

VE Proposal #	Comment	
P01-001 Move Auraria Wye south	Residents and businesses in the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood are concerned that VE Proposal #P01-001, which would keep the existing Auraria West Station, streets and infrastructure has been rejected. We ask that this Option be reopened for further study. The construction of the New Auraria West Station within the Auraria Campus requires the relocation of the heavy freight train line known as the Burnham Lead. This freight train track is being moved from the Auraria Campus into the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood. The impact of this heavy freight train line on the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood will be significant to the residents and businesses. We will have train horns blowing at new at grade crossings within 25 feet of businesses and 130 feet from existing homes. These horns will be redirected to the east towards our homes and businesses. The West 13th Avenue rail and light rail at grade crossing will become more congested and dangerous.	
P01-001 Move Auraria Wye south	Residents and businesses in the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood are concerned that VE Proposal #P01-001, which would keep the existing Auraria West Station, streets and infrastructure has been rejected. We ask that this Option be reopened for further study. The construction of the New Auraria West Station within the Auraria Campus requires the relocation of the heavy freight train line known as the Burnham Lead. This freight train track is being moved from the Auraria Campus into the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood. The impact of this heavy freight train line on the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood will be significant to the residents and businesses. We will have train horns blowing at new at grade crossings within 25 feet of businesses and 130 feet from existing homes. These horns will be redirected to the east towards our homes and businesses. The West 13th Avenue rail and light rail at grade crossing will become more congested and dangerous.	
P01-001 Move Auraria Wye south	P01-001 the reconfiguration of the Auraria wye should be moved south and the existing Auraria West Station should be preserved as proposed in P01-001. While the details of P01-001 were not discussed or made available to the LaAlma Lincoln Park Neighborhood, when RTD dropped the Burnham Yard failure on the neighborhood, it appears that P01-001 could be a starting point for working with the existing Burnham Lead and not relocating the Lead through the LaAlma Lincoln Park Neighborhood. Clearly the advantages of this would be cost savings of not relocating the Burnham Lead \$23,000,000 plus; significantly less impacts (noise, traffic, pollution, environmental property damage) on the LaAlma Lincoln Park neighborhood not to mention the \$4,000,000 additional savings on design. P01-001 should be put on the table with the neighborhood and adjacent property owners to determine the viability. As for the disadvantages being EIS or EA issues these appear to be minor in ...	
P01-001 Move Auraria Wye south	Residents and businesses in the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood are concerned that VE Proposal #P01-001, which would keep the existing Auraria West Station, streets and infrastructure has been rejected. We ask that this Option be reopened for further study. The construction of the New Auraria West Station within the Auraria Campus requires the relocation of the heavy freight train line known as the Burnham Lead. This freight train track is being moved from the Auraria Campus into the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood. The impact of this heavy freight train line on the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood will be significant to the residents and businesses. We will have train horns blowing at new at grade crossings within 25 feet of businesses and 130 feet from existing homes. These horns will be redirected to the east towards our homes and businesses. The West 13th Avenue rail and light rail at grade crossing will become more congested and dangerous. ...	
P01-001 Move Auraria Wye south	Residents and businesses in the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood are concerned that VE Proposal #P01-001, which would keep the existing Auraria West Station, streets and infrastructure has been rejected. We ask that this Option be reopened for further study. The construction of the New Auraria West Station within the Auraria Campus requires the relocation of the heavy freight train line known as the Burnham Lead. This freight train track is being moved from the Auraria Campus into the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood. The impact of this heavy freight train line on the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood will be significant to the residents and businesses. We will have train horns blowing at new at grade crossings within 25 feet of businesses and 130 feet from existing homes. These horns will be redirected to the east towards our homes and businesses. The West 13th Avenue rail and light rail at grade crossing will become more congested and dangerous.	
P01-001 Move Auraria Wye south	Residents and businesses in the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood are concerned that VE Proposal #P01-001, which would keep the existing Auraria West Station, streets and infrastructure has been rejected. We ask that this Option be reopened for further study. The construction of the New Auraria West Station within the Auraria Campus requires the relocation of the heavy freight train line known as the Burnham Lead. This freight train track is being moved from the Auraria Campus into the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood. The impact of this heavy freight train line on the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood will be significant to the residents and businesses. We will have train horns blowing at new at grade crossings within 25 feet of businesses and 130 feet from existing homes. These horns will be redirected to the east towards our homes and businesses. The West 13th Avenue rail and light rail at grade crossing will become more congested and dangerous.	

P01-001 Move Auraria Wye south	Residents and businesses in the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood are concerned that VE Proposal #P01-001, which would keep the existing Auraria West Station, streets and infrastructure has been rejected. We ask that this Option be reopened for further study. The construction of the New Auraria West Station within the Auraria Campus requires the relocation of the heavy freight train line known as the Burnham Lead. This freight train track is being moved from the Auraria Campus into the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood. The impact of this heavy freight train line on the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood will be significant to the residents and businesses. We will have train horns blowing at new at grade crossings within 25 feet of businesses and 130 feet from existing homes. These horns will be redirected to the east towards our homes and businesses. The West 13th Avenue rail and light rail at grade crossing will become more congested and dangerous.	
P01-001 Move Auraria Wye south	Residents and businesses in the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood are concerned that VE Proposal #P01-001, which would keep the existing Auraria West Station, streets and infrastructure has been rejected. We ask that this Option be reopened for further study. The construction of the New Auraria West Station within the Auraria Campus requires the relocation of the heavy freight train line known as the Burnham Lead. This freight train track is being moved from the Auraria Campus into the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood. The impact of this heavy freight train line on the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood will be significant to the residents and businesses. We will have train horns blowing at new at grade crossings within 25 feet of businesses and 130 feet from existing homes. These horns will be redirected to the east towards our homes and businesses. The West 13th Avenue rail and light rail at grade crossing will become more congested and dangerous.	
P01-001 Move Auraria Wye south	This option should not be rejected! The construction of the New Auraria West Station within the Auraria Campus requires the relocation of the heavy freight train line known as the Burnham Lead. This freight train track is being moved from the Auraria Campus into the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood. The impact of this heavy freight train line on the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood will be significant to the residents and businesses. We will have train horns blowing at new at grade crossings within 25 feet of businesses and 130 feet from existing homes. These horns will be redirected to the east towards our homes and businesses. The West 13th Avenue rail and light rail at grade crossing will become more congested and dangerous. RTD should only consider building a New Auraria Station when the freight line problem can be solved without moving the problem into the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood.	
P01-001 Move Auraria Wye south	Residents and businesses in the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood are concerned that VE Proposal #P01-001, which would keep the existing Auraria West Station, streets and infrastructure has been rejected. We ask that this Option be reopened for further study. The construction of the New Auraria West Station within the Auraria Campus requires the relocation of the heavy freight train line known as the Burnham Lead. This freight train track is being moved from the Auraria Campus into the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood. The impact of this heavy freight train line on the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood will be significant to the residents and businesses. We will have train horns blowing at new at grade crossings within 25 feet of businesses and 130 feet from existing homes. These horns will be redirected to the east towards our homes and businesses. The West 13th Avenue rail and light rail at grade crossing will become more congested and dangerous.	
P01-001 Move Auraria Wye south	Residents and businesses in the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood are concerned that VE Proposal #P01-001, which would keep the existing Auraria West Station, streets and infrastructure has been rejected. We ask that this Option be reopened for further study. The construction of the New Auraria West Station within the Auraria Campus requires the relocation of the heavy freight train line known as the Burnham Lead. This freight train track is being moved from the Auraria Campus into the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood. The impact of this heavy freight train line on the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood will be significant to the residents and businesses. We will have train horns blowing at new at grade crossings within 25 feet of businesses and 130 feet from existing homes. These horns will be redirected to the east towards our homes and businesses. The West 13th Avenue rail and light rail at grade crossing will become more congested and dangerous.	
P01-001 Move Auraria Wye south	Residents and businesses in the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood are concerned that VE Proposal #P01-001, which would keep the existing Auraria West Station, streets and infrastructure has been rejected. We ask that this Option be reopened for further study. \ \ \ \ The construction of the New Auraria West Station within the Auraria Campus requires the relocation of the heavy freight train line known as the Burnham Lead. This freight train track is being moved from the Auraria Campus into the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood. \ \ \ \ The impact of this heavy freight train line on the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood will be significant to the residents and businesses. We will have train horns blowing at new at grade crossings within 25 feet of businesses and 130 feet from existing homes. These horns will be redirected to the east towards our homes and businesses. The West 13th Avenue rail and light rail at grade crossing will become more congested and dangerous. \ \ ...	

P01-001 Move Auraria Wye south	Residents and businesses in the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood are concerned that VE Proposal #P01-001, which would keep the existing Auraria West Station, streets and infrastructure has been rejected. We ask that this Option be reopened for further study. The construction of the New Auraria West Station within the Auraria Campus requires the relocation of the heavy freight train line known as the Burnham Lead. This freight train track is being moved from the Auraria Campus into the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood. The impact of this heavy freight train line on the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood will be significant to the residents and businesses. We will have train horns blowing at new at grade crossings within 25 feet of businesses and 130 feet from existing homes. These horns will be redirected to the east towards our homes and businesses. The West 13th Avenue rail and light rail at grade crossing will become more congested and dangerous.	
P01-001 Move Auraria Wye south	Residents and businesses in the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood are concerned that VE Proposal #P01-001, which would keep the existing Auraria West Station, streets and infrastructure has been rejected. We ask that this Option be reopened for further study. The construction of the New Auraria West Station within the Auraria Campus requires the relocation of the heavy freight train line known as the Burnham Lead. This freight train track is being moved from the Auraria Campus into the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood. The impact of this heavy freight train line on the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood will be significant to the residents and businesses. We will have train horns blowing at new at grade crossings within 25 feet of businesses and 130 feet from existing homes. These horns will be redirected to the east towards our homes and businesses. The West 13th Avenue rail and light rail at grade crossing will become more congested and dangerous.	
P01-001 Move Auraria Wye south	Residents and businesses in the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood are concerned that VE Proposal #P01-001, which would keep the existing Auraria West Station, streets and infrastructure has been rejected. We ask that this Option be reopened for further study. The construction of the New Auraria West Station within the Auraria Campus requires the relocation of the heavy freight train line known as the Burnham Lead. This freight train track is being moved from the Auraria Campus into the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood. The impact of this heavy freight train line on the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood will be significant to the residents and businesses. We will have train horns blowing at new at grade crossings within 25 feet of businesses and 130 feet from existing homes. These horns will be redirected to the east towards our homes and businesses. The West 13th Avenue rail and light rail at grade crossing will become more congested and dangerous.	
P01-001 Move Auraria Wye south	Residents and businesses in the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood are concerned that VE Proposal #P01-001, which would keep the existing Auraria West Station, streets and infrastructure has been rejected. We ask that this Option be reopened for further study. The construction of the New Auraria West Station within the Auraria Campus requires the relocation of the heavy freight train line known as the Burnham Lead. This freight train track is being moved from the Auraria Campus into the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood. The impact of this heavy freight train line on the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood will be significant to the residents and businesses. We will have train horns blowing at new at grade crossings within 25 feet of businesses and 130 feet from existing homes. These horns will be redirected to the east towards our homes and businesses. The West 13th Avenue rail and light rail at grade crossing will become more congested and dangerous. ...	
P01-001 Move Auraria Wye south	Residents and businesses in the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood are concerned that VE Proposal #P01-001, which would keep the existing Auraria West Station, streets and infrastructure has been rejected. We ask that this Option be reopened for further study. The construction of the New Auraria West Station within the Auraria Campus requires the relocation of the heavy freight train line known as the Burnham Lead. This freight train track is being moved from the Auraria Campus into the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood. The impact of this heavy freight train line on the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood will be significant to the residents and businesses. We will have train horns blowing at new at grade crossings within 25 feet of businesses and 130 feet from existing homes. These horns will be redirected to the east towards our homes and businesses. The West 13th Avenue rail and light rail at grade crossing will become more congested and dangerous. ...	
P01-001 Move Auraria Wye south	Residents and businesses in the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood are concerned that VE Proposal #P01-001, which would keep the existing Auraria West Station, streets and infrastructure has been rejected. We ask that this Option be reopened for further study. The construction of the New Auraria West Station within the Auraria Campus requires the relocation of the heavy freight train line known as the Burnham Lead. This freight train track is being moved from the Auraria Campus into the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood. The impact of this heavy freight train line on the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood will be significant to the residents and businesses. We will have train horns blowing at new at grade crossings within 25 feet of businesses and 130 feet from existing homes. These horns will be redirected to the east towards our homes and businesses. The West 13th Avenue rail and light rail at grade crossing will become more congested and dangerous. ...	
P01-001 Move Auraria Wye south	Residents and businesses in the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood are concerned that VE Proposal #P01-001, which would keep the existing Auraria West Station, streets and infrastructure has been rejected. We ask that this Option be reopened for further study.	
P01-001 Move Auraria Wye south	The Existing Auraria West Station streets and infrastructure should be retained, saving the estimated \$4,000,000. RTD should only consider building a New Auraria Station when the freight line problem can be solved without moving the problem into the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood.	

