

CDOT Interregional Connectivity Study PLT Workshop December 10, 2012 - Comment Matrix

Comment Number	Name	Organization	Category	COMMENT	RESPONSE
1	Anderson, Carol	EPA	Environmental Impacts	Probable Overall Environmental impact* should include environmental justice considerations. This could be a really big deal for alignments that go through Denver.	The potential for EJ impacts is being considered in Level 2 and will be more fully identified in Level 3. Where impacts appear to be problematic, they can be mitigated through additional engineering in Level 3.
2	Lewin, Amy	Fort Collins	Alignments	City staff supports the N I-25 EIS Commuter Rail alignment (red line) as higher priority than the Greenfield High-Speed Rail (HSR) (green line). There was a lot of work/support gathered through the N I-25 EIS process, and it will be important to the community to honor that.	Agreed. The EIS assumes commuter rail along this alignment and the ICS team recognizes that it carries strong community support. This alignment is being utilized by the ICS team to validate ridership of HSIPIR for comparison at this stage.
3	Lewin, Amy	Fort Collins	Alignments	For now, please use Harmony as the terminus of Greenfield HSR line; this is consistent with the N I-25 EIS assumptions.	Agreed. We will use Harmony as the assumed terminus of the Greenfield HSR line in later evaluation.
4	Lewin, Amy	Fort Collins	General	What is the definition of "interregional" within this study?	Connection of regions within the state; no inter-state. For example, Denver to Fort Collins; or Denver to Pueblo.
5	Lewin, Amy	Fort Collins	General	How is bus being considered/integrated within the various options?	Bus transit connections are assumed to be integral to providing local connectivity between HSIPIR stations and surrounding destinations. However, at this level of planning, specific bus transit connections are not part of the evaluation.
6	Lewin, Amy	Fort Collins	General	HSR was screened out early in the process of the N I-25 EIS, can you describe what has changed such that the technology is being considered now in the same corridor?	The ICS team recognizes that the North I-25 EIS eliminated HSR, among other things like BRT. However, one of the missions of the ICS study is to validate (or not) the ridership realized by the RMRA study and as such is utilizing this alignment for modeling purposes at this stage.
7	Rickershauser, Peter	Omni TRAX	Alignments	Of the "thru Denver" alternatives, I think A-5, Eastern Beltway, provides the most service capabilities when coupled with the currently in operation or under construction RTD rail/light rail routes; this ensures the network which emerges from the ICS study provides service to the most people and markets and builds volumes on RTD (will RTD be able to handle these new markets?).	The A-5 Eastern Beltway is being considered. One permutation of A-5 that will most likely be evaluated will be the use of the Eagle project for E-W movements and a new HSIPIR for the N-S movements.
8	Rickershauser, Peter	Omni TRAX	Alignments	The route through Denver may or may not share a route/right-of-way with RTD - to be effective for the I-70 corridor, I believe it needs to operate at a higher speed with fewer stops than RTD will.	Yes that would be the plan - there would be far fewer stops than the RTD system, even in cases where the HSIPIR shared track with RTD.
9	Rickershauser, Peter	Omni TRAX	Alignments	For the Fort Collins/north segment, while I believe the "Greenfield" (I-25 corridor) option is better, I recommend a modification: use OmniTRAX' Great Western Railway corridor from near downtown Fort Collins to where it intersects I-25, then the I-25 corridor to provide maximum downtown connectivity; or use UP's Fort Collins Sub from near downtown Fort Collins (UP and Great Western operate in one corridor for part of the distance here) to where it intersects I-25 at about MP 258, just north of the US 34 exit. Use of either route would improve community connectivity and could garner greater public support in this area. Believe both freight railroad rights-of-way are sufficiently wide to permit 1-2 HSR lines with retention of the present single track for freight service, though the existing track would have to be relocated to one side or the other of the right of way.	This is a modification that may be considered in Level 3 screening. The I-25 (N-2) alignment needs to be modeled at Level 2 to confirm the ridership results of the RMRA study, which is our first step. We acknowledge that there is a desire on many of the public to access the downtown area of Fort Collins, as well as Loveland and Longmont.
10	Rickershauser, Peter	Omni TRAX	Alignments	No comments on the South Corridor alignment, though I would investigate possibility of recapturing the former AT&SF right-of-way from Monument Hill to Colorado Springs, currently partly a "rails-to-trails" corridor, partly currently a utility corridor, possibly for either HSR use or freight traffic relocation out of the downtown Colorado Springs corridor, permitting the current rail corridor to be dedicated to HSR.	Thank you for your suggestion.
