout, including its potential impact to the Platte Bridge, very curious to see what the likely construction and operation impacts to the Platte River Trail and the Lakewood/Dry Gulch Trails might be. | Denver | Denver Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| P01-081- Fed Ctr pocket track mod | Need to check easement to make sure new configuration still fits there. Otherwise, no concerns. | GSA | GSA Meeting Jan 26, 2007 | | |
| P01-081- Fed Ctr pocket track mod | GSA would be supportive if there was no visual or operational impacts on the Federal Center. If this is considered further we need more information to clearly understand any potential impacts. | GSA | GSA Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| P01-081- Fed Ctr pocket track mod | Another reason to support single track to Jeffco | Lakewood | Lakewood Meeting Jan 23, 2007 | | |
| P01-085- dedicated fleet on extension | This needs to be considered. Other properties make it work, why not RTD? Instead of putting all the burden on stakeholders, RTD needs to step up to some challenges of its own. | Lakewood | Lakewood Meeting Jan 30, 2007 | | |
| P01-091- jack and bore tunnel under I-70 | Coordinate closely with FHWA/CDOT. Timing could be a problem. They want right to review. Concern over breaking their "A Line" twice. Explained that expansion to second bore would be far in the future. | CDOT | CDOT Meeting Jan 23, 2007 | | |
| P01-091- jack and bore tunnel under I-70 | 1. Reservations with tunneling, with respect to safety issues, under heavy truck traffic. Need more information. 2. Will require development and implementation of an Incident Management Plan. That portion of I-70 is a designated Hazardous and Nuclear Materials Route. IMPs take time to develop. CDOT suggests IMP plan development initiated as soon as possible. 3. Pls refer to CDOT R6 Lane Closure Strategy when developing construction phasing/schedules. | CDOT | CDOT Written Comment February 5, 2007 | | |
| P01-091- jack and bore tunnel under I-70 | Need more design info. Appears to have promise. | Golden | Golden Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| P02-005- stop alignment at Fed Ctr | Not only is this item strongly opposed, it would likely impact overall ridership and operations a lot, due to the future congestion at the federal center. | Golden | Golden Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| P02-005- stop alignment at Fed Ctr | The County is opposed to this idea. The West Corridor was promoted - and voted on - as light rail from Downtown Denver to the Jefferson County campus. | Jefferson County | Jeffco Written Comments February 7, 2007 | | |
| P02-008- Johnson Rd. EOL station | Likes this proposal. Eliminating the crossing of Johnson Road is good. | CDOT | CDOT Meeting Jan 23, 2007 | | |
| P02-008- Johnson Rd. EOL station | What are traffic operational impacts to Johnson Rd/US-6 and Ulysses/US-6? Need to identify ROW implications. | CDOT | CDOT Written Comment February 5, 2007 | | |