P01-001 Move Auraria Wye south	The construction of the New Auraria West Station within the Auraria Campus requires the relocation of the heavy freight train line known as the Burnham Lead. This freight train track is being moved from the Auraria Campus into the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood.
P01-001 Move Auraria Wye south	The impact of this heavy freight train line on the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood will be significant to the residents and businesses. We will have train horns blowing at new at grade crossings within 25 feet of businesses and 130 feet from existing homes. These horns will be redirected to the east towards our homes and businesses. The West 13th Avenue rail and light rail at grade crossing will become more congested and dangerous.
P01-001 Move Auraria Wye south	Proposal #P01-001 should not be rejected Do not move The Auraria West Station. do not move the heavy freight train line from the Auraria Campus into the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood.
P01-001 Move Auraria Wye south	The La Alma/Lincoln Park neighborhood park will be ngatively impacted by this realignment. In addition, it does not seem as if sufficient dialogue has been held for this neighborhood. Specifically, we all felt that the Burnham Yard was going to be purchased. Then without any notice, we were told that RTD was uncooperative rearding this purchase and that the relocation would be going thru this area and would negatively impact this area forever. \ I do not feel that sufficient alternatives were explored when this occured and nothing was communicated to the neighborhood when this event occured. Also, there will be disruptive traffic, noise, pollution and property value degradation associated with this decision. Finally, every other area along the RTD route has received substantial improvements to lessen these issues to the adjacent residents. We have not. It is unfair and unique for us to be treated in this manner. Why are we not being treated as other comparable areas were ...
P01-002 Remove future 'ghost' station at 8th Avenue	If there's deemed to be a good chance that increased use will necessitate an 8th Avenue station w/in 5-8 years, this seems penny-wise and pound-foolish. On the other hand, if this was a "back burner" station even in long-range projections, then this makes sense.
P01-002 Remove future 'ghost' station at 8th Avenue	Keep the 8th Ave. station. People need to be able to walk to the light rail and get on.
P01-002 Remove future 'ghost' station at 8th Avenue	If the goal of FasTracks to is promote economic development, how does it make sense to eliminate even the possibility of a station in an industrial area? The extension from DFC west is scheduled to run only one third of the time of the eastern section. If that is considered reasonable, why not a station in an industrial area.
P01-002 Remove future 'ghost' station at 8th Avenue	If the goal of FasTracks to is promote economic development, how does it make sense to eliminate even the possibility of a station in an industrial area? The extension from DFC west is scheduled to run only one third of the time of the eastern section. If that is considered reasonable, why not a station in an industrial area.
P01-002 Remove future 'ghost' station at 8th Avenue	NO - The savings is not worth it. Keep the Ghost station at 8th Ave...!
P01-002 Remove future 'ghost' station at 8th Avenue	Although there are offices and businesses in the area, LRT riders could be accommodated at the Oak St and Federal Center stations, preferably via bus service.
P01-002 Remove future 'ghost' station at 8th Avenue	Keep in plans and make room for it the future.
P01-002 Remove future 'ghost' station at 8th Avenue	Lame #!@%& don't keep promises.
P01-003 Install only single track from DFC to Jeffco	This makes sense to me - as long as it doesn't run the same risk as #P01-009 in terms of loss of federal funding.

P01-003 Install only single track from DFC to Jeffco	If only a single track is initially installed between the Denver Federal Center and the Jefferson County Government Center, the designers should cost options that will allow the installation of a second track in the future. First, the cost differential between building any bridge, tunnel, or similar structure in this section wide enough for only one track vs. two tracks should be evaluated. In other words, what are the costs of keeping the options of a future second track open? I would guess, in 2007 dollars, building a LRT bridge wider would be considerably less than building a second bridge in the future. What is the designers estimate of the differential for a double tracks bridge? An additional 15%? The future costs of traffic disruption for construction of a second LRT bridge (etc) should be included. That is, is it prudent to build a bridge once over the increasingly busy Sixth Avenue, or a tunnel under I-70, etc.?	
P01-003 Install only single track from DFC to Jeffco	I can grit my teeth and accept this, but worry over limits of future service. As long as 4 car trains can operate that would be minimally acceptable, but I would like to know the minimum headway that would be possible based on a passing siding. Would there also be adequate right of way still available for future expansion to double track or would this decision permanently eliminate that possibility? Although not necessarily a part of this project, I would want to ensure that adequate feeder and circulator bus service would be available for the Golden area.	
P01-003 Install only single track from DFC to Jeffco	I can accept 7.5" headways but not 15" with single track.	
P01-003 Install only single track from DFC to Jeffco	Jeffco Courthouse has traffic flow both in and out at all times of day. Single rail line seems inadvisable. Limits access for attorneys & clients from downtown Denver and other areas of the city.	
P01-003 Install only single track from DFC to Jeffco	Defer to Golden and Jeffco long-term growth and zoning plans when determining single or double track. \ If double track determined as a future need or possibility put double in right away so developers and business owners can make plans based on it.	
P01-003 Install only single track from DFC to Jeffco	I agree!	
P01-003 Install only single track from DFC to Jeffco	Keep ability to add the double track in the future. Hopefully soon. \ How does the single track affect schedule where it joins in central corridor with its closely scheduled trains?	
P01-003 Install only single track from DFC to Jeffco	A short sighted proposal. Use double tracks all the way so you won't have to re-do later on based on anticipated ridership	
P01-003 Install only single track from DFC to Jeffco	We agree this is short-sighted with short-term savings which will equal larger long-term costs.	
P01-003 Install only single track from DFC to Jeffco	Don't do this. It would make for very tight schedules. What if the schedule gets out of whack for any reason, like snow.	
P01-003 Install only single track from DFC to Jeffco	Only Install Single Track from Federal Center Station to JeffCo "End of Line" \ \ The vast majority of riders using the JeffCo/Golden section of the West Corridor system will be driving to the stations located at the Federal Center and the JeffCo "End of Line". Since the 6th Avenue "highway drive time" between the two stations is minimal, I seriously doubt that riders will choose to wait for 15 minutes for a train at the JeffCo Station when they will only have to wait for 5 minutes at the Federal Center Station. The level of service provided by single track operation with 15 minute headways will never encourage increased ridership on this section of the system. \ \ The estimated savings (\$15 million to \$33 million) related to this proposal represent savings of approximately 2.6% to 5.7% of the current estimated project cost of \$574 million (Ref Denver Post Article, 0207/2007, " West light-rail line wins funds"). It would be a serious ...	

P01-003 Install only single track from DFC to Jeffco	Single track makes a great deal of sense with the western end of this line. Make allowances for possible future double tracking, but for now single track is all you need. It saves millions.	
P01-003 Install only single track from DFC to Jeffco	IF the line truly has the ridership to be built, build it right. Construction costs later will be considerable, and the neighborhoods and Sixth Avenue drivers will be subjected to two sets of construction annoyances.	
P01-003 Install only single track from DFC to Jeffco	Single tracking from the Federal Center west would be OK if the ROW and plans still allowed for the second track to be added in the future... Hope you don't have to do this...!	
P01-003 Install only single track from DFC to Jeffco	For achieving savings of limited FasTracks \$, this makes the most sense to me. Single track service should be sufficient for many years, at which point it can be determined whether or not there is sufficient demand for service to warrant going back to the well for more \$ to build a second track. I fear that if RTD skimps on building a top quality line from Denver to the Federal Center it will never never go back to make the needed/desired improvements to serve users, enhance development opportunities, and maintain or improve quality of life in the existing residential areas.	
P01-003 Install only single track from DFC to Jeffco	The 6th Ave West HOA submits: If the line truly has the ridership to be built, build it right. Construction costs later will be considerable, and the neighborhoods and Sixth Avenue drivers will be subjected to two sets of construction annoyances.	
P01-004 Future spur or line extension to DFC	This flies in the face of the entire rationale for mass transit, and is acceptable ONLY if the alternative is no West Corridor Line at all. There are hundreds of hotel rooms, thousands of dwelling units, and thousands of jobs within 3/4 mile of this station. Shuttling to an 8th Street station that elsewhere in the VE Report is being proposed for elimination is short-sighted at best. Residential density immediately to the west on Green Mountain is higher, by far, than at any other point on the West Corridor route. From a commuting standpoint, once in their cars, many people will be inclined to stay in them, and drive to their destination rather than to the park-n-ride to take light rail. Adoption of this proposal will be a HUGE mistake on both environmental and transit rationale grounds.	
P01-004 Future spur or line extension to DFC	This decreases ease of use for riders and may drive some folks away. Minimize need for transfers like this	
P01-004 Future spur or line extension to DFC	Does this mean that a single line only would run to Golden? Poor service would result in Federal Center Station being very popular with the ridership.	
P01-004 Future spur or line extension to DFC	I thought the line was to cross once, to get to the Federal Center. Do the Feds have internal commuter vans or buses in use already?	
P01-004 Future spur or line extension to DFC	Glad to hear the elementary light track (fact trade) to Federal Center (6th and Simms) will be eliminated - these take light rail to downtown - particularly from Green Mtn R.R. would not bother if they had to change.	
P01-004 Future spur or line extension to DFC	Really bad idea. The Federal Center is the western anchor of the corridor. This would really be short-sighted.	
P01-004 Future spur or line extension to DFC	I am opposed to this 'spur' proposal! You need to keep the Federal Center plan as is (ie; double track from Downtown to at least the Federal Center...!	

P01-004 Future spur or line extension to DFC	This center will be a major center for services, employment, business, and housing for Lakewood. It has excellent TOD potential. Downgrading it is exceptionally bad for light rail users, the City of Lakewood, residents, and the overall multimodal transportation system. One of the worst proposals.	
P01-005 Elimination of Knox and/or Lamar Stations	Knox is cross by the #1 bus so passengers could transfer to light rail.	
P01-005 Elimination of Knox and/or Lamar Stations	Keep Lamar & Knox stations. These were promised in the MIS process and the EIS process. Don't break your promises to the communities.	
P01-005 Elimination of Knox and/or Lamar Stations	Perry has #10 and #49 which could transfer passengers.	
P01-005 Elimination of Knox and/or Lamar Stations	Light rail is better for the disabled than buses.	
P01-005 Elimination of Knox and/or Lamar Stations	Perry and Knox both are near low income and disabled housing.	
P01-005 Elimination of Knox and/or Lamar Stations	Kiss and drop is a viable concept. Neighborhood use by pedestrians and cyclists a selling point for the Knox Station. Short duration stop!	
P01-005 Elimination of Knox and/or Lamar Stations	KEEP	
P01-005 Elimination of Knox and/or Lamar Stations	Walkers need to ride and need stations too.	
P01-005 Elimination of Knox and/or Lamar Stations	Lamar is the only transfer point for the #9 bus (except for fairly useless ones downtown and at Cold Springs/Federal Center)	
P01-005 Elimination of Knox and/or Lamar Stations	This seems to minimize the utility of the line. Why would the neighborhoods and parking facilities of the remaining stations be able to absorbed the extra traffic?	
P01-005 Elimination of Knox and/or Lamar Stations	Knox Station is transfer point for the #1 and #49 bus routes. These routes, especially the #1 can't be readily changed to go to Perry St. Station.	
P01-005 Elimination of Knox and/or Lamar Stations	Knox station is part of a multi-modal system - its within the 1/4 miles walking distance. It connects to buses on Knox and Colfax. It connects to walkway detached sidewalks and bike ways; and its in a PK which needs to have lower speeds. Keep it!	

P01-005 Elimination of Knox and/or Lamar Stations	Keep stations and prepare zoning for T.O.D. at 20 -30 V.A.	
P01-005 Elimination of Knox and/or Lamar Stations	I was told the expectation was people would walk to the station.	
P01-005 Elimination of Knox and/or Lamar Stations	Need to make service available to those neighborhoods if stations are eliminated.	
P01-005 Elimination of Knox and/or Lamar Stations	After following the West Corridor plans for many years and being an advocate of the Light Rail concept I am extremely disappointed to hear of the discussions around eliminating the Lamar St. station. This area has a high density population and it is an excellent extension of the Colfax Revitalization plan. The old JCRS shopping area, along with the other new additions already built, and new development moving East from Wadsworth can all experience renewed interest with the Light Rail Lamar Station's help. All of my neighbors are extremely concerned about the Lamar St. station and the commuting/development enhancements it could bring. As we try to get away from automobile use and dependence on foreign oil, the light rail becomes even more valuable to all of us. Ridership from the Lamar St. station promises to be excellent just from walkup riders. I put my vote in before for the West Corridor as planned and I request that the Lamar Station be retained as the best stop ...	
P01-005 Elimination of Knox and/or Lamar Stations	To build stations only where there is a Park-n-Ride. This has negative social policy and energy policy impact. It promotes transit expansion as a luxury for people who own and use cars, rather than as a utility for public good and people who can't afford to drive. It also promotes driving, rather than walking or riding bikes to a station. This dilutes transit's positive impact on US energy consumption and the environment. Emphasizing cars should be the last thing public transit expansion should do.	
P01-005 Elimination of Knox and/or Lamar Stations	To build stations only where there is a Park-n- Ride. This has negative social policy and energy policy impact.It promotes transit expansion as a luxury for people who own and use cars, rather than as a utility for public good and people who can't afford to drive. It also promotes driving, rather than walking or riding bikes to a station. This dilutes transit's positive impact on US energy consumption and the environment. Emphasizing cars should be the last thing public transit expansion should do.	
P01-005 Elimination of Knox and/or Lamar Stations	There are too many stations. Delaying Lamar is a great idea. Knox is too close to Perry. Eliminating these two station will speed travel, making the line more attractive to Jeffco travelers!	
P01-005 Elimination of Knox and/or Lamar Stations	The Lamar station should not be eliminated. This area needs a station to serve the neighborhood. West Colfax redevelopment will contribute to ridership. There is a need for a station between Sheridan and Wadsworth because of the distance between the two.	
P01-005 Elimination of Knox and/or Lamar Stations	The fact that it was even proposed to delay or flat out not build the Lamar street station is evidence that the VE team, though I'm sure well qualified, possesses absolutely no understanding of how essential this station is or just how busy this station will infact be. It would be a great misdeed to the people of the Two Creeks community if this station were not built, we have been some of this projects biggest backers since day one and have done much to rally support in our neighborhoods. Get your heads out of the sand! The Lamar station must be built.	
P01-005 Elimination of Knox and/or Lamar Stations	Defering construction of Lamar St. station is NOT good idea. Costs will never go down; it will never be less expensive, and is unlikely ever to be done. Local access from community is crucial to developing ridership and serving community. Lamar station is important to economic health and vitality of surrounding neighborhoodl. Present time is the most economica and efficient time to create Lamar station.	
P01-005 Elimination of Knox and/or Lamar Stations	The comments regarding the Knox station do not mention that this station is the transfer point for RTD bus routes 1 and 49. In the case of route 49, it is the only rail connection for what could become a significant feeder route. It should not be assumed that these bus routes can (or will) be modified to make connections at Perry Street instead. The statement is made that the Knox station's proximity to the Perry and Decatur stations dilutes the "ridership and development potential" of the three stations. While ridership may indeed be diluted, the development potential of a rail station area is not affected in any way by the proximity of other atations. The proposal does not acknowledge that the Lamar station is a transfer point for RTD route 9. The comments about development prospects (or lack thereof) at Lamar appear to be little more than uninformed speculation.	