11	Welch, Brian	RTD	Modeling	Slide 32: How will the DRCOG FOCUS model be utilized in the transit forecasting process?	It will be used for estimating ridership within the DRCOG service area.
12	Welch, Brian	RTD	Benefit Calculation	Slide 37: Would cost per rider, based on annualized capital cost and horizon year O & M cost (base year \$), be a valid cost effectiveness measure?	It can easily be calculated as a measure. This may be appropriate if FIA is considered a funding source, as this is the metric used by that agency.
13	Owens, Rick	Highlands Ranch Metro District	Alignments	It appears we continue to seek solutions that require no tax increase, and I for one am against any form of Toll Lanes in C-470 corridor.	We are assuming that implementing any significant segment of HSIPIR will require some form of new revenues. Options for new revenues will be explored in conjunction with the AGS project later in this process. This will be explained at our next PLT meeting.
14	Owens, Rick	Highlands Ranch Metro District	Alignments	I believe we need to expand one lane in each direction of C-470 from Santa Fe to Quebec and would be supportive of a tax, if I would be sure it would benefit the situation, be completed on budget and time, and the tax would sunset. That is the prevalent perspective of my neighbors as well. I will not support toll lanes.	The potential for a statewide sales tax is being considered among many other measures.
15	Owens, Rick	Highlands Ranch Metro District	Alignments	I believe E-470 is too expensive and avoid it at all costs.	The cost estimate prepared by the team suggests that E-470 will likely be equivalent in cost to some of the options that travel through the developed area of Denver.
16	Raitano, Flo	AGS PLT	Alternatives	Some of the alternatives being explored for the DIA to Golden connection are not technology agnostic. Any line that contemplates sharing track with RTD or BNSF or UP would mandate FRA compliant steel wheel on steel rail technology. If the ICS study is genuinely technology agnostic, those alternatives should get little or no serious consideration.	Sharing the RTD Eagle (East and Gold Line) alignments would require FRA compliant technology. Nonetheless, the concept of making use of \$2.1 B in existing infrastructure needs to be evaluated against other options. This is the C-1 Scenario. All of the other segments and scenarios are being assessed without consideration of technology.
17	Love, Brian	Arapahoe County PW	Alignments	Two comments on behalf of Arapahoe County Public Works regarding using E-470 alignments, and thanks for allowing me to attend on 12-10. 1. The E-470/Quincy and Gun Club/Quincy intersection is very tight and constrained. The northbound Ramp proximity to Gun Club is very close, and the following improvements are proposed in the area in the future: 1. Regional Water Quality Pond 2. Partial Continuous Flow intersection construction at Gun Club/Quincy. 3. Regional Park immediately NW of E-470/Quincy. 4. Regional Pedestrian trail with crossings of Quincy and E-470. 5. Additional lanes are also planned for Quincy and Gun Club in the future. 6. Also, Aurora has some major water distribution utilities in Quincy and expansion of those facilities in the future are planned.	This is good information that will be taken into consideration. It may be helpful if Arapahoe County Public Works can provide the ICS team with drawings or plans which depict these proposed facilities. These details may be useful in Level 3 evaluation.
18	Love, Brian	Arapahoe County PW	Alignments	Arapahoe County has a future planned crossing of Belleview at E-470. See the County's Transportation Plan: http://www.co.arapahoe.co.us/Departments/PW/2035TransportationPlan/2035TransportationPlanmain.asp	This will require another grade separation. Once we have finalized the alignment (at Level 3) we can determine the best work around between the two projects.
19	Callison, Mac	City & County of Aurora	Alignments	As discussed at the actual PLT Workshop in December that from Aurora's perspective, an opportunity seems to exist for a combined East Rail/HSR Station at Highpoint Development Project Area (72nd/Himalaya) in that transfers could readily be realized to-from these two transit lines.	Thank you. This will be the subject of future discussions with DIA currently scheduled for February 22.
Break-out Session Group Comments - Dec 10, 2012					
20	PLT-North Metro Area Meeting		I-76 and 96th Avenue Alignment	Consider 3-way station at Pecos: NW Rail, Gold Line, and AGS/ICS station on E-W alignment	Agreed. This can be considered.
21	PLT-North Metro Area Meeting		I-76 and 96th Avenue Alignment	Consider 2-way station at 72nd/Colorado/I-76: North Metro line and AGS/ICS station	This would be a part of the I-76 alignment.