ALL VE Comments

| VE Proposal # | Comment | Originating Agency | Source | | |
|--|--|--------------------------|---|--|--|
| P02-008- Johnson Rd. EOL station | After discussion of option, Golden concerned regarding construction feasibility, distance to parking, impact on TOD, and impact to cemetery and existing roadway. See January 31, 2007 letter to Dennis Cole. | Golden | Golden Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| P02-008- Johnson Rd. EOL station | The only operational benefit for Jefferson County and the Golden community appears to be the elimination of the at-grade crossing of Johnson Road. While we recognize that this design change may address a number of traffic issues, it creates a number of negative community and land use impacts. | Golden | Letter from Steve Gleuck, Golden Planning January 31, 2007 | | |
| P02-008- Johnson Rd. EOL station | By moving the station area over 1,000 feet east, the possible relocation would drastically affect any neighborhood pedestrian access to the end of line station from the closest existing and potential residential areas on the south side of US 6. This change would also significantly affect the possible TOD-style development on the Golden Ridge property | Golden | Letter from Steve Gleuck, Golden Planning, January 31, 2007 | | |
| P02-008- Johnson Rd. EOL station | Willing to see further evaluation on VE item; sees potential to save cost, allows extension to Golden and eliminates at-grade crossing of Johnson Road with ped crossing either under or over road. | Golden, Jefferson County | Jeffco/Golden Meeting Jan 31, 2007 | | |
| P02-008- Johnson Rd. EOL station | As you know, the County is concerned about operational and safety issues associated with the at-grade crossing of Johnson Road. The elimination of the at-grade crossing of Johnson Road would be a great benefit. However, impacts to the cemetery and the process of obtaining the land should be thoroughly evaluated and carefully considered before this idea is advanced. Also with the encouragement of RTD staff and an RTD-sponsored Transit Oriented Development (TOD) workshop, the City of Golden has begun the planning process of developing a TOD project. The impacts of increasing the distance from the TOD to the station, as well as Golden's investment should be considered. County staff would like to be an integral part of designing the station and connections to the campus should this design advance. | Jefferson County | Jeffco Written Comments February 7, 2007 | | |
| P02-008- Johnson Rd. EOL station | This is a Jeffco issue and appears on its face to be inappropriate. Sandwich station between a cemetery and a four-lane arterial that all riders would be forced to cross. | Lakewood | Lakewood Meeting Jan 23, 2007 | | |
| P02-025- change structure type at Fed Blvd | Only concern is with traffic management and construction plan. CDOT to review design drawings. RTD needs utility/CDOT agreements. | CDOT | CDOT Meeting Jan 23, 2007 | | |
| P02-025- change structure type at Fed Blvd | 1. Selection criteria included a requirement that the new bridge mimic the architecture of the existing arch bridge. Also, shallow structure is required. Cost savings seems high. 2. Need to determine if impacts would be different from those described for CE recently signed by CDOT; if so, would require new CE. 3. Requires SHPO consultation. | CDOT | CDOT Written Comment February 5, 2007 | | |
| P02-025- change structure type at Fed Blvd | Denver's concerns were that the width stay the same and the basic function remains the same. As long as those criteria are met, they are ok with the new design. | Denver | Denver Meeting Jan 25, 2007 | | |