P01-005 Elimination of Knox and/or Lamar Stations	I believe you need to keep the Lamar station in the plan!! Eliminating the Knox station seems reasonable due to the Decatur station just east of Knox and the Perry station just west of Knox.
P01-005 Elimination of Knox and/or Lamar Stations	Both stations in Lakewood should be built ASAP. Both Garrison and Lamar are needed right away. Lamar is key to the City's and the community's goal to upgrade this downtrodden area, and to include housing to accommodate, among others, people whom the market now serves poorly. The Lakewood Housing Authority has property for below-market-rate housing in that area. Regarding Garrison, there are already many residents in the area who would use the service, and besides, Lynn and I would not be able readily to get to Wadsworth using our walkers in 2012.
P01-005 Elimination of Knox and/or Lamar Stations	The 6th Ave West HOA submits: Include the elimination of the Red Rocks Station and pedestrian bridge at Arbutus Drive. The Red Rocks Station is a non-park-n-ride station. It is close to the Denver Federal Center and the JeffCo "end of Line" stations which have park-n-ride facilities. This would decrease the traffic on the 6th Ave Frontage Road and the surrounding neighborhood. This is a cost reduction and should be considered.
P01-005 Elimination of Knox and/or Lamar Stations	The construction of the Lamar Station should not be delayed or deferred. Deferring the construction of the Lamar Station would increase the costs because prices would be escalated by inflation when finally constructed.
P01-005 Elimination of Knox and/or Lamar Stations	The construction of the Lamar Station should not be delayed or deferred. Deferring the construction of the Lamar Station would not decrease costs because prices would be substantially increased by reduced construction efficiencies and not being part of the initially large bid and construction package.
P01-005 Elimination of Knox and/or Lamar Stations	The construction of the Lamar Station should not be delayed or deferred. Deferring the construction of the Lamar Station would actually increase the costs because delayed construction would mean the Lamar Station would be built after the West Corridor line is already operational. This would further add to construction costs of the station to create doubled-up or by-pass track, and acquire additional rights-of-way so the operational West Corridor trains could by-pass the Lamar station during its construction. This is a ridiculous Savings proposal.
P01-005 Elimination of Knox and/or Lamar Stations	The construction of the Lamar Station should not be eliminated nor delayed. The delayed or eliminated construction of all non Park-n-Ride stations should not be considered a value engineering idea and should be rejected completely. Although Park-n-Ride stations serve one market (suburban dwellers) very well, these should not be the only group the RTD FastTracks West Corridor intends to serve. Long Range Urban Planning must not be sacrificed as a cost saving measure. The urban core of Lakewood must have its future protected with transportation options at the same time we attempt to better serve suburbs and mountain dwellers.
P01-005 Elimination of Knox and/or Lamar Stations	The construction of the Lamar Station should not be delayed or deferred. Deferring the construction of the Lamar Station would increase the costs not decrease costs. The VE Proposal #P01-005 claims Future Estimated Savings which are completely specious. Deferred construction costs would necessarily be higher, not lower. This proposal only generates additional costs, not any savings.
P01-005 Elimination of Knox and/or Lamar Stations	The construction of the Lamar Station should not be delayed or deferred. The Lamar Station will be a magnet for development and spur the growth of an Urban Transit Centered housing community, just possibly a lower-income group that most dramatically needs access to Public Transit. Deferring or eliminating the Lamar station would condemn the neighborhood to a steady decline, creating a Route 66 Effect similar to the death of towns along Route 66 as Interstate Highway construction bypassed once viable towns. The City of Lakewood and private developers do have development plans for this area and as long-term stake-holders, we do have tax, revenue, and infrastructure needs to consider. All current Park-n-Ride facilities on existing Denver RTD light-rail lines are full to capacity by 8:00 am each morning. If not constructed, suburban dwellers would simply park and then ride through urban blighted wastelands on their way to downtown ...
P01-005 Elimination of Knox and/or Lamar Stations	The construction of the Lamar Station should not be delayed or deferred. The urban transit provided in other major metropolitan cities provide access to light rail with both Park-n-Ride and also walk up type stations. Cities that immediately come to mind are New York, Washington, DC, San Francisco, and Atlanta. The Fast Tracks program should not set the precedent of serving Park-n-Ride customers over neighborhood and urban needs.
P01-005 Elimination of Knox and/or Lamar Stations	The construction of the Lamar Station should not be delayed or deferred. Deferring the construction of the Lamar Station would increase the costs not decrease costs because this VE Proposal would substantially increase the complexity of construction planning and logistics by taking the station out of the package and making it an orphan requiring construction management as a stand-alone project.

P01-005 Elimination of Knox and/or Lamar Stations	I don't believe you should delay development of the Lamar St. station. This would have a huge economic impact on this part of Lakewood. Owners of business's and property in this section of Lakewood having been waiting for years for Light Rail on this Western corridor and it is imperative it begin as soon as possible.
P01-005 Elimination of Knox and/or Lamar Stations	This will add a lot of value to the comunity. It will be so convenient. Do not delay or defer this process.
P01-005 Elimination of Knox and/or Lamar Stations	Having a station so near by is great!!!! People won't be driving as much less excidents less polusion less traffic on the roads. This would be great. Don't delay or deferr the process.
P01-005 Elimination of Knox and/or Lamar Stations	Having a station in Lakewood would be faboules. No more speeding tickes :) We would be saving money on gas. There are a lot of great things this station would do for all of us that live in Lakewood. Please do not delay or deferr this process. Thank You
P01-005 Elimination of Knox and/or Lamar Stations	Construction of the Lamar Station should not be delayed or deferred because residents need direct walk-up access to light rail to get to jobs.
P01-005 Elimination of Knox and/or Lamar Stations	My firm manages several properties within blocks of the Lamar Station at 13th & Lamar Street. Our office has been located on West Colfax for over 20 years. Many of our tenants are tax payers with limited incomes. They rely on public transportation. I strongly urge you to retain the construction of the Lamar Station in the current schedule for the RTD West Corridor Fast Tracks project. Furthermore, building the Lamar Station would be more expensive at a later date than doing it now as a part of the current design, bid, and construction package. This is an important neighborhood walk up transit station that is justified by the number of multi-family units in the neighborhood and the residents need for convenient, easy access to public transportation.
P01-005 Elimination of Knox and/or Lamar Stations	Construction of the Lamar Station should NOT be eliminated nor delayed because it would substantially increase complexity of construction planning and logistics by taking the station out of the package and making it an orphan. In fact, combined with additional costs due to inflation, materials-cost increases, and re-engineering, Lamar station probably would never be built.
P01-005 Elimination of Knox and/or Lamar Stations	It is NOT correct that there are no redevelopment plans for the area of Lamar Station. City of Lakewood, private businesses such as ourselves, and developers do have development and re-investment plans, predicated on the Lamar Station that will generate long term community development, improved tax revenues, and much greater economic health and vitality that will generate jobs and improved opportunity for the population. Deferring or eliminating Lamar station will consign this area to steady economic decline.
P01-005 Elimination of Knox and/or Lamar Stations	Construction of Lamar Station should not be delayed or deferred. Immediate local pedestrian access to rapid transit would contribute greatly to economically integrated, vital urban neighborhoods that are good for the local community as well as the economic health of the Denver region by easing access to jobs and commerce.
P01-005 Elimination of Knox and/or Lamar Stations	Construction of the Lamar Station should NOT be eliminated nor delayed. Doing so would increase costs, not decrease costs because: 1. costs will increase by inflation when finally constructed. 2. costs would be substantially increased by reduced construction efficiencies and by not being part of initial bid/construction package. 3. Delayed construction would ADD to construction costs by requiring doubled-up or by-pass track and additional rights-of-way to allow already installed operational West Corridor trains to by-pass Lamar station during construction.
P01-005 Elimination of Knox and/or Lamar Stations	Construction of the Lamar Station should not be delayed or deferred. If you do not provide convenient walk-up access to rapid transit, you just encourage people to keep using cars - NOT the goal of the Light Rail project!
P01-005 Elimination of Knox and/or Lamar Stations	Deferring kiss and ride stations creates even more congestion at the main stations as well as more traffic throughout neighborhoods.

P01-005 Elimination of Knox and/or Lamar Stations	The Eiber Neighborhood Association supports RTD's decision to keep the Garrison Street Station as planned. Final station design has not been developed, and we are concerned that quality of design and materials may be undesirably compromised by this type of cost reduction in the future.	
P01-005 Elimination of Knox and/or Lamar Stations	I have heard there is some discussion about not building a Lamar station and would like to encourage that it be built. We continue to experience increased residential development in the neighboring areas, already significantly impacting traffic. I believe people who would not travel to Wadsworth or Sheridan, will find a station at Lamar convenient to access.	
P01-005 Elimination of Knox and/or Lamar Stations	For what it's worth, I've really been looking forward to the construction of the LRT and Lamar Stations. Presently, the 9 picks me up at my house and though the LRT @ Lamar would be a bit further, I would rather take that. My concern when the LRT is built, the 9 would be eliminated. Without the Lamar Station, my walk is even longer to Wadsworth. Please bear this in mind.	
P01-005 Elimination of Knox and/or Lamar Stations	If Lamar has to go, any possibility of alternative funding to bring it back (city of Lakewood?)	
P01-005 Elimination of Knox and/or Lamar Stations	No station at Lamar? Boo! The neighborhood would become a fly-over for LRT and considering the lack of sidewalks in the area --walking a mile to a station on the side of a road would discourage use.	
P01-005 Elimination of Knox and/or Lamar Stations	I'm not familiar enough with the neighborhood to know the locations of stations well enough to have a definitive opinion. If, in fact, Knox and Perry stations are close enough to dilute ridership, perhaps one can be eliminated. Lamar station seems a different case, though postponement will have repercussions for local residents - some of whom will surely think it's just fine not to build stations that don't have their own parking. In a generation, when fuel prices have escalated to the point where car ownership has dramatically declined, this may not be an issue, but at present...	
P01-005 Elimination of Knox and/or Lamar Stations	Don't want to see the Lamar Station eliminated. It will hinder future development. Plans have already been made for that site.	
P01-005 Elimination of Knox and/or Lamar Stations	With regard to the potential elimination of the Lamar Station: The general area around this station has a significant potential for development due to the existence of over 25 acres of industrial land, much of which is vacant. Speaking for the Lakewood Housing Authority-we have recently acquired 6 acres within 500 feet of the stop. Since we have acquired the site, we have received several offers of partnership in development from strong mixed-use developers. I can tell you that on our 6-acres alone, there is the potential to add significant ridership to the line and greatly improve the immediate area of Lakewood with a high-quality residential-oriented development. I urge you not to eliminate this stop.	
P01-008 Eliminate redundant platforms, where they occur	I might support some reduction here, but not elimination of all redundant platforms due to concern for operational and maintenance flexibility.	
P01-008 Eliminate redundant platforms, where they occur	At grade level does not always work for disabled. Make sure myself and others can access the light rail.	
P01-009 Increase the time between trains from 5 to 7.5 minutes	Savings are substantial, but without federal funding the entire West Corridor Line may be at risk. This doesn't seem a responsible proposal in that light. I wouldn't have a problem personally with waiting another 3 minutes for the train, but jeopardizing federal funding doesn't seem a good way to approach cost-saving.	
P01-009 Increase the time between trains from 5 to 7.5 minutes	What is the definition of headway? What is the expected rider capacity at 5 min vs. 7.5 min? What happens if you change it to 10 min headways? Is the cost saving linear? Also, if you start with 7.5 min for the first few years, can you increase the headway to 5 min while still using the current infrastructure?	

P01-009 Increase the time between trains from 5 to 7.5 minutes	I can accept 7.5" headways but not 15" with single track.	
P01-009 Increase the time between trains from 5 to 7.5 minutes	NO! EIS promised 5 minute service. Don't break your promise. Cuts ridership a lot! What is the point of building West Corridor if you cut out riders?	
P01-009 Increase the time between trains from 5 to 7.5 minutes	In this area if people perceive a long wait, they're likely to drive instead of ride.	
P01-009 Increase the time between trains from 5 to 7.5 minutes	Good idea, much more realistic than 5 minute headways. No other current line has five minute headways.	
P01-009 Increase the time between trains from 5 to 7.5 minutes	YES! 15 or 20 minute headways would be sufficient west of the federal center. 7.5 is fine for the rest of the route...!	
P01-009 Increase the time between trains from 5 to 7.5 minutes	The 6th Ave West HOA submits: Does the line truly have the ridership? When you decrease the service it will impact the ridership numbers and impact the levels below FTA criteria for federal funds.	
P01-011 Change drainage design of MSE walls	This seems a good idea if local expansive soil can be reliably protected from exposure to water. The key is the degree to which it can be "reliably" protected.	
P01-011 Change drainage design of MSE walls	Yes. This idea makes sense and saves \$\$\$!	
P01-012 Recycle excess excavation materials on site	I agree - substantial cost savings if existing soil has no major geotech problems.	
P01-012 Recycle excess excavation materials on site	Well, duh! Also contact developers in the areas and ask them to contribute "fill" they take out for their construction projects.	
P01-012 Recycle excess excavation materials on site	YES! Good idea to recycle excavation material as you go...!	
P01-013 Move the interlocking tracks at Jeffco to the east of the station.	This seems reasonable, and irrelevant if only one track is built to Jeffco Gov't. Center.	
P01-013 Move the interlocking tracks at Jeffco to the east of the station.	Yes! Logical change which sure makes sense!!!	