22	PLT-North Metro Area Meeting		I-76 and 96th Avenue Alignment	Along the RMANWR there is 200' of ROW: 100' of land owned by Commerce City and 100' reserved for a Wildlife Refuge trail outside the fence line.	At this point, we will continue to consider this alignment for modeling as it is the routing assumed by the RMRA study and we need to beta test the ridership results assuming the same configuration used by that study.

23	PLT-North Metro Area Meeting		I-76 and 96th Avenue Alignment	Commerce City opposes anything along 96th because of platted and soon-to-be developed land. Two options: § Go further south into the RMANWR to find an alignment that exists the east side of the refuge along a commercial (not residential) arterial street. § Consider using the Rock Island RR alignment between Gold and East Corridors, from near Pecos Station going east, then southeast toward the East Corridor.	Refer to the response to Comment 22.
24	PLT-North Metro Area Meeting		RMRA History/Precursor Study Comments	Note that for the RMRA study, there was a slim majority that recommended the freight RR alignment N-S through Denver.	The E-470 Beltway alignment provides a possible alternative which we feel will be less costly to construct on a per mile basis, but longer.
25	PLT-North Metro Area Meeting		RMRA History/Precursor Study Comments	FRA criteria drove the outcomes of that study	FRA criteria are not anticipated to drive the results of the ICS; it is likely that public support and cost-effectiveness will drive the results of the ICS recommendations.
26	PLT-North Metro Area Meeting		RMRA History/Precursor Study Comments	The spur off of I-70 to Steamboat Springs was dropped due to a B/C ratio of less than one	That would make sense and that particular segment is not being studied in ICS.
27	PLT-North Metro Area Meeting		RMRA History/Precursor Study Comments	Talk with Bob Briggs about his past role with RMRA and his current state-wide proposals	ICS team members will follow up with this item to inform the study.
28	PLT-North Metro Area Meeting		Benefit/Cost Analysis Suggestions	Put B/C info into not only social/system level numbers for policy makers & technical staff, but also in individual-level dollars and cents so that the general public can understand it.	This can be done in terms of per capita benefits and costs. It would be an interesting measure.
29	PLT-North Metro Area Meeting		Benefit/Cost Analysis Suggestions	Consider ways to show not only raw (total) B/C information, but also the time-dimension of it. For instance, the same development might occur sooner if HSIPR is there, later if it is not.	As we recall this comment it dealt with accelerating development and the revenues associated with it. The B/C studies will also include the avoidance of new highway investment and possibly avoided airport investment. Our intent is to avoid subjectivity so the analysis will focus on benefits that are easily supported.
30	PLT-North Metro Area Meeting		Benefit/Cost Analysis Suggestions	Look at how TIGER grant application information/process considers B/C. It's not just about relocating jobs from one part of the country or state to the part with HSIPR in it, but also about creating new jobs for the United States on a global level. See Federal Register guidance for TIGER.	Looking at the global benefits of a project in Colorado is more sophisticated than envisioned for the B/C that we are providing for the ICS. Conversely, considering competitiveness advantages afforded at the state level can be subjectively analyzed.
31	PLT-North Metro Area Meeting		I-25 Alignment Suggestions	Slay east of I-25 as the ICS rail alignment approaches the edge of the Denver metro area	We will attempt to use the median to the extent possible.
32	PLT-North Metro Area Meeting		I-25 Alignment Suggestions	Thornton will oppose the use of I-25 between the RTD ROW crossing (north of Erie exit, south of Hwy 52) and E-470. Maintain this area for auto-oriented development.	At this point we are assuming the use of the I-25 median or the N I-25 CRT alignment.
33	PLT-North Metro Area Meeting		I-25 Alignment Suggestions	Provide a cross-platform connection at either the North Metro end-of-line near 162nd Avenue or near E-470 before ICS enters E-470 ROW to/from the airport.	Cross-platform connections will be considered.