ALL VE Comments

| VE Proposal # | Comment | Originating Agency | Source | | |
|--|--|--------------------|---|--|--|
| P02-025- change structure type at Fed Blvd | <p>Denver has not seen the proposed re-design and awaits the details with great interest.</p> <p>There are also questions of the architectural appropriateness of the structure since the existing bridge is a distinctive landmark. The Federal Bridge is owned by CDOT (5DV7067) and the MOU on West Corridor indicated that the bridge design would be done by CDOT in consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHIPO). Denver is also concerned that a proposed embankment and triple culvert structure will not meet expectations and will both detract from the park space and create a public safety challenge for users of the park, station and bikeway. Denver is also concerned that the proposed structural changes for the bridge have not been through a 65% review process and are largely unknown to us, UDFCD and CDOT.</p> <p>This is an unacceptable downgrade of the current structure that will not only be ugly, but will prevent any possibility of future ped passage on both</p> | Denver | Denver Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| P02-025- change structure type at Fed Blvd | Your acceptance of this without talking to us is unacceptable conduct on RTD's part, but then this has obviously been greased for some time. This project is going to be as ugly as T-REX. | UDFCD | UDFCD Written Comments February 13, 2007 | | |
| P02-038- Depress LRT under Wadsworth | Only concern is with traffic management and construction plan. No more than two lanes closed at one time on Wadsworth during construction. | CDOT | CDOT Meeting Jan 23, 2007 | | |
| P02-038- Depress LRT under Wadsworth | Pls refer to CDOT R6 Lane Closure Strategy when developing construction phasing/schedules. Walls are more complex being in cut, possibly caisson walls. Dewatering issues. | CDOT | CDOT Written Comment February 5, 2007 | | |
| P02-038- Depress LRT under Wadsworth | Oppose. We have spent two years in planning and hundreds of thousands of dollars on this station. The dollar savings (if they are real which is questionable) are insufficient to overcome the negatives. | Lakewood | Lakewood Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| P02-038- Depress LRT under Wadsworth | Lakewood reserved further comments on the concept graphics presented today until after the public meeting on 01-31-07. | Lakewood | Lakewood Meeting Jan 30, 2007 | | |
| P02-038- Depress LRT under Wadsworth | Oppose. We have spent two years in planning and hundreds of thousands of dollars on this station. The dollar savings (if they are real which is questionable) are insufficient to overcome the negatives. | Lakewood | Lakewood Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| P02-040- change Federal bridge to vertical columns | Only concern is with traffic management and construction plan. CDOT to review design drawings. RTD needs utility/CDOT agreements. | CDOT | CDOT Meeting Jan 23, 2007 | | |
| P02-040- change Federal bridge to vertical columns | Same comments on P02-025. | CDOT | CDOT Written Comment February 5, 2007 | | |
| P02-040- change Federal bridge to vertical columns | Change to REJECT (see P02-025). | Denver | Denver Meeting Jan 18, 2007 | | |
| P02-040- change Federal bridge to vertical columns | We haven't seen a proposed elevation so it is difficult to comment, but this may be acceptable. Definitely prefer arches that would mimic the old structure. Denver has not seen the proposed re-design and awaits the details with great interest. | Denver | Denver Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| P03-008- Deposit excess material at Fed Ctr loop | Ok with idea, but want to make sure dirt is clean. Need to set systematic plan to distribute dirt. Confirmed that this applies only south of North Avenue. Any excavation that occurs outside the area that we have NFA on will need to be removed. Consent order/schedule need to be discussed and included in the CDPHE agreement. | GSA | GSA Meeting Jan 26, 2007 | | |
| P03-008- Deposit excess material at Fed Ctr loop | GSA is supportive of this recommendation if the fill is "clean" and meets all associated requirements under GSA's RCRA Consent Orders. In addition, any fill work must be conducive to and supportive of the proposed Federal Center Master site plan and future development. Lastly, bringing in the fill would have to be coordinated to avoid any impacts to Federal Center operations. | GSA | GSA Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| P03-008- Deposit excess material at Fed Ctr loop | Don't know Federal Center position, but this is an idea I (DB) suggested several months ago. | Lakewood | Lakewood Meeting Jan 23, 2007 | | |
| P04-005- reduce bike path section | Whatever material is concluded it must meet the criteria to hold trucks for maintenance and emergency access; Will need to work with Parks & Rec/Urban Drainage/Fire-Life-Safety; Other Denver departments don't have issues with the suggestion | Denver | Denver Meeting Jan 25, 2007 | | |