P01-019 Eliminate the pedestrian bridge at Tennyson	Pennywise, dollars wasted	
P01-019 Eliminate the pedestrian bridge at Tennyson	We have school children needing to cross. The bridge needs to be built at the same time as the rails. Where ever the money comes from our park taxes or RTD taxes.	
P01-019 Eliminate the pedestrian bridge at Tennyson	We have large population of children.	
P01-019 Eliminate the pedestrian bridge at Tennyson	We need north/south connections for our families and youth to access their school, park, light rail.	
P01-019 Eliminate the pedestrian bridge at Tennyson	NO! Was not agreed to by CCD Parks was agreed to by RTD as a safety consideration for affected neighborhoods.	
P01-019 Eliminate the pedestrian bridge at Tennyson	With the proposed elimination of pedestrian bridges where are the pedestrians supposed to go?	
P01-019 Eliminate the pedestrian bridge at Tennyson	As far as I am aware, Parks has already counted on RTD building these pedestrian improvements. And I believe RTD has already accepted responsibility for these bridges, and to put the onus back onto Parks is buck-passing. Pedestrian improvements further all of transit expansion's goals. To eliminate funding for pedestrian improvement will hamper pedestrian use of transit and bring into question the efficacy of light rail expansion, and RTD management generally. The lack of pedestrian access to Park Meadows Mall on the southeastern expansion has been widely ridiculed among ridership and the press, and any attempt to eliminate pedestrian access in future expansion could bring similar public ire to the West Corridor.	
P01-019 Eliminate the pedestrian bridge at Tennyson	As far as I am aware, Parks has already counted on RTD building these pedestrian improvements. And I believe RTD has already accepted responsibility for these bridges, and to put the onus back onto Parks is buck-passing. Pedestrian improvements further all of transit expansion's goals. To eliminate funding for pedestrian improvement will hamper pedestrian use of transit and bring into question the efficacy of light rail expansion, and RTD management generally. The lack of pedestrian access to Park Meadows Mall on the southeastern expansion has been widely ridiculed among ridership and the press, and any attempt to eliminate pedestrian access in future expansion could bring similar public ire to the West Corridor.	
P01-019 Eliminate the pedestrian bridge at Tennyson	Consider using recycled materials for foot/bike bridges. This reduces costs, increases park and light rail use.	
P01-019 Eliminate the pedestrian bridge at Tennyson	I don't know the topography of the site, but a means for pedestrians to safely get from one side of the tracks to the other seems imperative. Eliminating the pedestrian bridge would only be acceptable to me if its inclusion in CCD Parks proposal was a certainty, and if necessary funding was also in place. Otherwise, I couldn't support this.	
P01-019 Eliminate the pedestrian bridge at Tennyson	Do not eliminate pedestrian bridges from Perry St. west to Sheridan Blvd. Provides an opportunity to access the light rail. Good for pedestrians without vehicle. And would be nice to have a bridge after soooooo many years without any pedestrian crossover. Good for kids to be able to use bridges --- safety consideration.	
P01-020 Use highest concrete strength for precast concrete bridges	Will this proposal meet required safety standards for shear strength and other issues related to accident, earthquake, and other substantial and sudden stresses? If so, I'd accept this.	

P01-021 maintenance walkways from sides of track to center	Move	This seems sensible from a cost standpoint, and I'd support it if safety of maintenance workers is not compromised by adoption of the proposal.	
P01-021 maintenance walkways from sides of track to center	Move	Re doing more money we wasted so much time and money on study and re-doing.	
P01-021 maintenance walkways from sides of track to center	Move	NO - Savings does not justify this change to the walkways...!	
P01-021 maintenance walkways from sides of track to center	Move	Does not seem to affect riders.	
P01-022 Eliminate all pedestrian bridges through the park		Maintain all park pedestrian bridges. Allows for greater and easy access from one side (e.g. Tennyson St.) to the other for pedestrians - specifically riders and children walking to and from school...a safety consideration.	
P01-022 Eliminate all pedestrian bridges through the park		What happened to "pedestrians have the right of way"	
P01-022 Eliminate all pedestrian bridges through the park		No - we need access north/south. We have a large population of children going to Lake Middle School. PK money was not to be used for this. It was to apply improvements to the PK with mitigation.	
P01-022 Eliminate all pedestrian bridges through the park		Cost shift to other agencies is not a savings...just out of THIS projects responsibility.	
P01-022 Eliminate all pedestrian bridges through the park		The park has its own pool of money for improvements.	
P01-022 Eliminate all pedestrian bridges through the park		Walkers are cheaper to serve than drivers.	
P01-022 Eliminate all pedestrian bridges through the park		Somebody is going to be a liar. We don't forget promises.	
P01-022 Eliminate all pedestrian bridges through the park		With the proposed elimination of pedestrian bridges where are the pedestrians supposed to go?	

P01-022 Eliminate all pedestrian bridges through the park	As far as I am aware, Parks has already counted on RTD building these pedestrian improvements. And I believe RTD has already accepted responsibility for these bridges, and to put the onus back onto Parks is buck-passing. Pedestrian improvements further all of transit expansion's goals. To eliminate funding for pedestrian improvement will hamper pedestrian use of transit and bring into question the efficacy of light rail expansion, and RTD management generally. The lack of pedestrian access to Park Meadows Mall on the southeastern expansion has been widely ridiculed among ridership and the press, and any attempt to eliminate pedestrian access in future expansion could bring similar public ire to the West Corridor.	
P01-022 Eliminate all pedestrian bridges through the park	As far as I am aware, Parks has already counted on RTD building these pedestrian improvements. And I believe RTD has already accepted responsibility for these bridges, and to put the onus back onto Parks is buck-passing. Pedestrian improvements further all of transit expansion's goals. To eliminate funding for pedestrian improvement will hamper pedestrian use of transit and bring into question the efficacy of light rail expansion, and RTD management generally. The lack of pedestrian access to Park Meadows Mall on the southeastern expansion has been widely ridiculed among ridership and the press, and any attempt to eliminate pedestrian access in future expansion could bring similar public ire to the West Corridor.	
P01-022 Eliminate all pedestrian bridges through the park	Consider using recycled materials for foot/bike bridges. This reduces costs, increases park and light rail use.	
P01-022 Eliminate all pedestrian bridges through the park	I support the park pedestrian bridges but would be OK with eliminating them if some other fund picks them up. People have been crossing the track ROW for over 100 years and will continue to do so with or without the bridges. The bridges (including Tennyson) are important!!	
P01-022 Eliminate all pedestrian bridges through the park	Pedestrains need to be able to cross safely. Bridges provide a safe passage	
P01-022 Eliminate all pedestrian bridges through the park	I don't know the topography of the site, but a means for pedestrians to safely get from one side of the tracks to the other seems imperative. Eliminating the pedestrian bridge would only be acceptable to me if its inclusion in CCD Parks proposal was a certainty, and if necessary funding was also in place. Otherwise, I couldn't support this.	
P01-025 Use signals on the train instead of by the tracks	Compatibility with existing equipment may be an issue, but if not, I'd agree to this proposal.	
P01-025 Use signals on the train instead of by the tracks	Re-Do, Re-Study-waste money. Keep it the way it is, it is safer.	
P01-025 Use signals on the train instead of by the tracks	NO - I think the existing wayside signal system works fine...	
P01-025 Use signals on the train instead of by the tracks	Are these auditory or visual signals?	
P01-028 Use Vital processors instead of Vital relays	I (and most of the public) lack the expertise to make a judgment about this proposal.	
P01-029 Reduce miniumum curve radius	The key question here is HOW MUCH will rail life expectancy be reduced? Increased maintenance and/or replacement may offset initial cost savings.	

P01-029 Reduce minimum curve radius	No again of the rail curve radius limit for hardened rail...!	
P01-030 Redesign diamond tangents at Auraria Wye	Savings seem small, especially in light of future design work necessitated by this change.	
P01-031 Reduce the minimum curve radius for restraining rail	I agree IF no substantial safety issues are found.	
P01-031 Reduce the minimum curve radius for restraining rail	Reducing curve radius limits for restraining rail would seem to be a safety issue. I DO NOT think this is a good idea...!	
P01-032 Relocate the TPSS at Indiana	I agree - this seems sensible, even if installation is a bit more difficult.	
P01-033 Review number and locations of CCTV cameras	Leave off cameras. Hire real police.	
P01-033 Review number and locations of CCTV cameras	I agree. If infrastructure is in place, cameras can be added in the future as needed.	
P01-033 Review number and locations of CCTV cameras	What are the cameras for?	
P01-033 Review number and locations of CCTV cameras	Have eyes on the platform by integrating T.O.D with open access. Cameras MUST GO!	
P01-033 Review number and locations of CCTV cameras	Having a safe ride is the more important need here. Gang members are going to press the advantage right away, not wait for funding, they have it through drug sales.	
P01-033 Review number and locations of CCTV cameras	Shifting responsibility and funding does not enhance security. What are the security measures to ensure the safety of riders and workers within the DFC? Can anyone have unchecked access to the DFC from light rail?	
P01-033 Review number and locations of CCTV cameras	Shifting responsibility and funding does not enhance security. What are the security measures to ensure the safety of riders and workers within the DFC? Can anyone have unchecked access to the DFC from light rail?	
P01-033 Review number and locations of CCTV cameras	The 6th Ave West HOA submits: Based on today's concerns regarding security issues, this diminishes the intent to have CCTV cameras in place on a 24 hour basis for our protection. What are the security measures to ensure the safety of riders and workers within the DFC?	

P01-033 Review number and locations of CCTV cameras	Having limited security could result in vandalism, harm to others, lawsuits, and increase costs to maintenance etc.	
P01-034 Reduce ballast requirements	I agree. Reduction in materials seems relatively minor, especially in light of cost savings.	
P01-034 Reduce ballast requirements	The idea of reducing ballast requirements makes sense on the straightaways may make sense but not sure it should be done on curves...? Will leave that idea to the experts...!	
P01-053 Reduce height of concrete parapet on bridges/Use steel handrail	I'd agree with this. "Splash protection" from rail car wheels shouldn't require extensive mitigation.	
P01-053 Reduce height of concrete parapet on bridges/Use steel handrail	Why does a handrail need to be steel? Consider recycled materials. The New York Throughway built an entire road bridge out of recycled milk cartons--new technology needs to be more apparent within new designs.	
P01-054 Use Alternative materials for sound walls	Are you planning ANY use of chainlink in Lakewood? Please don't; and don't use chainlink in your scenarios. What would the current design and the proposed design look like? Are they equally safe?	
P01-054 Use Alternative materials for sound walls	I'd favor this change in materials IF further study shows alternatives to be relatively equal in terms of durability. If the sole expectation/burden on sound walls is that they deflect noise, then weather durability may be the only significant issue. If alternatives can deal with temperature extremes and higher UV without significant deterioration, I'd support this.	
P01-054 Use Alternative materials for sound walls	I thought the "visual effect" of the design of the concrete walls was going to be aesthetically pleasing. How will a flimsy wood or lexon wall be more pleasing to the eye?	
P01-054 Use Alternative materials for sound walls	Earth trees bashes loot to natural solutions.	
P01-054 Use Alternative materials for sound walls	Can't be assumed for entire corridor. Need to evaluate for high visibility areas and future TOD areas.	
P01-054 Use Alternative materials for sound walls	Will it hold with the Bentanight changes? I don't think so. Check it out.	
P01-054 Use Alternative materials for sound walls	Constructing sound walls out of concrete is not cost effective because of noise "bouncing and the cost of materials. Recycled materials are more effective and cost efficient.	
P01-054 Use Alternative materials for sound walls	Constructing sound walls out of concrete is not cost effective because of noise "bouncing and the cost of materials. Recycled materials are more effective and cost efficient.	

P01-054 Use Alternative materials for sound walls	Do not have sufficient information (i.e., none) to comment.	
P01-054 Use Alternative materials for sound walls	The 6th Ave West HOA submits: The alternative materials for sound walls must be questioned and looked at closely for application in this area. Constructing sound walls out of concrete is not cost effective because of noise "bouncing" and the cost of materials. Recycled materials are more effective and cost efficient. Effective noise mitigation can be achieved through a combination of measures. Solutions should not be universal but rather individual. Sound Walls must be continuous to be effective. An "opt out" policy is unacceptable because it would render any benefit to other participants useless. The most efficient place to start is at the source of the noise. Vibration is as big a problem as noise. <u>Since barriers must be placed on the track to keep ballast in place, they should be made of a noise absorption material.</u>	
P01-054 Use Alternative materials for sound walls	Concrete sound walls are an attractive, low-maintenance, safe, long-term solution. The value engineering proposal for lighter weight materials simply shifts the costs from present day to the future costs of deferred maintenance and creates long-term, eye-sores. The estimated, up-front savings would be far out-weighed by long term maintenance costs of alternatives.	
P01-054 Use Alternative materials for sound walls	Sound wall / barrier WhisperWall ® type of technology would be the preferred solution for sound attenuation. However, RTD has not provided any design details as to how this solution will be implemented, nor has RTD even committed to its use. Barrier heights and placement are still to be determined. RTD representatives have stated that this material is comparable in cost to precast concrete, so while there is no cost penalty, neither is there any cost savings. So this appears to be outside the scope of this value engineering exercise. Eiber Neighborhood Association acknowledges RTD's offer to allow adjacent property owners to opt-out in sections of 800'. As a neighborhood, our primary desire is to maintain an overall consistent and pleasant sound wall / barrier design. <u>We do not endorse nor reject any single property owner's preference.</u>	
P01-059 Lengthen track circuits, reduce boundary blocks	I agree, and headways closer than 5 minutes may never be necessary, or if so, not for decades to come.	
P01-059 Lengthen track circuits, reduce boundary blocks	Yes. Great savings and you do not need headways closer than 5 minutes. I have watched trains get loaded after Broncos games and they cannot even get them off in less than 5 minutes even with trains pulling up immediately after one leaves...!	
P01-060 Defer construction of Auraria Wye and make connection from tangent track	Bad idea. Build the wye. Do not defer it!!	
P01-060 Defer construction of Auraria Wye and make connection from tangent track	Because I believe this system will be more heavily used than many anticipate (in line with experience virtually everywhere else in the country), operational flexibility seems a crucial consideration, and should not be unduly restricted. This will be far more difficult to construct and finance at a later date.	
P01-060 Defer construction of Auraria Wye and make connection from tangent track	Keep regular service on the west corridor to Union Station during Bronco games. Regular riders need it.	