34	ICS PLT Workshop General Session		General Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the horizon year for the model? 2050 like in the I-70 PEIS? • How is the team determining values of certain criteria? • Will use federally estimated values • Any net present value analysis? • Looking at time/value of money • Any increase in sales tax? Etc.? • Are looking at property tax (it was commented that this isn't the same as sales tax) and can add sales tax. • Should show the economic benefit/cost of I-70 open/closed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the horizon year for the model? 2035 • How is the team determining values of certain criteria? - Through the PLT • Will use federally estimated values - will follow FRA guidance where applicable. • Any net present value analysis? - Yes for B/C evaluations. • Looking at time/value of money - Yes for B/C evaluations and life cycle costing • Any increase in sales tax? Etc.? - Yes new revenues need to be assumed. • Are looking at property tax (it was commented that this isn't the same as sales tax) and can add sales tax. It is one alternative being considered. • Should show the economic benefit/cost of I-70 open/closed - if this measure is assumed the impact would be even greater if I-25 closures were considered.
35	ICS PLT Workshop - East/West Alignment Break-out 1:30-2:30			ICS Team should talk to arsenal about using ROW since Commerce City is opposed to using 96th Ave.	Team will provide follow-up.
36	ICS PLT Workshop - East/West Alignment Break-out 1:30-2:31			Avoid tight turn at Golden. There is likely no public support for it	We developed an alternative (W-1A), as it appears shorter and have a faster travel speed.
37	ICS PLT Workshop - East/West Alignment Break-out 1:30-2:32			I-70 reps felt that any shared track with RTD would mean a technology is not compatible with AGS technology and not technologically agnostic.	It would be compatible with any of the 1aigo equipment but not compatible with the mag-lev type technologies.
38	ICS PLT Workshop - East/West Alignment Break-out 1:30-2:33			South of Golden: need to consider all improvements along there (B-2) even if no money for them. Several at grade intersections, etc.	If this alignment is carried forward, these unfunded improvements can be considered.
39	ICS PLT Workshop - East/West Alignment Break-out 1:30-2:34			While the NW quadrant would be difficult through Golden, needs to stay on the table; it's worth looking at.	It is being carried through Level 2.
40	ICS PLT Workshop - East/West Alignment Break-out 1:30-2:35			Along 6th, need to clear LRT and leave room for double tracking. Would likely need to widen 6th as the shoulders are already at a minimum.	Construction along US 6 represents many challenges and will be costly and result in assumed high levels of community impact; however, this alignment needs to be carried through modeling to beta test the RMRA ridership estimates.
41	ICS PLT Workshop - East/West Alignment Break-out 1:30-2:36			Team should consider I-76 to I-270 to I-70. Wouldn't be any worse out-of-direction than not using 96th and going up to 470 from I-76.	Our goal is to not go out of direction during Level 2 modeling; rather we will assume options with the best travel times first then mitigate impacts after we determine the 'best case' ridership. This alignment could be one of the mitigating options considered.

42	ICS PLT Workshop - East/West Alignment Break-out 1:30-2:37			What are the ridership boundaries? Where will we be drawing riders from? How far out?	Generally, the bulk of the ridership will be generated from within 20 miles of the stations. 3 of 6
43	ICS PLT Workshop - East/West Alignment Break-out 1:30-2:38			I-70 reps do not like the alignment that shares with the Gold Line.	This is recognized.
44	ICS PLT Workshop - East/West Alignment Break-out 1:30-2:39			No central stations on B routes – include a 5th station only if makes sense	If the I-70 alignment were considered, the Stockyards station would attract some of the same riders as a DUS stop. The impact of not stopping at DUS will be evaluated.
45	ICS PLT Workshop - East/West Alignment Break-out 2:30-3:30			East Corridor: Will RTD be able to provide ROW? This would be a shared route and likely slower travel times; stretches of single track; not technology agnostic	The C-1 Scenario assumes shared track assuming an operating window (leased time slot) with RTD. Sharing ROW would not be possible and UPRR ROW is not available along the East Corridor. As noted in the comment, this option would require steel wheel technology.
46	ICS PLT Workshop - East/West Alignment Break-out 2:30-3:31			I-76: Look at penalty of not stopping at DUS	This is being evaluated and the results will be available during the April PLT meeting.
47	ICS PLT Workshop - East/West Alignment Break-out 2:30-3:32			Aurora is concerned with stations and serving population on east side of metro area (120th to Lincoln)	At this point we are assuming not more than 5 stations in the Denver metro area. In Level 3 screening we anticipate looking at ridership impacts of adding (or subtracting) stations.