ALL VE Comments

| VE Proposal # | Comment | Originating Agency | Source | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|--------------------------|---|--|--|
| P04-005- reduce bike path section | Denver's standard for bike path construction is concrete. Whatever material is selected, it must meet the criteria to hold trucks for maintenance and emergency access. | Denver | Denver Written Comment February 15, 2007 | | |
| P04-005- reduce bike path section | Will need to work with Parks & Rec/Urban Drainage/Fire-Life-Safety. | Denver | Denver Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| P04-005- reduce bike path section | | Denver | Denver Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| P04-005- reduce bike path section | This does not meet COD's current standards for bike trail construction, and concrete is definitely the preferred material. However, in the interest of maintaining a bridge at Sheridan, Park would be willing to accept a downgrade to asphalt, which hopefully could be upgraded to concrete thru the \$5 million fund. Walks that are currently concrete must be replaced in kind. The main east-west bike trail must be graded to allow for a 10'-wide x-section. Secondary trails must be at least 8' wide. Upgrading to concrete can also be accomplished at a future date without significant disruption to the park - only \$\$\$ | Denver | Denver Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| P04-005- reduce bike path section | Use of asphalt bike paths likely violates local standards in all jurisdictions. Need verification that replacement of any concrete bike paths will be in concrete. | Golden | Golden Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| P04-005- reduce bike path section | This violates the IGA. City of Lakewood standards will be used. | Lakewood | Lakewood Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| P04-005- reduce bike path section | This violates the IGA. City of Lakewood standards will be used | Lakewood | Lakewood Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| P04-005- reduce bike path section | Asphalt is not acceptable for any trail used for drainage maintenance access by Urban Drainage. | UDFCD | UDFCD Written Comments February 13, 2007 | | |
| P06-003- replace I-70 bridge | New bridge shall accommodate 8, 12 ft lanes and inside and outside standard shoulder widths. | CDOT | CDOT Written Comment February 5, 2007 | | |
| P06-003- replace I-70 bridge | Concerned about traffic impacts; interested in understanding how construction will be done. Liked the idea of pushing a shield that would not require lane closures. | Golden, Jefferson County | Jeffco/Golden Meeting Jan 31, 2007 | | |
| Staff 1- LRT over Sheridan | RTD would need to prove that we aren't infringing on future expansion. They prefer that RTD pay to have Sheridan rebuilt now. | CDOT | CDOT Meeting Jan 23, 2007 | | |
| Staff 1- LRT over Sheridan | 1. Sight distances along Sheridan compromised? 2. Design should not preclude future vertical adjustments to grade on Sheridan to desirable AASHTO standard. 3. May not need Sheridan CE if this goes forward. | CDOT | CDOT Written Comment February 5, 2007 | | |
| Staff 1- LRT over Sheridan | This is Denver's #1 concern. Are against this change but will look at concept plans. Concern about elevated station, neighborhood connectivity, gulch trails continuity, station and neighborhood access, compatibility with TOD/parking on south, and visual impacts. Right-of-way that is purchased for original plan can be sold to developers when it is built. Denver will work to put zoning regulations in place. Need to have discussion on Sheridan with Denver, Lakewood and CDOT. | Denver | Denver Meeting Jan 25, 2007 | | |

ALL VE Comments

| VE Proposal # | Comment | Originating Agency | Source | | |
|----------------------------|--|--------------------|---|--|--|
| Staff 1- LRT over Sheridan | <p>The Sheridan at-grade station plan included significant traffic analysis that resulted in a beneficial circulation and access design for the station and park and ride for all transportation modes traveling to and adjacent to LRT station. At this time, the VE elevated LRT and station proposal demonstrates none of those benefits. Also, community members have expressed traffic safety concerns regarding the proposed LRT bridge in regards to sight distance from nearby intersections and access points. These concerns include the location of the proposed LRT overpass, speed of vehicles on Sheridan, and the topography of the roadway due to the gulch. Parks is strongly opposed to this proposal because it is the WRONG thing to do - from an environmental planning standpoint, from a neighborhood connection standpoint, all those things that we're supposed to be supporting to make this a more livable city. Keeping Sheridan at its current grade will permanently retain what has always been in impenetrable barrier, both visually and physically. Over the years, Denver has spent millions of dollars to create bike-ped connections in open space areas where barriers were shortsighted set up at some point in the past. Cost alone should not trump all other value Part of the reason that Fastracks was approved was its promise to improve urban livability, but by not installing the bridge at Sheridan, this value will be eliminated in favor of just getting a rail line in. The worst thing is that this condition would become "permanent" - essentially impossible to fix at any time in the future (unlike replacing asphalt walks with concrete or replacing less expensive sound walls with more expensive ones, for instance). Although a bike-ped bridge might suffice to make a physical connection, it in no way will make a visual connection. Furthermore, the natural landscape form would dictate that Sheridan should bridge the gulch</p> | Denver | Denver Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| Staff 1- LRT over Sheridan | <p>The proposal to put the light rail over Sheridan would need to be designed so that future improvements to Sheridan are not precluded. i.e. if the sag curve is lengthened in the future to match the design speed, then the roadway will be higher in the future, or if a new structure of the channel is constructed it might affect the future roadway elevation. Previous plans had shown a new overpass structure for Sheridan, allowing for the gulch trail to connect via a grade-separated crossing of Sheridan. In the absence of plans defining the proposed alternative of the light rail bridge passing over Sheridan I don't have anything to specifically comment on. This re-design would require a repeat 65% design review and comment process. If this bridge can provide a connection for the trail it would reduce my concerns. Denver is requesting that the trail have a grade-separated crossing of Sheridan in all design scenarios. A light rail bridge here would have significant approach embankment impacts - both to the park as well as to the gulch. Lack of sidewalks and the grade of Sheridan will result in m pedestrians particularly from the north and south. If Denver is to accept the new Sheridan design and save RTD up to \$6M, then Denver wants assurance of some improvements to Decatur.</p> | Denver | Denver Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| Staff 1- LRT over Sheridan | <p>This will introduce many problems related to station access for pedestrians. Riders will be compelled to attempt to cross Sheridan at the nadir. We predict that cars will stop at the bottom of Sheridan to let off passengers. The community is very opposed to this change and feels that RTD is not adhering to what is in the EIS.</p> | Denver | Denver Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| Staff 1- LRT over Sheridan | <p>This is more of an issue for Denver than Lakewood, but we are effected. Wall through the park.</p> | Lakewood | Lakewood Meeting Jan 16, 2007 | | |
| Staff 1- LRT over Sheridan | <p>What would the bike path do? Would it be at existing grade Can we build a bike path on the Sheridan flyover? Need more detail about bike and pedestrian movement in this area. Lakewood has fewer planning concerns about Sheridan than Wadsworth and will follow Denver's lead.</p> | Lakewood | Lakewood Meeting Jan 23, 2007 | | |
| Staff 1- LRT over Sheridan | <p>We can support LRT over Sheridan if station stays at Sheridan.</p> | Lakewood | Lakewood: e-mail on 1/26: | | |