<p>P01-060 Defer construction of Auraria Wye and make connection from tangent track</p>	<p>Keep the wye so trains could go to union station or to 16th street mall. Or emergencies.</p>	
<p>P01-060 Defer construction of Auraria Wye and make connection from tangent track</p>	<p>This is a short sighted proposal. Work at Union Station will entail short-term closure of the station and approaching tracks. The wye construction will be "absolutely necessary" almost immediately after the West Line opens.</p>	
<p>P01-060 Defer construction of Auraria Wye and make connection from tangent track</p>	<p>Light rail is supposed to be faster than bussing. Let's keep it faster.</p>	
<p>P01-060 Defer construction of Auraria Wye and make connection from tangent track</p>	<p>The Auraria wye should be built for many reasons. First, one function of transit is reliably operate during times of daily highway congestion, severe weather, and accidents on our highways. Without a wye, critical service would be affected during atypical and normal operations. . The estimated price of \$6M sounds large, but the benefits over the next years could also be large. Assuming the LRT maintenance facility is built on the lines going south, lack of a wye would make bringing trains onto the West Corridor difficult. What if the line was inoperable towards Denver Union Station for several hours or days? To provide service for a majority of the riders RTD should b able to run trains from Jefferson County to the fully functional wye and into downtown Denver.</p>	
<p>P01-060 Defer construction of Auraria Wye and make connection from tangent track</p>	<p>The Auraria wye should not be eliminated. The comments receommending this proposal say that the wye could be built when "absolutely necessary," whatever that means. If eliminated, the lack of this wye connection will become a nuisance as soon as the West Line begins operation.</p>	
<p>P01-060 Defer construction of Auraria Wye and make connection from tangent track</p>	<p>?? Not sure eliminating the wye is a good idea. Might be real hard to put it in at a later date...! Seems like you ought to think long and hard before eliminating this wye...</p>	
<p>P01-060 Defer construction of Auraria Wye and make connection from tangent track</p>	<p>RTD's Value Engineering Power Point presentation titled West Corridor Elected Officials Meeting January 19, 2007 states the overall goals and intent of the project will not change. Immediately following this statement the following goal is stated: Light Rail Line from Jeffco to Auraria The goals do not include a New Station in Auraria, nor do the goals state a requirement for the construction of a Light Rail Line from Jeffco to Union Station. The West Line should connect to the Auraria West Station where passengers could then transfer to the Downtown, Union Station or South trains. If the VE process is to result in no changes to the goals and intent of the project yet still provide a quality system then the elimination of the Auraria Wye VE proposal P01-060 should be accepted and not tabled. The Auraria Wye cost savings is estimated at \$6,000,000. Eliminating the Wye should be combined with a simplified Auraria West Transfer Station.</p>	
<p>P01-068 Build privacy fences on private property instead of noise walls on the guideway</p>	<p>This may be necessary, but in the long run may also be penny-wise and pound-foolish unless there is some legal or statutory mechanism to ensure, through enforcement and fines, that individual property owners maintain those privacy fences. Without that, appearance could easily deteriorate, and even if not legally responsible, RTD will be blamed. "Opt-out" policy may already address this, but the policy is nowhere to be found in the report.</p>	

<p>P01-068 Build privacy fences on private property instead of noise walls on the guideway</p>	<p>Local community is opposed to privacy fences on 13th Ave frontage road. Privacy fences already exist on properties that back to the tracks, but for those that face the tracks, this is not an acceptable option.</p>	
<p>P01-068 Build privacy fences on private property instead of noise walls on the guideway</p>	<p>Privacy/Noise fences seem to be a better idea along 13th Ave as they are lower and create a more unified sense of community and don't seem to appear to divide neighborhoods as much.</p>	
<p>P01-068 Build privacy fences on private property instead of noise walls on the guideway</p>	<p>Not fair to push future maintenance to property owners!</p>	
<p>P01-068 Build privacy fences on private property instead of noise walls on the guideway</p>	<p>Do it right or don't....</p>	
<p>P01-068 Build privacy fences on private property instead of noise walls on the guideway</p>	<p>NO! Takes away our view of the park/open space areas. Low saving/benefit level.</p>	
<p>P01-068 Build privacy fences on private property instead of noise walls on the guideway</p>	<p>Lower quality given to low income and they are further burdened with maintenance.</p>	
<p>P01-068 Build privacy fences on private property instead of noise walls on the guideway</p>	<p>Goals are not achieved - noise mitigation should not be compromised.</p>	
<p>P01-068 Build privacy fences on private property instead of noise walls on the guideway</p>	<p>Penny wise.</p>	

P01-068 Build privacy fences on private property instead of noise walls on the guideway	Material foolish.	
P01-068 Build privacy fences on private property instead of noise walls on the guideway	Wood rots.	
P01-068 Build privacy fences on private property instead of noise walls on the guideway	Require rezone! Which involves incentives for masonry construction of new T.O.D. housing, 500' feet.	
P01-068 Build privacy fences on private property instead of noise walls on the guideway	Low income families can not afford expensive fences. They do pay taxes to cover this cost.	
P01-068 Build privacy fences on private property instead of noise walls on the guideway	We voted on the tax level. Use it. Each individual cannot afford expensive fence. Seattle did it.	
P01-068 Build privacy fences on private property instead of noise walls on the guideway	Effective noise mitigation can be achieved through a combination of measures. Solutions should not be universal but rather individual. Sound walls must be continuous to be effective. An "opt out" policy is unacceptable because it would render any benefit to other participants useless. The most efficient place to start is at the source of the noise. Perhaps recycled tires could be used under the rails. Vibration is as big a problem as noise. An individual doesn't sleep any better if it is quiet, but the bed is shaking violently as a high speed train passes by in the middle of the night. Since barriers must be placed on the track to keep ballast in place, they could be made of a noise absorption material. Again, recycled tires could be incorporated since the barriers do not have to support anything. Money spent on problem at its source won't have to be spent elsewhere. The use of "green" material not only saves the environment, increases the ...	
P01-068 Build privacy fences on private property instead of noise walls on the guideway	It's hard to imagine that this wouldn't be ugly for people using streets adjacent to LRT and unacceptable for residents whose front yards would be physically and aesthetically limited by a tall fence. For those on the north side there would be icing problems, as there would for traffic/pedestrians on the south side. How is noise diminished at driveway openings? Maximum noise remediation with minimum visual impact are achieved by a well-designed low wall next to the wheels of the LRT vehicle.	
P01-068 Build privacy fences on private property instead of noise walls on the guideway	The two noise barrier proposals require more close analysis and work with architects and urban planners to reconcile multiple requirements. High 8-10 foot fences in concept 2 along property lines could create a "canyon effect" cutting off visual access and openness, possibly creating public safety hazards. With opt-out provisions and unreliable owner maintenance, fences and walls may create an undesirable, ineffective inconsistency. Further study with architects and planners is necessary.	

P01-068 Build privacy fences on private property instead of noise walls on the guideway	VE Proposal #P01-068 is a terrible idea. If 8'-10' tall fences are required for effective noise reduction, fences at this height are against the City of Lakewood ordinance (for good reasons). Because these fences would probably not be part of complete fence surrounding a gated property, they would be a safety hazard (reduce visibility and provide an easy hiding place). These proposed fences would also be a serious graffiti target and, with a wood surface, would be difficult to clean. They would also create an ugly fenced "canyon" out of 13th Avenue, further cutting-off the north side from the south side of tracks through the Two Creeks Neighborhood. I wonder which side will become "the wrong side of the tracks"?	
P01-068 Build privacy fences on private property instead of noise walls on the guideway	Privacy fences bordering ROW this option may be practical and acceptable for properties backing the ROW. However, it is unacceptable and violates city ordinance for properties facing the ROW, and for sides of property forward of house front face. Open mesh fencing is common to older properties in the neighborhood and contribute to its character. In accordance with relevant action steps of the neighborhood plan we will discourage placement of fences on side yards, as being out of character. We recognize the property owners' rights in the choice of material and placement of fences on their property, but our position would be to discourage it. This is a significant aesthetic compromise that we feel will detrimentally affect the value of properties in the neighborhood. We would therefore prefer that a proper sound barrier solution be developed that meets the requirements of sound attenuation and aesthetics as described above.	
P01-068 Build privacy fences on private property instead of noise walls on the guideway	When looking at 13th Avenue from Harlan to Wadsworth, many of the homes face 13th and the RTD line. Tall wooden fences along the property lines would be disastrous for property values, a loss of use of land by the property owners, a great graffiti target, and make 13th Avenue look like an ugly tunnel. Fences of the proposed height and location are in violation of the Lakewood City Ordinance regarding fences on residential properties. Due to these and additional concerns for responsibility of maintenance, we do not support this proposal.	
P01-068 Build Privacy Fences on private property instead of noise walls on the guideway	Sound walls on private property lines. These are not acceptable. They could create safety issues for the residences. And- the City of Lakewood (as many other cities w/in the RTD boundaries), have codes that prohibit these canyons in front of proprties. Please, stop cheapening the West Corridor at the expense the residents who's neighborhoods you are disrupting. We've worked with you to find good resolutions but your recent proposals are not even close to meeting the needs and previous 10 years of comments we feel are valid.	
P01-069 Simplify the ballast wall design	A key question here is HOW MUCH the redesign reduces safety in case of an auto crash. If safety loss is relatively minimal, I'd accept this.	
P01-073 Shift the pocket track at Federal Decatur station off bridge	Will additional design work negate the savings envisioned by this proposal?	
P01-073 Shift the pocket track at Federal Decatur station off bridge	Yes. Makes sense to me...	
P01-081 Eliminate or modify pocket track at DFC	Once again, operational flexibility is a crucial consideration, and should not be unduly restricted.	
P01-081 Eliminate or modify pocket track at DFC	Keep maximum flexibility for operation. Therefore, keep pocket track.	
P01-081 Eliminate or modify pocket track at DFC	This track should still remain in the plans for future use and the room for its footprint should be kept.	

P01-091 and bore tunnels under I-70 with two separate bores	Jack	Yes. This is a good idea to save \$\$\$!	
P01-091 and bore tunnels under I-70 with two separate bores	Jack	This seems sensible if single-track line to Jeffco Gov't. Center will be the near-future standard.	
P01-091 and bore tunnels under I-70 with two separate bores	Jack	If this good proposal continues to be accepted with modifications, probably we can remove the references to tunnel under I-70 from my above comments on P01-003. However, RTD should determine if this is any cost interaction between drilling only one tunnel now and one later. That is, are the two tunnel drilling processes financially independent? For a small cost during the construction of one tunnel can RTD do something to make the cost of a future (probable) second tunnel less?	
P01-101 Prepurchase rail for entire project		I agree. Need for more storage space seems minor compared to potential cost savings.	
P01-101 Prepurchase rail for entire project		Will this take money from other area's needed now?	
P01-101 Prepurchase rail for entire project		What are the costs of storing all of the rail for an entire transportation system at one time? What happens as the projects (lines) are re configured and the needs of rail change? What happens if the funding for FasTracks is greatly reduced or eliminated? Will the savings incurred at the time of purchase be lost due to storage fees and "garage sale" prices to sell rail at a later date? The total cost of an option should be carefully explored.	
P01-101 Prepurchase rail for entire project		Yes. Pre-purchase the rail in advance to save money...!	
P01-101 Prepurchase rail for entire project		The 6th Ave West HOA submits: What are the costs for storing all of the rail for an entire transportation system at one time? What happens as the projects (lines) are re-configured and the needs of rail change? What happens if the funding for FasTracks is greatly reduced or eliminated? The total cost of an option should be carefully explored.	
P02-005 Modify the alignment to stop at the DFC, build extension to Jeffco in the future		The 6th Ave West HOA submits: Put the FasTrack line from the DFC to JeffCo "End of Line" ON HOLD until further study can be made to determine if the rail line is cost effective. Does the line truly have the ridership? If cost is a true consideration then this option must be considered. The HOA submits its comment to eliminate the Red Rocks Station and the pedestrian bridge connected to the Red Rocks Station at Arbutus Drive. The RRCC has direct access to the FasTracks at the Denver Federal Center Station through West Second Avenue which runs from the DFC Station west straight to the RRCC campus. This is a cost reduction and should be considered. This would eliminate the additional amount of traffic on the 6th Ave Frontage Road which impacts the neighborhood.	
P02-005 Modify the alignment to stop at the DFC, build extension to Jeffco in the future		If cost is a true consideration then this option must be considered. Three years after the EIS the exact route has not been established, in part because the ultimate land use has not been determined. A better idea for the Red Rocks/Stevinson Development station would be to have a station at RRCC. The line could run from DFC through Second Ave, across Simms-Union and up the drainage directly to the campus, then turn and cross Sixth Ave. An on demand mini-bus could run from the passenger crossover to the station.	
P02-008 Jeffco station on east side of Johnson Road	Realign	In the long run, this might be an improvement on the original plan, especially if it has the anticipated result of making expansion into Golden easier/less costly. Pedestrian tunnel or bridge to Jeffco Gov't Center seems to me a perfectly satisfactory solution for access from Gov't Center parking.	

P02-008 Jeffco station on east side of Johnson Road	Realign	On behalf of Victim's Outreach (VO1) and people who visited in the Jeffco Memorial Garden, we feel this current design along Johnson Road is superior to the past proposals.	
P02-008 Jeffco station on east side of Johnson Road	Realign	Johnson Road alt. NO! Go to west side. Too far to Taj Mahal, too far from Social Services, jail, open space building, DA building, etc. Purpose of West Corridor is to provide access and transportation!	
P02-008 Jeffco station on east side of Johnson Road	Realign	Consider the historical impact of the cemetery carefully. At present this is not noted as a disadvantage. There is a triangle of memorials in this area: Marines cemetery and garden.	
P02-008 Jeffco station on east side of Johnson Road	Realign	This new station will be much too far from the Government Center - Inconvenient for elderly passengers	
P02-025 Change structure type of Federal Bridge		I'm not enthused about this, but given rising costs, the sacrifice of aesthetics for utility may be unavoidable - and fiscally responsible.	
P02-025 Change structure type of Federal Bridge		Make access to west side more pleasant in this redesign.	
P02-025 Change structure type of Federal Bridge		Let us redesign it to death. Never build.	
P02-025 Change structure type of Federal Bridge		Prefer three span bridge to keep historical remnants vs. columns.	
P02-025 Change structure type of Federal Bridge		Yes. I support this change to the Federal bridge...	
P02-026 Deeper girders at Dry Gulch		I (and most members of the public) lack the expertise to make a judgment about this.	
P02-038 Depress the Light rail alignment under Wadsworth, instead of flying over		Prefer "Option A" for the Wadsworth Station	
P02-038 Depress the light rail under Wadsworth instead of flying over		Depressing LRT at Wadsworth seems innovative to me rather than regrettable. I like this idea.	