48	ICS PLT Workshop - East/West Alignment Break-out 2:30-3:33			DIA study: has aviation O/D numbers. There are a number of issues with alignments in terms of air space and airport planning and it's worth a meeting to discuss. o 470 – Curve with B4 is too close to end of runway o Alignment needs to be south of East Corridor o Other airspace issues; use Pena if possible o Talking with Aurora about the High Point station (72nd and Himalaya) – part of Phase I of East Corridor. From this station implement a people mover to terminals; options for baggage and check in capability o 70 feet south of the east corridor line is set aside by DIA o There will be 4 tracks into the terminal, but no room for turnaround (in and out only)	These are all helpful agenda items and will be discussed at a meeting at DIA on February 22, 2013.
49	ICS PLT Workshop - East/West Alignment Break-out 2:30-3:34			CCD thinks it makes more sense to go to DUS; many using the system will go to Denver. Bypassing DUS would require a transfer.	We will know the penalty of not accessing DUS during the Level 2 modeling to be presented at the April PLT meeting.
50	ICS PLT Workshop - East/West Alignment Break-out 2:30-3:35			Use HSR for connecting major cities and use RTD for more local destination	Several of our scenarios will test this concept. The goal will be to come up with a configuration that increases RTD ridership and serves as a feeder to the HSIPR system.
51	ICS PLT Workshop - East/West Alignment Break-out 2:30-3:36			RTD – doesn't make sense to model Golden to DUS to DIA b/c that's a duplication of RTD and doesn't leverage the billion dollar investments	The evaluation of the C-1 scenario (shared track with RTD) will test this concept.
52	ICS PLT Workshop - East/West Alignment Break-out 2:30-3:37			Gathering information on where people want to go would be good to know in determining whether or not to bypass DUS	See comment # 49 above.
53	ICS PLT Workshop - East/West Alignment Break-out 2:30-3:38			Have demand help ferret out alignment	This agrees with our thinking - we are testing what works best first with the mitigation of impacts and political preferences being remanded to the Level 3 screening.
54	ICS PLT Workshop - East/West Alignment Break-out 2:30-3:39			Use/leverage RTD	See comment # 51 above.
55	ICS PLT Workshop - East/West Alignment Break-out 2:30-3:40			What is model assuming for RTD build out? A DRCOG plan amendment is about to remove North Metro and NW Corridor which will remove them from the model as well.	Measuring the potential connectivity to North Metro is critical to determining the ridership potential for this portion of the study area. We are assuming that the NM line will eventually be built.
56	ICS PLT Workshop - East/West Alignment Break-out 2:30-3:41			A power plant (along I-25?) in Colorado Springs may relocate in 5-10 years	This may free up space for station uses and future TOD. However, at this point our analysis assumes that the power plant remains in place.
57	PLT-Workshop-Colorado Springs/Pueblo Alignment Discussion Break-out 1:30 PM – 2:30 PM		Douglas County Comments, Including Castle Rock	In Castle Rock, if you are going to put a station near downtown, please consider and know that there is an abandoned historic railroad depot owned by Castle Rock that is on the west side of I-25. This is on the opposite side from the CDOT placeholder suggestion for a Castle Rock station on the east side of I-25 near 3rd Street.	There will need to be more meetings with Castle Rock to communicate the pros and cons of both options. Movement to the west provides the advantages of using a historic station and may avoid some impacts but on the other hand removes the station from the community.

58	PLT-Workshop-Colorado Springs/Pueblo Alignment Discussion Break-out 1:30 PM – 2:30 PM		Douglas County Comments, Including Castle Rock	Castle Rock would prefer a station, not in downtown due to impacts, but further north between US 85 and I-25 near the new interchange slated to be built in 2013.	Refer to the response to Comment #57 above..
59	PLT-Workshop-Colorado Springs/Pueblo Alignment Discussion Break-out 1:30 PM – 2:30 PM		Douglas County Comments, Including Castle Rock	Alternately a station could go south of Castle Rock at the proposed (no date for construction) to serve the Dawson Ridge (west of I-25) and Crystal Valley (east of I-25) subdivisions.	Refer to the response to Comment #57 above..
60	PLT-Workshop-Colorado Springs/Pueblo Alignment Discussion Break-out 1:30 PM – 2:30 PM		Douglas County Comments, Including Castle Rock	Overall, through Castle Rock, noise impacts and lighting (over- or under-lighting) will be the huge issues for the community in considering a commuter or high speed train/transit investment.	These impacts will also be considered as evaluation of alignments continues.