ALL VE Comments

| VE Proposal # | Comment | Originating Agency | Source | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|--------------------------|---|--|--|
| Staff 1- LRT over Sheridan | COL reviewed the updated concepts on 01-30-07 and were receptive to taking LRT on a bridge spanning the ROW over the roadway with a station location on the west side of the roadway on retained fill or fill slope and wall to reduce the height of the walls particularly on the Gulch side. | Lakewood | Lakewood Meeting Jan 30, 2007 | | |
| Staff 1- LRT over Sheridan | City of Lakewood has concerns about the traffic circulation, parking access, steep grades remaining on Sheridan and proposed bridge aesthetics. Cannot support with current information, but willing to remain open as proposal is further developed. | Lakewood | Lakewood Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| Staff 11- 50 yr event drainage | Want to make sure MS4 drainage guidelines are followed. | CDOT | CDOT Meeting Jan 23, 2007 | | |
| Staff 11- 50 yr event drainage | Denver currently designs for a 5 year flood. They have no issue with this as long as RTD accepts responsibility for it. They don't want calls telling them to come drain water when the tracks are covered. | Denver | Denver Meeting Jan 25, 2007 | | |
| Staff 11- 50 yr event drainage | Denver currently designs for a 5 year flood. They have no issue with this as long as RTD accepts responsibility for it. They don't want calls telling them to come drain water when the tracks are covered. There are also issues of system reliability when the risk of system delays due to water over the infrastructure is increased. Denver is concerned over ridership impacts of reduced service reliability | Denver | Denver Written Coments February 15, 2007 | | |
| Staff 11- 50 yr event drainage | Just interested in what this means - no impact in their portion of the corridor. | Golden, Jefferson County | Jeffco/Golden Meeting Jan 18, 2007 | | |
| Staff 11- 50 yr event drainage | All Locations - Magnitude of cost savings is unsubstantiated. Specific estimate should be developed for each affected location if this alternative is pursued prior to a final decision. The 50-year flow may be only 10% +/- less than the 100-year flow. - Design of a 50-year system must convey 100-year flow over land in pattern similar to pre-construction condition. Dry Gulch at Richey Park and downstream to Zephyr -Lakewood decided to use Stormwater Utility funds to participate in the Richey Park work with the expectation that several properties would be removed from the 100-year flood plain. This benefit would be reduced or eliminated if the 50-year event is used for the culvert design between Carr and Zephyr, and Lakewood's participation would need to be reevaluated. -Urban Drainage and Flood Control matching funds would not be available if Lakewood did not participate. Not aware of UDFCD interest in funding 50-year. | Lakewood | Lakewood Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| Staff 2- 3 car platforms | Need further design information in order to comment. Need commitment to include stakeholders in this discussion. | Golden | Golden Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| Staff 4- no embankment walls Fed Ctr | Ok with this. Confirmed there would be paving at the grade crossings and rest of alignment would be fenced. | GSA | GSA Meeting Jan 26, 2007 | | |
| Staff 4- no embankment walls Fed Ctr | GSA is supportive of this recommendation if it supports the future development of the Federal Center, the proposed Master Site Plan, and accessibility and through-movement for both pedestrians and vehicles on the site in a safe and efficient manner. | GSA | GSA Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| Staff 5- reduce ornamental railing | Denver Planning supports the idea of reducing and simplifying the ornamental railing. Is also suggesting eliminating some of the ornamental touches at Knox and Perry stations. | Denver | Denver Meeting Jan 25, 2007 | | |
| Staff 5- reduce ornamental railing | Denver Planning supports the idea of reducing and simplifying the ornamental railing. Is also suggesting simplifying some of the ornamental touches at Knox and Perry. | Denver | Denver Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| Staff 5- reduce ornamental railing | Where? How much? Is the corridor fencing all chain link? What will the fencing look like? | Lakewood | Lakewood Meeting Jan 30, 2007 | | |
| Staff 5- reduce ornamental railing | Where? How much? City of Lakewood is willing to consider. | Lakewood | Lakewood Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| Staff 6- use weathering steel | CDOT concurs. | CDOT | CDOT Written Comments February 5, 2007 | | |
| Staff 6- use weathering steel | Denver has no issues with this. | Denver | Denver Meeting Jan 18, 2007 | | |
| Staff 6- use weathering steel | Denver has no issues with this. Taken off of Denver list | Denver | Denver Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| Staff 6- use weathering steel | Technique is commonly used on CDOT bridges. | Lakewood | Lakewood Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |

ALL VE Comments

| VE Proposal # | Comment | Originating Agency | Source | | |
|---|---|--------------------|---|--|--|
| Staff 7- design build bridges | Wants to make sure IGA's are in place prior to construction. | CDOT | CDOT Meeting Jan 23, 2007 | | |
| Staff 7- design build bridges | Need to facilitate development of a construction IGA between CDOT and RTD. Existing IGA only covers the design phase. Federal Bridge would be good candidate for CDOT modified DB guidelines. Needs environmental mitigation commitment plan or process. | CDOT | CDOT Written Comment February 5, 2007 | | |
| Staff 7- design build bridges | Denver wanted to be assured that design would continue from where it's currently at and not started over. If that is the case, then Denver has no issues with this. | Denver | Denver Meeting Jan 18, 2007 | | |
| Staff 7- design build bridges | Denver wanted to be assured that design would continue from where it's currently at and not started over. If that is the case, then Denver has no issues with this. It is off their list. | Denver | Denver Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| Staff 7- design build bridges | RTD is now looking at moving Eldridge bridge further west eliminating possibility of future station in the Mills area. City of Lakewood would support such a move that improves signal visibility on Indiana and reduces noise effects on adjacent neighborhoods. | Lakewood | Lakewood Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| Staff 8- eliminate caisson steel casing | Depends on geotech. | CDOT | CDOT Written Comments February 5, 2007 | | |
| Staff 9- DFC acquisition deal | In favor of this proposal. | GSA | GSA Meeting Jan 26, 2007 | | |
| Staff 9- DFC acquisition deal | GSA is very supportive of this recommendation and any partnership with RTD and another party that would help facilitate structured parking and appropriate transit-oriented development on the site. | GSA | GSA Written Comments February 15, 2007 | | |
| Staff 9- DFC acquisition deal | More of a Fed Center issue than City of Lakewood, but we need to complete land deal not cause more problems. | Lakewood | Lakewood Meeting Jan 23, 2007 | | |