P02-038 Depress the light rail under Wadsworth instead of flying over	Taking Wadsworth below grade is not what was originally planned and we don't like it.	
P02-038 Depress the light rail under Wadsworth instead of flying over	The underground station looks better and the cost is less. I am for that	
P02-038 Depress the light rail under Wadsworth instead of flying over	I much prefer the aesthetics of a below grade crossing. In California, BART lines and stations can overwhelm a community and are large and intrusive - this seems to be a much better approach.	
P02-038 Depress the light rail under Wadsworth instead of flying over	EXCELLENT IDEA! Reduces noise and visual pollution. Much cleaner lines. Much cheaper to build. A win-win idea for everyone.	
P02-038 Depress the light rail under Wadsworth instead of flying over	Good! Less visual impact. Odds of bridge design (even with Lakewood additional money) being timeless are not likely or possible. The originally proposed above grade has intrusive visual and physical wall separations. City should consider this.	
P02-038 Depress the light rail under Wadsworth instead of flying over	The tax increase isn't just to spend frivolously on bridges when we could save money and use it on other important parts of these developments.	
P02-038 Depress the light rail under Wadsworth instead of flying over	I believe the cost savings will be eaten up by hidden utilities.	
P02-038 Depress the light rail under Wadsworth instead of flying over	A really good idea. Less intrusive to the neighborhood. Why if this is less expensive, not included in the original plan. Overpasses divide neighborhoods, this will make it much more compatible with the surrounding area!!	
P02-038 Depress the light rail under Wadsworth instead of flying over	I attended the meeting on January 31 at the Jeffco Fairgrounds and saw the renderings of the Wadsworth station options. Hands down, this station should be built underground. The wall which would have to be built for the station to be elevated is about as attractive as the obtrusive eyesore at Garrison and sixth avenue. Do we want another 300 feet of elevated, ugly, lifeless concrete obstructing our views? Do we want Lakewood to become a city of walls and flyovers? I vote no. Build the Wadsworth station underground and save some money in the process. Don't erect another monument to how truly disgusting and unappealing modern design and engineering can be, our city is already scarred enough.	
P02-038 Depress the light rail under Wadsworth instead of flying over	Yes. The saving involved would make this a good idea!	

P02-038 Depress the light rail under Wadsworth instead of flying over	1. Whereas trenching may have value in eliminating the visual barriers ramps cause, it may not be feasible in terms of reengineering and redesign costs, and in the longer run it is likely not to look as good as a well-designed bridge for complementing adjacent high quality TOD. 2. The visual representations of walls and bridges at the Jan 31 community meeting were misleading; they tilted toward the trench alternative by portraying both the bridge and ramp walls as uglier than need be. The City of Lakewood's bridge design is far superior and the community likes it. Please use that in future presentations. 3. Although the station itself would be out of the weather if located under Wadsworth it would pose security problems. 4. The pedestrian/bicycle trail MUST not be at grade, so it should be provided for either below grade or by an overpass; I'd rather ride a bicycle above a street than in a trench.	
P02-038 Depress the light rail under Wadsworth instead of flying over	Wadsworth Station due to considerable effort and coordination of the city in developing the Wadsworth Station Area Plan, and the efforts of the city's planning department in developing the concept of the gateway bridge, all with significant involvement of the citizenry, Eiber Neighborhood Association supports the retention of the original plan for an above grade station at Wadsworth.	
P02-040 Federal Bridge Change	This sacrifices the historical look, just as in the proposed change for #P02-025, but with far less in savings. I prefer #P02-025 if the original CIP arch is deemed too expensive.	
P02-040 Federal Bridge Change	No. I am opposed to this proposed change to the Federal Blvd bridge. The savings doesn't justify doing this...!	
P02-048 Eliminating the pocket track at Lakewood Gulch	Yes. Eliminating the pocket track here would appear to be OK. I don't think it would have received much use...!	
P03-008 Utilize the inside area of the DFC as deposit for excess embankment materials	This makes sense, though I have questions. Where will truck access to the site be? What will this do to already-high traffic levels on Union Boulevard? If access uses the Union/2nd Place intersection, will some provisions be made for pedestrian safety at an already-dangerous crossing of Union?	
P04-005 Change the bike path material from concrete to asphalt	In a perfect world, this wouldn't be necessary, but despite lower durability, maintenance costs are probably equivalent otherwise, and replacement costs will be lower, so it makes sense. I'm not a cyclist, so I have no idea how cyclists will respond.	
P04-005 Change the bike path material from concrete to asphalt	The bike path needs to be concrete to meet City Standards. Need to be able to access with maintenance vehicles. Asphalt is less durable. Asphalt is just as expensive as concrete, if not more.	
P04-005 Change the bike path material from concrete to asphalt	It's good to see that you are planning a bike route along the rail. I would certainly use it if the weather turns inclement. I currently commute +/- 1,500 miles a year to/from work.	
P04-005 Change the bike path material from concrete to asphalt	Bike paths need to installed if you cannot do right give us a grant to move to Seattle and Paris.	

P04-005 Change the bike path material from concrete to asphalt	Access is needed for maintenance vehicles and police.	
P04-005 Change the bike path material from concrete to asphalt	Lower quality material will have a shorter life span.	
P04-005 Change the bike path material from concrete to asphalt	Bike paths need to be built. Period.	
P04-005 Change the bike path material from concrete to asphalt	Will the bike paths still be designed for rapid commuters? Still 10 ft wide? Who maintains? Will paths still follow along side the train all the way into Denver?	
P04-005 Change the bike path material from concrete to asphalt	The city took 10 years to build the bike path, city taxes paid for it once, the cost needs shared between the two tax system's do it. Do it safe.	
P04-005 Change the bike path material from concrete to asphalt	Take a look at the existing asphalt bikepaths in the Denver area. They are not performing well.	
P04-005 Change the bike path material from concrete to asphalt	20 years of experience has shown that asphalt is not a satisfactory material for bike path construction.	
P04-005 Change the bike path material from concrete to asphalt	If you mess up a bike path fix it, or work in track.	
P04-005 Change the bike path material from concrete to asphalt	Not acceptable. We are trying to enhance an active community with transportation options. Asphalt/Crusher fines not conducive to rollerblade/strollers. Deteriorates fast.	
P04-005 Change the bike path material from concrete to asphalt	Bikes are traffic	

P04-005 Change the bike path material from concrete to asphalt	Work with cities now. Do the work now, cost are only going to keep rising. Penny wise pound foolish.	
P04-005 Change the bike path material from concrete to asphalt	Again, these recommendations are marginalizing pedestrian and bicycle traffic to save money. The primary purpose of public transit should be to promote energy conservation, reduce congestion, reduce environmental impact, and promote economic development through facilitation transportation to those who are without automobiles. To cut costs and reduce facilities for pedestrians and bicycles hurts all of the main goals of public transportation.	
P04-005 Change the bike path material from concrete to asphalt	Again, these recommendations are marginalizing pedestrian and bicycle traffic to save money. \ \ The primary purpose of public transit should be to promote energy conservation, reduce congestion, reduce environmental impact, and promote economic development through facilitation transportation to those who are without automobiles. \ \ To cut costs and reduce facilities for pedestrians and bicycles hurts all of the main goals of public transportation.	
P04-005 Change the bike path material from concrete to asphalt	Long experience has shown that full-depth asphalt construction is not satisfactory for a bike path. \ \ Asphalt is particularly unsuitable for construction in Lakewood-Dry Gulch, where drainage from adjacent land will cause fluctuation in the moisture of the subgrade. \ \ I'm sure that RTD would not consider substituting asphalt for concrete in station platforms and plazas, for example.	
P04-005 Change the bike path material from concrete to asphalt	You gotta be kidding. Yuk! RTD would build minimally, thus increasing maintenance costs, which would have to be absorbed by the City? What a deal!	
P04-005 Change the bike path material from concrete to asphalt	Lowering access creates less desire to ride the light rail. Delaying any part of these projects to a later date as we all know increases the cost.	
P04-005 Change the bike path material from concrete to asphalt	Bike trail material Eiber fully supports the city's ordinance that bike trails be constructed of concrete. It should be noted that the final layout of the bike path at this point in time is still to be determined. Eiber continues to endorse the inclusion of pedestrian crossings at some closed streets (e.g. Allison, Pikeview specific locations still to be negotiated with RTD), and sidewalks parallel to the track in areas where there is common pedestrian access, but no bike path or street planned by RTD (e.g. Zephyr, Brentwood, or other areas as determined by final layout of bike trail).	
P06-003 Provide a new bridge for I-70 that crosses light rail and 6th Avenue	Supplied information doesn't explain what's involved visually or in terms of auto travel. If "visual impact" is only during construction, it shouldn't be a determining consideration unless there's some sort of permanent after-effect.	
Staff 01 Light rail over Sheridan instead of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under	There's no explanation in the PDFs of how this affects connectivity and/or operational flexibility, so I'm in the dark regarding these two important aspects. Assuming no negative effects on those factors, I'd accept this	

<p>Staff 01 Light rail over Sheridan instad of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under Light rail over Sheridan instead of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under</p>	<p>Concern was expressed about the proposed change at Sheridan. Affects to the park and access to the station.</p>	
<p>Staff 01 Light rail over Sheridan instad of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under Light rail over Sheridan instead of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under</p>	<p>RTD needs to get serious about collaborating with CDOT on items such as Sheridan improvements. The Sheridan bridge is a much needed improvement that benefits the citizens of Colorado in general, and CDOT should be motivated - by petition if necessary - to move up the priority of these improvements and make them coincide with building of the west corridor.</p>	
<p>Staff 01 Light rail over Sheridan instad of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under Light rail over Sheridan instead of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under</p>	<p>I live in the area and would prefer the bridge for light rail than the bridge for the highway.</p>	
<p>Staff 01 Light rail over Sheridan instad of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under Light rail over Sheridan instead of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under</p>	<p>Public office (CDOT, Lakewood, Denver, RTD) have a responsibility to ensure the safety of pedestrians and traffic. This design compromises both pedestrians and traffic. Please stay with the original design.</p>	
<p>Staff 01 Light rail over Sheridan instad of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under Light rail over Sheridan instead of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under</p>	<p>NO! Grade needs to be eliminated. To reduce congestion at 10th ave. Access to parking structure especially in inclement weather.</p>	

<p>Staff 01 Light rail over Sheridan instad of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under Light rail over Sheridan instead of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under</p>	<p>Good cost savings plan. Noise barrier re-design needed due to increased altitude of vehicles.</p>	
<p>Staff 01 Light rail over Sheridan instad of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under Light rail over Sheridan instead of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under</p>	<p>This design should be changed to include bicycle and pedestrian amenities to offset eliminating the Sheridan overpass spanning the gulch.</p>	
<p>Staff 01 Light rail over Sheridan instad of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under Light rail over Sheridan instead of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under</p>	<p>This is a short solution to a long-term problem. Traffic at 10th; Traffic and need for expansion on Sheridan anyway; Safety at 10th; Create more congestion. Propose funding from DOT to overhaul Sheridan and share cost of expanding and repairing an already stressed and congested road.</p>	
<p>Staff 01 Light rail over Sheridan instad of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under Light rail over Sheridan instead of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under</p>	<p>Bridge LRT. very positive if multi-modes are optimized and access to park is simplified.</p>	
<p>Staff 01 Light rail over Sheridan instad of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under Light rail over Sheridan instead of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under</p>	<p>Again this will make it horrible.</p>	

<p>Staff 01 Light rail over Sheridan instad of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under Light rail over Sheridan instead of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under</p>	<p>On/off should have access to below grade.</p>	
<p>Staff 01 Light rail over Sheridan instad of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under Light rail over Sheridan instead of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under</p>	<p>Bad weather bottlenecks Sheridan. Guess what! You will be opening the door on that problem.</p>	
<p>Staff 01 Light rail over Sheridan instad of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under Light rail over Sheridan instead of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under</p>	<p>Sheridan currently bottlenecks.</p>	
<p>Staff 01 Light rail over Sheridan instad of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under Light rail over Sheridan instead of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under</p>	<p>Share the cost wtih CDOT.</p>	
<p>Staff 01 Light rail over Sheridan instad of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under Light rail over Sheridan instead of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under</p>	<p>No! Hwy and RTD need to fix the horrible Sheridan mess. Share the cost with CDOT.</p>	

<p>Staff 01 Light rail over Sheridan instad of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under Light rail over Sheridan instead of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under</p>	<p>CDOT and RTD already designed fixing the Sheridan mess. Fix it. No on change. It was already approved.</p>	
<p>Staff 01 Light rail over Sheridan instad of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under Light rail over Sheridan instead of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under</p>	<p>Doesn't seem to work well with gully and access to light rail is important! Hasn't been analyzed by neighbors or others.</p>	
<p>Staff 01 Light rail over Sheridan instad of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under Light rail over Sheridan instead of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under</p>	<p>The issue with this is the opportunity to enhance corridor as multi-transit oriented is lost. Lakewood Gulch Trail and the safety will be greatly affected due to large walls/ramps. This corridor already has saftey issues. Take the opportunnity or think about in either scenario the "whole" corridor and future park, trail development. Talk with Denver and city of Lakewood for cost share.</p>	
<p>Staff 01 Light rail over Sheridan instad of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under Light rail over Sheridan instead of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under</p>	<p>EIS change</p>	
<p>Staff 01 Light rail over Sheridan instad of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under Light rail over Sheridan instead of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under</p>	<p>You are wasting funds</p>	

<p>Staff 01 Light rail over Sheridan instad of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under Light rail over Sheridan instead of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under</p>	<p>Consider cost of redesign in the 11th hour.</p>	
<p>Staff 01 Light rail over Sheridan instad of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under Light rail over Sheridan instead of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under</p>	<p>Consider what it will cost to fix problems created by quick decisions.</p>	
<p>Staff 01 Light rail over Sheridan instad of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under Light rail over Sheridan instead of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under</p>	<p>You need public support</p>	
<p>Staff 01 Light rail over Sheridan instad of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under Light rail over Sheridan instead of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under</p>	<p>Hasty redesign</p>	
<p>Staff 01 Light rail over Sheridan instad of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under Light rail over Sheridan instead of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under</p>	<p>In my opinion, this proposal, especially what has not been mentioned is the most important of all the proposals. The bicycle crossing at Sheridan Blvd. is of utmost importance. A bicycle commuter path should be built with safety in mind and also what is the fastest way which a bicyclist can go from point A to point B. If, as I have heard, the bike path will turn at Harlan or some other street, and go to 11th ave., 14th ave. or another street, this will significantly downgrade the commuter path. Bicyclists will be forced to ride out into traffic, cross a busy Sheridan Blvd. and wait for long periods of time at traffic lights. This is completely unacceptable and preventable. We have the opportunity to build a state of the art LTR and bicycle commuter path, one which will be viewed in years to come as something to be proud of. The bicycle path should completely parallel the LTR. This is one area between Lakewood and Denver where managers need to work together for the good of both ...</p>	