61	PLT-Workshop-Colorado Springs/Pueblo Alignment Discussion Break-out 1:30 PM – 2:30 PM		Douglas County Comments, Including Castle Rock	A planning and environmental linkages (PEL) study will be bid by Region 1 in the summer and likely start in the fall of 2013, covering the stretch of corridor from Castle Rock to Monument. The study is partially funded now, and is awaiting full funding before the RFP can be released.	There will need to be some coordination among the ICS and this proposed study.
62	PLT-Workshop-Colorado Springs/Pueblo Alignment Discussion Break-out 1:30 PM – 2:30 PM		El Paso County Comments, Including Monument, Colorado Springs, and Fountain/Fort Carson	Monument Station § If the station is as far south as Baptist Road & I-25 there are prebbles mouse there, an endangered species. § Much of I-25 between Monument and Colorado Springs is on an Air Force property easement.	Noted. The plan will be to avoid both issues.
63	PLT-Workshop-Colorado Springs/Pueblo Alignment Discussion Break-out 1:30 PM – 2:30 PM		El Paso County Comments, Including Monument, Colorado Springs, and Fountain/Fort Carson	Colorado Springs § Every year the circus train parks near Fontanero Street where the tracks come through town. The circus is valued by the community. § The road network will be connected east-west in the vicinity of Constitution so that should be considered a future crossing/conflict point worth consideration. § Downtown at the historic train depot, Guiseppe's Italian Restaurant has closed. The historic train depot is available now. § Downtown, south of Colorado Avenue (near Vermijo) there is an urban renewal area (URA) with a tax increment financing (TIF) district. There is a pedestrian bridge being constructed over the railroad tracks to connect downtown (on the east of the tracks) to Confluence Park (on the west side of the tracks). This area might be another location for a station if there is not enough space, parking, etc at the historic depot location. § Downtown, the City is in discussion about whether the power plant may be eliminated or moved in the next 5-10 years.	Thank you - all station input will need to be considered in further detail during Level 3 Evaluation.
64	PLT-Workshop-Colorado Springs/Pueblo Alignment Discussion Break-out 1:30 PM – 2:30 PM		El Paso County Comments, Including Monument, Colorado Springs, and Fountain/Fort Carson	Fountain / Fort Carson § Fort Carson Gate 19 is one possible location for a station § Fountain will be sensitive (wary) of noise impacts. It may be that Fountain would prefer the increase in noise from an occasional train, rather than the constant noise from widening of I-25 in that location. § Another possible location for a station is between SH 16 (MaGrath Ave/Mesa Ridge Parkway) and US 85 (S. Santa Fe Avenue) along I-25. § Rick Orphan (sp?) is the transportation contact at Fort Carson.	Thank you - all station input will need to be considered in further detail during Level 3 Evaluation.
65	PLT-Workshop-Colorado Springs/Pueblo Alignment Discussion Break-out 1:30 PM – 2:30 PM		Pueblo County Comments, Including City of Pueblo	In considering ICS routing to enter Pueblo's downtown from the northwest, CDOT should be aware of Pueblo's intent to extend Highway 45/Pueblo Boulevard north from the vicinity of Highway 50 to I-25. This extension is shown in Pueblo's long range transportation plan. It does not present a conflict, just something CDOT should consider.	Thank you for the information.
66	PLT-Workshop-Colorado Springs/Pueblo Alignment Discussion Break-out 1:30 PM – 2:30 PM		Pueblo County Comments, Including City of Pueblo	As the ICS alignment comes into downtown, there is a "neck down" of all transportation infrastructure due to a significant bluff edge between the river's path and downtown (above on bluff), and the related flood plain.	Thank you for the information.
67	PLT-Workshop-Colorado Springs/Pueblo Alignment Discussion Break-out 1:30 PM – 2:30 PM		Pueblo County Comments, Including City of Pueblo	Pueblo generally agrees with the ICS proposal to enter downtown from the northwest and affirms that CDOT should not be coming in along the railroad alignment from the northeast.	Thank you for the information.
68	PLT-Workshop-Colorado Springs/Pueblo Alignment Discussion Break-out 1:30 PM – 2:30 PM		Pueblo County Comments, Including City of Pueblo	CDOT should consider how to exit Pueblo's downtown on the south to keep open the possibility of future connections south of Pueblo.	Agree with the comment. Our ridership studies will be help with the timing of any possible extensions. Nevertheless, none of our plans should preclude future expansions to the south.

69	PLT-Workshop-Colorado Springs/Pueblo Alignment Discussion Break-out 1:30 PM – 2:30 PM		Pueblo County Comments, Including City of Pueblo	In Pueblo's downtown, when considering a possible train station there... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> § Everything is historic. § There is very little undeveloped or re-developable land § There are already parking constraints around the Hospital 	Thank you for the information.	5 of 6
70	PLT-Workshop-Colorado Springs/Pueblo Alignment Discussion Break-out 1:30 PM – 2:30 PM		Pueblo County Comments, Including City of Pueblo	As an alternate location, consider a station at the Hwy 45/Hwy 50 junction area	If it is supported we will need to consider it as we refine the alternative in Level 3 Evaluation.	
71	PLT-Workshop-Colorado Springs/Pueblo Alignment Discussion Break-out 1:30 PM – 2:30 PM		Pueblo County Comments, Including City of Pueblo	As another alternate location, consider a station at the Pueblo airport	We have not looked at this location. If it is supported we will need to consider it as we refine the alternative in Level 3 Evaluation.	
72	PLT Workshop - North to Fort Collins Alignment Discussion Breakout 1:30 PM – 3:30 PM		General Group comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Key concern that HSR on I-25 might eliminate the possibility of commuter rail under EIS. All parties are interested in a commuter rail service that serves the communities and follows the EIS alignment along/adjacent to 287 corridor. o Both systems should be assumed to be moving forward o Greater number of-at grade crossings on the 287 corridor is a big issue o There could be a ridership tradeoff between HSR and Commuter o Local transit system to support a HSR rail system would be critical, especially to those communities that did not have a station o Intra community travel has been the focus of these communities to date; and there is not necessarily public support for HSR o Going to need a description of HSR, size of consists, station needs in order to understand where it makes sense. A station at Hwy 34 Loveland-Greeley junction should be considered, as well as at I-25 and Hwy 56 where community college may help ridership o Would be good to have population density bubbles reflection of 2035 o EIS-Tolled express lane should be included in the model effort because that might pull ridership 	These are all good comments. . The EIS assumes commuter rail along this alignment and the ICS team recognizes that it carries strong community support. This alignment is being utilized by the ICS team to validate ridership of HSIIPR for comparison at this stage. We will model the results for both alternatives and the affected stakeholders will have a large impact on the decision. Our ridership model will only include existing and funded commitments. Yes the managed lanes, BRT and CRT will all affect the feasibility of HSIIPR. Prioritization of these improvements will need to be one of many subjects for a project implementation plan, if a HSIIPR appears to be feasible.	
73	PLT Workshop - North to Fort Collins Alignment Discussion Breakout 1:30 PM – 3:30 PM		Longmont	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Longmont would like to see the alignment come into downtown Longmont o Is NW Rail included in evaluation of ridership or has it been pulled out? 	Comment noted. The model has included all future year transportation system improvements that are coded in the DRCOG transportation model. The NW Rail line out to Longmont is in the future-year model, so we have kept it.	
74	PLT Workshop - North to Fort Collins Alignment Discussion Breakout 1:30 PM – 3:30 PM		Fort Collins	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The North I-25 EIS identifies downtown Fort Collins as the location for commuter rail and Fort Collins would like to see service shaped to serve downtown. o Fort Collins has identified Harmony and Prospect as Enhanced Travel Corridors (ETC) at this time. Mulberry is not currently an ETC. o The Harmony Transfer center for the MAX has some redevelopment possibilities and could be a consideration 	Thank you for making our team is aware of these issues. They will be addressed as we advance our planning after HSIIPR ridership is determined.	
75	PLT Workshop North-South through Denver (Beltways) Breakout 1:30 PM – 2:30 PM		Team Comments	The RMRA study included the eastern freight bypass, freeing up capacity on the CML/JL through Denver. That assumption is no longer viable.	That is true.	
76	PLT Workshop North-South through Denver (Beltways) Breakout 1:30 PM – 2:30 PM		DRCOG	The DRCOG representative said that there are technical issues going through Commerce City. They suggested CDOT coordinates with Commerce City sooner rather than later.	There are similar issues with all of the urban alignments being considered. A more detailed evaluation will be conducted in Level 3.	
77	PLT Workshop North-South through Denver (Beltways) Breakout 1:30 PM – 2:30 PM		CCD	The CCD representative said that Denver feels strongly about having the passenger rail service go through downtown Denver and into the Denver Union Station (DUS).	We are testing the ridership impact of a stop versus no stop at DUS as addressed in several locations above.	