<p>Staff 01 Light rail over Sheridan instad of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under Light rail over Sheridan instead of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under</p>	<p>Your proposed solution to the Western FastTracks route for bike-friendly commuting is flawed. I'm officially protesting the option of NOT building a bike bridge over Sheridan. I am a disabled bike rider that uses a 'handcycle' (refer to- http://www.ushf.org/) to commute and therefore suggesting the RTD engineering team take 'basic' ADA requirements into account for all route engineering solutions.</p>	
<p>Staff 01 Light rail over Sheridan instad of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under Light rail over Sheridan instead of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under</p>	<p>I understand that RTD has changed its plans for the Golden Denver light rail route which included a continuous bike route from the Federal Center in Lakewood to downtown Denver. This original design included grade separated crossings at all the major intersections, including a route alongside the rail route under Sheridan Blvd. I now understand that RTD wants to put the rail route OVER Sheridan Blvd to save money. No mention is made by RTD of the cost of building a bike bridge over Sheridan. Thus, one can only presume that RTD does not plan to build one. Presumably, this means that the plan would be for cyclists to use the existing low cost D-10 route which means a two block diversion north to cross busy Sheridan Blvd. at the 14th Avenue traffic signal at grade before returning two blocks to the planned route. THIS IS NOT ACCEPTABLE FOR BICYCLISTS, ESPECIALLY COMMUTERS.</p>	
<p>Staff 01 Light rail over Sheridan instad of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under Light rail over Sheridan instead of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under</p>	<p>Please understand cyclist are experiencing the same increasing road rage problem that drivers are these days. Please take a moment and look at the existing bicycle paths that spar from Downtown to the west, you will see those pathway are impractical for commuting as they either take us very south or through commerce city that ends in the hood. Please I strongly urge you to keep the bike path/ light rail project the same with regards to under traffic (Sheridan blvd). We all enjoy the active lifestyle that Colorado/Denver seems to promote and if bike paths are built in congruant with light rail with safety for all we will use it! Best Regards</p>	
<p>Staff 01 Light rail over Sheridan instad of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under Light rail over Sheridan instead of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under</p>	<p>I have heard that there has been a change in the RDT light rail route plan from Golden to Denver. I understand that where this route crosses Sheridan it will go over using the existing D-10 route. My concern is that what will be the route for Bicycle traffic alone this route? Will there be an above or below grade crossing added. Something needs to be done to accommodate trail users the point it to make it a quick route.</p>	
<p>Staff 01 Light rail over Sheridan instad of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under Light rail over Sheridan instead of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under</p>	<p>The proposed Golden to Denver FastTracks solution MUST include a bicycle bridge at Sheridan Avenue. I regularly commute by bike from Evergreen to Denver and Sheridan is one of the three busiest and most dangerous crossings I make (along with Wadsworth and Kipling), what with heavy traffic, right turns on red and, often, tricky light angles in the AM and PM.</p>	

<p>Staff 01 Light rail over Sheridan instad of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under Light rail over Sheridan instead of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under</p>	<p>In regards to the proposed change at Sheridan Blvd. If there is going to be a bridge over Sheridan does it include a lane for Bicyclist? If not then cyclists would be forced to go two blocks out of their way to 14th and then would have to wait at a light to cross a very busy Sheridan Blvd. We need to encourage alternative transportation not discourage it. As I write this the air quality in the Denver/Lakewood area has been terrible for most of this week. I have a sinus headache from the pollution in the air. I am an avid cyclist and would love to run all my errands via the bike however, there are many parts of town that are not bike friendly.</p>	
<p>Staff 01 Light rail over Sheridan instad of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under Light rail over Sheridan instead of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under</p>	<p>I would like to urge RTD to consider installing a pedestrian / bicycle bridge near the proposed Sheridan Blvd. station. It is vital that nearby residents be able to access the station as well as having cyclists being able to cross Sheridan Blvd. Without a bridge, one will have to make a significant detour north to 14th Ave. to cross Sheridan Blvd. at a traffic light, where there are many safety issues.</p>	
<p>Staff 01 Light rail over Sheridan instad of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under Light rail over Sheridan instead of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under</p>	<p>I understand RTD has changed plans for the crossing at Sheridan on the West corridor light rail. The initial plan was to go underneath Sheridan and bike path was included in this plan. The bike path is part of a continuous path from Denver to the Federal Center with seperated grade crossings at all major intersection. To change this at Sheridan would cause a major disruption in the path and be a major impediment to multi-modal transportation in the west corridor. I urge you to reconsider.</p>	
<p>Staff 01 Light rail over Sheridan instad of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under Light rail over Sheridan instead of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under</p>	<p>No mention is made by RTD of the cost of building a bike bridge over Sheridan. Thus, one can only presume that RTD does not plan to build one. Presumably, they plan to use the existing low cost D-10 route which means a two block diversion north to cross busy Sheridan Blvd. at the 14th Avenue traffic signal at grade before returning two blocks to the planned route. THIS IS NOT ACCEPTABLE FOR BICYCLISTS, ESPECIALLY COMMUTERS, and invalidates our successful efforts to establish a West Corridor FastRoute.</p>	
<p>Staff 01 Light rail over Sheridan instad of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under Light rail over Sheridan instead of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under</p>	<p>Sheridan Station The VE solution for the Sheridan Station presents the problem of the seriously dangerous intersection of 10th and Sheridan. The EIS presents the possibility of 600 cars arriving at the park n' ride in a 2 hour period - coming from the south traveling to the north. Coming from that direction means that the cars will turn across the oncoming lane to get on 10th . The viewing of traffic on Sheridan traveling south is not visible until they crest the hill. It is not possible to estimate the speed of the on coming cars because you do not see them until they are close. This intersection is dangerous for pedestrians, moving cars and cars stopped at the light. If you implement this station without correcting the problem you will increase the danger here. You will be responsible for the injury and death that happens at this intersection. You will be physically removed from anything that happens here but it will be your decision that increases the threat ...</p>	

<p>Staff 01 Light rail over Sheridan instad of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under Light rail over Sheridan instead of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under</p>	<p>I am requesting that you reconsider your plans for the Sheridan FasTracks and FastRoute construction. In order to promote alternative methods of travel, specifically bicycle commuting, the path should be safe and convenient. Having to get off a path and cross a busy street is not only cumbersome to a cyclist, it is also dangerous.</p>	
<p>Staff 01 Light rail over Sheridan instad of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under Light rail over Sheridan instead of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under</p>	<p>I think putting the bike crossing at grade where it crosses Sheridan is very dangerous for cyclists. The safest design would be to keep the below grade crossing at Sheridan for the light rail and cyclists & pedestrians.</p>	
<p>Staff 01 Light rail over Sheridan instad of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under Light rail over Sheridan instead of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under</p>	<p>Hello! Thank you for listening to comments about the Sheridan bridge. Apparently this bridge is not designed to include a bicycle overpass and cycling commuters will be diverted two blocks to a safe crossing, then they will have to retrace the two blocks to continue to downtown. Such a detour will penalize and discourage cyclist commuters. Please keep in mind that for bicycles to provide true alternate transportation, they must be able to follow direct routes just as autos and trains do. A meandering route may be lovely for a recreational ride, may be safer, but is not a viable transportation route. Judging by personal observation, the Denver to Golden corridor must be among the most heavily trafficked bicycle routes in the United States. This four block detour will simply not be acceptable to that river of cyclists. They will likely ignore the detour. Accidents will occur. There will be remorse. Perhaps national disgrace. Why not do it right the first time? An underpass ...</p>	
<p>Staff 01 Light rail over Sheridan instad of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under Light rail over Sheridan instead of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under</p>	<p>Like to see Fastrack as planned in 1st proposal Let us cyclist be save , so no detour to old D-10 route at Sheridan Blvd. This is a popular commuter route now, it will be #1 with an uninterrupted and safe route to Denver Let it follow Lightrail all the way, build bridges, no crossings of the S-N arteries</p>	
<p>Staff 01 Light rail over Sheridan instad of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under Light rail over Sheridan instead of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under</p>	<p>The original design facilitated the construction of pedestrian and bicycle crossings under Sheridan Boulevard. Staff 1 Light rail over Sheridan instead of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under proposal will need to be modified to preserve these crossings, probably by augmenting the width of the bridge over Sheridan Boulevard. \ \ The redesign should also include the construction of sidewalks on Sheridan Boulevard to the same extent as the original proposal. \ \ The proposed bridge will need to be designed so that it does not create dangerous sight-distance conditions at the intersection of 12th Avenue and Sheridan Boulevard, and also at any driveway to the parking garage. The sight-distance analysis should take into account the presence of buses stopped in the southbound pullout on Sheridan.</p>	

<p>Staff 01 Light rail over Sheridan instad of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under Light rail over Sheridan instead of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under</p>	<p>Yes! This is a good idea too. Unless CDOT is willing to pay for a portion of this project, Light rail should go over Sheridan...!</p>	
<p>Staff 01 Light rail over Sheridan instad of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under Light rail over Sheridan instead of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under</p>	<p>Bike Jeffco has worked hard with RTD, the City of Golden and the City of Lakewood to ensure that the bicycle route paralleling the West Corridor LRT is truly a "FastRoute" into downtown Denver. It is through Bike Jeffco's efforts that funding was obtained for bike bridges over Kipling and Wadsworth on the LRT route. \ The proposed break in the through trail at Sheridan completely negates these major gains and ensures that the route is considerably less attractive and, hence, less used.</p>	
<p>Staff 01 Light rail over Sheridan instad of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under Light rail over Sheridan instead of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under</p>	<p>If this proposal is accepted, please consider all possible improvements to Sheridan to maintain or improve the safety of intersections at 10th and 11th Avenues given the significant increase in automobile, pedestrian and bus traffic created by the station and parking garage. These improvements should include wide sidewalks (on both sides of Sheridan); dedicated bus pull out (on both sides of Sheridan); dedicated turn lanes on the west side of Sheridan for the parking garage, 10th, and 11th avenues; a pedestrian bridge over Sheridan; a generous pedistrian bridge over the gulch; and pedstrian access from the neighborhood on the north side of the tracks to the relocated station (without having to use a sidewalk along Sheridan). Also, what will the connectivity for the D-10 bike path to the parks on the east side of Sheridan?</p>	
<p>Staff 01 Light rail over Sheridan instad of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under Light rail over Sheridan instead of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under</p>	<p>Changing the plan at sheridan I beleive will be both dangerous and hasty. I beleive after years of planning with the public and private enitys \ such a short period for public comment is not in the best interests of all involved.</p>	
<p>Staff 01 Light rail over Sheridan instad of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under Light rail over Sheridan instead of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under</p>	<p>This is totally devaluating the potential for a long term improvement for the whole area. The light rail is so successful and cutting funds at the 11th hour with little opportunity for public to react is going to create long term problems. Traffic throughout the neighborhood will increase heavily due to the alteration and relocation of the station. Major safety issues arise and already exist due to the gulch dip especially at 10th Ave. A child was hit not long ago at this intersection and cars are not visible 100ft descending into the gulch. We deserve more time to react to these drastic changes in design. We have spent many hours throughout this process to give public input and now it is all crammed into a 2 week period to react to these changes.</p>	

<p>Staff 01 Light rail over Sheridan instad of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under Light rail over Sheridan instead of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under</p>	<p>If the funding for sheridan gets cut back, then other considerations should be taken to enhance the parts of the project that dont get cut. If you build a smaller station area, it better look attractive. Selling short the light rail is hasty and stupid. Alternative funding should be intensely considered and researched to salvage what is left of a botched up solution at the last minute. Long term problems get created out of hasty decision making. It is soo sad to see a successful ridership project get sold short.</p>	
<p>Staff 01 Light rail over Sheridan instad of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under Light rail over Sheridan instead of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under</p>	<p>Bridge will create a split in community, the gulch park, and potential places for crime. Sheridan is already in dire need of road expansion and improvements. Work with C-dot to share the cost of the bridge and ease the already horrible congestion. This station has a unique opportunity to split costs between Denver and Lakewood. Both cities are selling this opportunity short and both will pay for that later. Sheridan station is starting to look more and more like a substation. With the loss of other stations, core stations will be stressed with more congestion. Cutting "Park and Ride" stations funding with all the other cuts can create unforeseen problems. Find alternative funding. Lottery funds could be utilized especially since Gulch Park runs through this area. Give both cities the opportunity to decorate the surrounding area. Take out another loan (Bonds)to allow revenue to pay off later. Offer tasteful advertising in areas (such as benches, kiosks, ...</p>	
<p>Staff 01 Light rail over Sheridan instad of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under Light rail over Sheridan instead of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under</p>	<p>We have concerns about the impact of this crossing: a.The LRT bridge across Sheridan will be in the direct line of vision of drivers going in both directions that could cause accidents as it will impede visibility and drivers may not be watching the road but, instead, looking at the bridge and train. b.Access and egress to the station and parking garage at 11th Avenue will increase traffic volume to an already hazardous area. Under existing conditions, 11th Avenue is a problem area and 10th Avenue has traffic problems getting on, off and across Sheridan. Adding sidewalks on both sides of Sheridan will be a great asset for pedestrians but will not help in the automobile traffic problems. c.We have been verbally told there will be a pedestrian bridge across Sheridan and another one accessing the north side of the neighborhood. We have not seen any designs or actual locations for these bridges.</p>	
<p>Staff 01 Light rail over Sheridan instad of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under Light rail over Sheridan instead of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under</p>	<p>In December, we learned the good news that plans for the Golden-Denver light rail route included a continuous bike route from the Federal Center in Lakewood to downtown Denver. This included grade separated crossings at all the major intersections, including a route alongside the rail route under Sheridan. Since then, RTD has changed its plans and now wants to put the rail route OVER Sheridan to save money. No mention is made by RTD of the cost of building a bike bridge over Sheridan. Thus, one can only presume that RTD does not plan to build one. Presumably, the plan is to use the existing low cost D-10 route which means a two block diversion north to cross busy Sheridan Blvd. at the 14th Avenue traffic signal at grade before returning two blocks to the planned route. THIS IS NOT ACCEPTABLE FOR BICYCLISTS, ESPECIALLY COMMUTERS, and invalidates our (Bike Jeffco's) successful efforts to establish a West Corridor FastRoute. I ask that you reconsider making the bike ...</p>	

<p>Staff 01 Light rail over Sheridan instad of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under Light rail over Sheridan instead of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under Light rail over Sheridan instead of lifting up Sheridan and putting light rail under.</p>	<p>The plan for a "FastRoute" bicycle commuter route should include a bike bridge over Sheridan Ave as advocated by Bike Jeffco. The advantages of more people biking to work are obvious, and not having a bike bridge would make this less desirable</p>	
<p>Staff 02 Build 3 car platforms instead of 4</p>	<p>I cannot support this. Penny-wise & pound-foolish if ridership increases - as it has everywhere else in the country that light rail has been made operational.</p>	
<p>Staff 02 Build 3 car platforms instead of 4</p>	<p>...as long as space is there for future fourth cars.</p>	
<p>Staff 02 Build 3 car platforms instead of 4</p>	<p>Safe money.</p>	
<p>Staff 02 Build 3 car platforms instead of 4</p>	<p>Costs are only going up.</p>	
<p>Staff 02 Build 3 car platforms instead of 4</p>	<p>Keep four car station.</p>	
<p>Staff 02 Build 3 car platforms instead of 4</p>	<p>Build for the future.</p>	
<p>Staff 02 Build 3 car platforms instead of 4</p>	<p>Don't be short sited and build only 3 car platforms. Four car platforms are a must!!</p>	
<p>Staff 02 Build 3 car platforms instead of 4</p>	<p>NO! Building 3 car platforms is counter productive to the whole concept of making the system work with 4 car trains. Even if you only need the 4 car trains for special events the first few years, you should keep the 4 car platforms!!!</p>	
<p>Staff 02 Build 3 car platforms instead of 4</p>	<p>Penny-wise, pound foolish? Could also consider "ghosting" the platform extension?</p>	

Staff 03 Eliminate duct bank encasement	This seems sensible, and I have no objection.	
Staff 03 Eliminate duct bank encasement	Is this even safe with bentanite rise and fall in Colorado dirt?	
Staff 04 Change slope grading at DFC	I'd like to see what this looks like - PDFs on the web page would do - but at first blush, why not?	
Staff 04 Change slope grading at DFC	Okay	
Staff 04 Change slope grading at DFC	Yes! Great idea, and great savings, to change the slope grading!!	
Staff 05 Reduce lineal footage of ornamental railing	This is regrettable - these are public facilities that will be with us for decades - but acceptable given cost constraints.	
Staff 05 Reduce lineal footage of ornamental railing	Excellent benefits. Improve access to park and multimodes	
Staff 05 Reduce lineal footage of ornamental railing	Take forever to redesign.	
Staff 05 Reduce lineal footage of ornamental railing	OK	
Staff 05 Reduce lineal footage of ornamental railing	Depends on location. Can't be across the board.	
Staff 05 Reduce lineal footage of ornamental railing	Yes! Great idea and great savings!!!	
Staff 05 Reduce lineal footage of ornamental railing	Only if it provides just as well for safety and if it's just as aesthetically pleasing, about which I have questions. Will local people have a chance to discuss the options, with photos or good drawings available for comparison? Remember, these fences are very important to the aesthetics of the neighborhood, and should not be downgraded to save money--they are high priority.	
Staff 05 Reduce lineal footage of ornamental railing	Based on the information provided so far, this proposal to reduce the length or ornamental railing is bad idea. IF the metal fencing cannot be completely eliminated for major stretches between stations, then the fencing should be as absolutely attractive as possible. More so than any other RTD corridor built to-date, many residents/ neighbors will look at this proposed fence from their front porch/patio or living room, kitchen, or bedroom windows Every Single Day. Please make this newly imposed view as attractive as possible. IF the fence barrier is required at all, then please make it as absolutely attractive and ornamental as possible. What have peer systems utilized under similar design and operational conditions?	

Staff 05 Reduce lineal footage of ornamental railing	Reduce Ornamental Railing It is not clear whether this applies only to platforms, or to the line as a whole. Regarding stations: the neighborhood has not seen the alternatives proposed, but desires an aesthetically pleasing solution that meets the expectations that have been expressed in various EIS, UDC, and SEG forums.	
Staff 05 Reduce lineal footage of ornamental railing	Again save all eliminated plans and expect to apply them to future use.	
Staff 05 Reduce lineal footage of ornamental railing	Ornamental fencing, Whisper Walls and steel fencing need to be shown to make any decision at this late date.	
Staff 05 Reduce lineal footage of ornamental railing	It would be regrettable to reduce linear feet of ornamental railing since stations already are so basic in design. Users need a little relief and grace from strictly utilitarian rectilinearity. This would be especially important where stations/railing are within eye-view of residences.	
Staff 06 Weathering steel for bridges	I agree.	
Staff 07 Design Build some bridges	This seems sensible, unless geotech concerns turn out to be major.	
Staff 07 Design Build some bridges	Get going on the West Corridor. Costs of materials are escalating, start building what you can immediately. This go slow process is absurd and costing millions of dollars. Speed construction and get it done!!	
Staff 07 Design Build some bridges	Yes. Design build makes sense. But please allow the trolley to operate in the 2007 season all the way to Xavier St...!	
Staff 08 Eliminate steel casing at drilled caissons	I'm not sure about this one. To what degree is rider safety potentially affected by geotech concerns?	
Staff 09 DFC Acquisition	To cut costs on west corridor: 1.Evaluate every little thing to see if some other entity can or should pay for it, with RTD paying for the transportation components only. 2. I'd like to see RTD get out of the parking garage business entirely. There are various ways this could be structured, such as leasing either the land for the garage or the garage itself. At the very least, have a private company set the parking fees instead of RTD. This insulates RTD from complaints about the price, and enables the private company to vary the price according to supply and demand.	
Staff 09 DFC Acquisition	This needs explanation. Nothing in materials supplied so far explains how, or to what degree, land acquisition and use would be different.	
Staff 09 DFC Acquisition	This is fine with me. Why not go for a corporate sponsorship for "Parking garage plus" Boutique shops, snack shops, ticket outlet, TV WIFI, lounge, ect?	
Staff 09 DFC Acquisition	Must have parking structure. Better get the land now while its cheap and undeveloped.	
Staff 09 DFC Acquisition	What are the ramifications of stations without any parking spaces in terms of ridership? Has a cost anaylis been done to determine the relationship cost of parking and additional ridership? What is the thinking behind the kiss-n-ride concept?	
Staff 09 DFC Acquisition	What are the ramifications of stations without any parking spaces in terms of ridership? Has a cost anaylis been done to determine the relationship cost of parking and additional ridership? What is the thinking behind the kiss-n-ride concept?	
Staff 09 DFC Acquisition	Shouldn't this be decided through negotiations among RTD, the Federal Center, St Anthony's Hospital, the City and any private developers involved? Why tie your negotiators' hands?	

Staff 09 DFC Acquisition	The 6th Ave West HOA submits: What are the ramifications of stations without any parking spaces in terms of ridership? Has a cost analysis been done to determine the relationship cost of parking and additional ridership? What is the thinking behind the kiss-n-ride concept?	
Staff 09 DFC Acquisition	See if you can work out a deal with the federal center for it to be an easement use or a co-funded venture.	
Staff 10 Copper OHC wire instead of bronze	I'm ambivalent. What's the service life of copper wire versus bronze? If copper needs to be replaced more often than bronze due to its softness or greater corrosion, cost savings may be imaginary.	
Staff 11 Change drainage requirements from 100 year to 50 year	The suggestion to limit floodplain prevention to within the 50-year flood is probably very short sighted. While there may be dollar savings up front, this would pale by costs suffered by a severe flood. Given the peculiar nature of weather in recent days, and given the amount of snow we are getting this very winter, I question the wisdom of such a step.	
Staff 11 Change drainage requirements from 100 year to 50 year	I am reluctant to criticize your engineering staff, however, I wonder if it's wise to build to a less stringent specification, the 50 year flood plan, during a time when all indications are for more severe weather as a result of global warming. If the current weather in Denver is any indication, perhaps staying with the 100 year flood plan would be best in the long run.	
Staff 11 Change drainage requirements from 100 year to 50 year	I cannot agree. This seems penny-wise and pound-foolish, as localized 100-year events are distressingly common along the front range.	
Staff 11 Change drainage requirements from 100 year to 50 year	We do have flood at "100" year measurement. What are you going to do when the light rail does not hold up?	
Staff 11 Change drainage requirements from 100 year to 50 year	The redesigning to a 50 year flood event needs to be considered for specific locations. Deep gullies at the bottom of a hill is more risky than simple runoff a flat roadbed.	
Staff 12 Reduce duct bank conduit size	What are the maintenance issues involved in this? If those can be solved, or are nonexistent, then I see no reason not to.	
Staff 13 Eliminate hardware for cameras	This seems a minor matter, and largely unnecessary.	
Staff 13 Eliminate hardware for cameras	Safety verse cost! Put camera in correctly.	
Staff 13 Eliminate hardware for cameras	Not smart, not safe.	

Staff 14 Eliminate hardware for VMS	This seems a minor matter, and largely unnecessary.	
Staff 14 Eliminate hardware for VMS	Safety vs. money saving. Safety wins.	
Staff 15 Eliminate hardware for emergency telephones	This seems a minor matter, and largely unnecessary.	
Staff 15 Eliminate hardware for emergency telephones	Safety vs. money saving. Safety wins.	
Staff 15 Eliminate hardware for emergency telephones	Not smart, not safe!	
z General	Ensure "safety" design of fence/guard rails along in residential areas. "Safety of our children and residents." Also- fence/guard rail style so as not to encourage crime problems.	
z General	VE has not considered fact that gas prices have fallen significantly in recent months, and with the current political climate probably will stay static for some time. Reduction in cost of fuel should be reflected in analysis.	
z General	No VE proposal made to reduce speed of train through neighborhood section. This proposal has not been given due consideration. Reduction of speed to 25-20 mph has potential for cost savings opportunities in safety, noise and vibration, and secondary aesthetic mitigations.	
z General	Smoke and mirror	
z General	Light rail has been highly successful. Consider funds to keep original plan from a supportive public.	
z General	Insane use of funds, 3 short years of planning and now only 12 days of public comment. How long until this would be changed again?	
z General	Short term can mean long term disaster and excess cost	
z General	We live in 6th Avenue West. Our concern is not tied to a specific VE proposal but continues to be the placement of the Red Rocks station along the Frontage Road. \ We feel the more logical placement of a station between the Federal Ctr and the Jeffco courthouse would be on the north side of 6th at Indiana rather than at Red Rocks College. There is open space now on the NE quadrant. This would more centrally service the population centers likely to use a station in this area (Welchester/Daniels, Golden/Pleasant View, the Mills, 6th Ave Estates, 6th Ave West, mt. traffic, etc). It is a 'straight-shot' of less than 2 miles from the Fed Center to the Warren Center/McClain and RRCC. We suspect that RTD would be running its circulator buses in that area for all the apts/condos as well as for the students. We have been told that buses will take the kids to the schools. If money were no object, it might make some sort of sense to build a Red Rocks station to serve ...	
z General	Wire mesh fencing -Eiber neighborhood residents who have been involved in this process since the early days of the EIS process have been repeatedly assured that the barrier fencing would be aesthetically pleasing. This is a design element that is extremely important to the neighborhood to help mitigate the unavoidable visual impact of a transportation system barrier. The type of fencing proposed strikes some as institutional or industrial. Eiber Neighborhood Association has been given virtually no time to discuss with neighbors and reach a consensus on this particular item; we were provided a reference to evaluate this material only days before the deadline for these comments. At this time, we would continue to prefer solutions that require no fencing, preferring instead to follow examples in Portland and LA who use center bollard and chain, which those cities claim have proven very effective in discouraging pedestrian trespass. We recognize the safety concerns stated by RTD which ...	

z General	Things not mentioned - Eiber Neighborhood Association is extremely concerned that, at this 65% stage of the project, significant compromises to quality and aesthetic value of design and materials are being suggested. This calls into question the quality, and even the very likelihood, of design options that have been held out to the community informally throughout this entire process, but have yet to be included in the design (always being told to wait for the next milestone). Detailed station design has been a topic of frequent discussion with RTD since the very beginning of the EIS phase. RTD knows well that the neighborhood desires unique station designs, reflecting the character of the neighborhood, incorporating design and aesthetic elements that are by their nature not the cheapest alternative. We are extremely concerned that these recent events are placing those promises in jeopardy, and we take the position that this repeated offensive on the quality of design elements must ...	
z General	Why do you even care what we have to say? You are going to do what you want to anyway.	
z General	We strongly feel the crossover (at Eldridge) is too high and would impact our neighborhood if it were to cross over by Eldridge.	
z General	Our house is on 621 Devinney Ct. and it faces 6th Avenue. We have been very concerned about the noise on 6th Avenue, especially with light rail coming through our neighborhood. The noise from the traffic has increasingly gotten worse in the 11 years that we have lived here, and we fear that it will get much louder with the "Eldridge Flyover" proposal. We don't like the idea of having a 20 plus foot high wall/crossover across from our home, as we feel the noise will bounce off the wall and into our neighborhood. We don't like the idea of two crossovers either. Why not be cost effective and only have one crossover further down away from homes.	
z General	The current drawing indicating a crossover from the south side of 6 to the north side (Eldridge bridge) would be a negative impact to the homeowners of both Sixth Avenue Estates and Mountain View Estates. Being a homeowner in Mountain View Estates, I am very aware of the benefits of the lite rail and also very aware of the proposed negative impacts. My thought is a single crossover that includes crossing both 6th and Indiana via one bridge would eliminate the necessity of a 20' wall that would affect both subdivisions. The wall would create an increase in the noise level as the noise created by the cars traveling east would be magnified as it bounces off the wall - to our neighborhood. It also seems to make sense to provide one crossover as a "value" proposition. The prospect of a station at 6th & Indiana could benefit the local economy as a result of access to CO Mills and the Denver West retail centers. Could the elimination of two crossovers also eliminate ...	