78	PLT Workshop North-South through Denver (Beltways) Breakout 1:30 PM – 2:30 PM		Aurora	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Aurora representative asked if CDOT is assuming a single vs. double track section. He also wanted to know the proposed width. o The Aurora representative encouraged CDOT to coordinate with E-470 authority. 	At this point the configuration is double track using about a 60 foot ROW. Single track will be considered where it is possible during value engineering. Coordination with E-470 is planned.	
79	PLT Workshop North-South through Denver (Beltways) Breakout 1:30 PM – 2:30 PM		DIA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The DIA representative said it is important for CDOT to have a separate meeting about E-470/Pena, the future airport expansion, the east corridor, etc. with DIA engineering team. He stated that: o 80' south of the east corridor is preserved as a transit corridor dual track o The middle of Pena is also fair game o High point station (Himalaya & 72nd) is being preserved as a major hub. Perhaps there could be a People mover to DIA from that station. o Airport cities study is starting Spring 2013 o CDOT and DIA need to work together to preserve needed corridor for high speed rail. o FAA won't allow tracks any closer to runway than the east corridor is building. CDOT will need to go south and east. o A future runway project planned for south of Pena – running east-west 	Thank you for the information. This will be discussed at a meeting at DIA on February 22, 2013.	

80	PLT Workshop - North-South through Denver (Beltways) Breakout 1:30 PM – 2:30 PM		RTD	RTD staff noted that there is a C-470 expansion /planning/ tolling study underway. So available ROW along C-470 could be questionable. Is that route really more viable than the US-85/JL alignment to south? They conducted a stated preference survey for this project that covers Jefferson County, Arapaho County, and Douglas County. Perhaps the results of that study could that could be used by CDOT for the ICS.	We will be meeting with CDOT representative to determine to what extent C-470 ROW is available.
81	PLT Workshop - North-South Through Denver Breakout 2:30 PM – 3:30 PM		Team Comments	Prior RMRA assumption that R2C2 plan would move much freight rail traffic to the eastern plains of Colorado and that the R2C2 assumption is not currently an expectation based on changes since the RMRA study. Really need travel time information to sort out different N-S alignment destination options: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o North I-25 to NW Parkway to Golden (connection with AGS) to C-470 then to South I-25 o North I-25 to North Metro (RTD) line or UPRR Brush Line to DUS, then south on CML/Santa Fe. o North I-25 to E-470 to DIA, continuing on E-470 to South I-25 o Different trip destinations: skiing (connect via NW Pkwy), employment (direct to downtown Denver), and/or air travel connections (DIA). 	This information will be provided at the February 26, 2013 PLT meeting.
82	PLT Workshop - North-South Through Denver Breakout 2:30 PM – 3:30 PM		North-South Segment 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 162nd Station (RTD end of line) via E-470 to Brush Line o Follow Brush Line on the west side of those tracks, outside of and parallel to UPRR ROW o Alignment is very tight through Commerce City o West of Globeville Yard 	We anticipate that we will need to acquire mostly private ROW in this segment. This will cause concerns on the part of some.
83	PLT Workshop - North-South Through Denver Breakout 2:30 PM – 3:30 PM		North South Segment 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o CML south of DUS o Likely aerial structure o CML south to about Jewell Avenue, then leave CML alignment o Go to aerial structure over Santa Fe/US 85 highway lanes o This diversion from CML avoids impacts to downtown Littleton in the Littleton Trench o Option to continue to Castle Rock via Santa Fe/US 85, but not currently the alignment under consideration. o Current alignment under consideration flies over from US85 to C-470, thence to South I-25. § C-470 Toll Lane Study would suggest there might not be available ROW on C-470 § Watch out for Chatfield State Recreation Area in terms of ROW takes/impacts 	Our alignment considers all of these issues. Where we have not been able to avoid issues, they will be addressed in our Level 2 matrix or evaluated further in Level 3.
84	PLT Workshop - North-South Through Denver Breakout 2:30 PM – 3:30 PM		Freight RR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o ~50% of freight traffic is coal o Coal traffic has peaked. No one is "betting on coal" to increase, except for export purposes. o As coal traffic stays flat or declines slightly, increases in freight traffic for gas/natural gas is increasing. Too soon to tell if that is a long-term trend or if pipelines will be built to serve gas/natural gas transmission. 	The State Rail Plan shows all major freight track and ROW to be over-committed by 2035. We are assuming that freight ROW is unavailable until the RR companies tell us differently. We will certainly look for ways to partner with the RRs.