

APPENDIX: SUMMARY OF PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

ACTIVITIES

This appendix describes the Longmont Diagonal Rail Feasibility Study’s Public Involvement activities related to station planning and TOD Analysis in Longmont.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT APPROACH

With the goal of building informed community support for the Longmont Diagonal Rail Feasibility Study’s direction and recommendations, Public Involvement focused on informing the public about the study, keeping the public up to date on its progress, and enabling public input on an ongoing basis and at key points during the study process. The Public Involvement activities for the rail study are listed in detail in this Appendix and included:

- The Corridor Communities Coordination Team (CCCT), the project’s technical and policy committee. The CCCT consisted of representatives from local jurisdictions, community and neighborhood organizations, and other transportation entities. Names of the individual representatives are found later in this Appendix on page A-17. The CCCT met monthly throughout the duration of the study. At its final meeting, the CCCT indicated support for the study’s recommendations.
- Key Person Interviews (KPI) conducted with key stakeholder representatives at the beginning of the study. The issues and themes identified in the KPIs were presented to and reviewed by the CCCT to confirm that they accurately identified and described the major study issues from the perspectives of those interviewed.
- Four public meetings held at two key junctures in the study process. The first two meetings, held in Niwot and Longmont, focused on conceptual issues and alternatives. The second two meetings, held in Gunbarrel and Longmont, focused on the study’s findings and recommendations. Public input was collected at all four meetings and summarized in relation to the study’s issues and recommendations.
- Four station planning and Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) workshops conducted before the first and second round of public meetings. The first two workshops, held in Niwot and Longmont, resulted in a list of “opportunities and issues” associated with the candidate stations. The second two workshops, held in Gunbarrel and Longmont, enabled public input on the preliminary study recommendations about stations. The study approach and recommendations were modified as a result of both public workshops.
- A project website that enabled ongoing input and provided updated information about the study. The web site included presentation materials and summaries from the public

meetings, summaries of public input, and meeting announcements. The website also enabled the public to sign up for the project's mailing list and included project team members' contact information.

- A project mailing list that was used to communicate with the public throughout the study by U.S. Postal Service and electronic mail. The list included approximately 1,000 individuals.

The Public Involvement approach was designed so that every public involvement activity would result in timely input to the CCCT and the project team about the study issues, conceptual and detailed alternatives, and recommendations.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC INPUT

The project team collected public input through a variety of activities during the study process. The major activities included interviewing key individuals in the study area and conducting eight public meetings and workshops, four of which focused on station planning and Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) opportunities. Input provided by members of the public who participated in these activities is summarized below. More detailed descriptions of the public meetings and workshops are included in the "Public Involvement Activities" section. Additional comments submitted by members of the public are included in the final section of this appendix.

Summary of Key Person Interviews

At the beginning of the study, the project team interviewed 18 key stakeholders representing nine different groups along the Diagonal corridor. All of those interviewed were members of the CCCT. Each of the nine interviews lasted approximately one hour and provided the opportunity for individuals to ask questions, raise issues, and share their ideas and concerns about the study. The interviews resulted in the following summary of issues and themes, which was presented to the CCCT to verify that the major issues had been identified and accurately depicted.

Summary of Issues and Themes from Key Person Interviews July 9, 2004

The following issues and themes were identified from Key Person Interviews (KPIs) conducted with stakeholders along the Diagonal corridor. This document is intended to reflect the shared interests and perspectives of the jurisdictions, community organizations, and other entities involved in the study. While this document identifies several issues common to different groups, it is necessary to recognize that there may be other issues of importance to individual groups that are not identified here.

Determining Travel Demand along the Diagonal

All three jurisdictions and several other stakeholders commented on assessing travel demand and markets. Those interviewed considered who the rail corridor is intended to serve and discussed what information is needed to accurately assess how to meet future travel demand. Themes included:

The rail corridor is intended to serve several ridership markets, including commuters from Longmont to Boulder, transit dependent populations, and riders from Weld County, Larimer County, and the communities along the Diagonal, including Gunbarrel. There is a shared sense that commuters will use rail to travel from Larimer County/Weld County/Longmont to Boulder and, to some extent, to employment centers at the western end of the US 36 corridor. There are differing perceptions about how far into the US 36 corridor riders originating in the Longmont area will travel. Some believe that some riders, such as transit dependent populations and those who prefer rail as a transit option, will use rail to travel to downtown Denver. Others believe that the majority of travelers will use the I-25 corridor for travel to downtown Denver. Modeling information will be important in determining which markets the rail corridor will serve and how it can best do so.

It is very important to have accurate and complete information to support study decision-making. There is concern that the figures used for modeling purposes are conservative and underestimate future travel demand. There is a general sense that the DRCOG 2025 population and employment numbers do not provide accurate projections. For the purpose of the rail study, it is important to recognize this sentiment and bring additional sources of information to the effort. To this end, several studies were identified during the KPIs for the project team to consider. It was also suggested that it would be useful to clearly articulate the assumptions that are made in the study, including what data is used and how other transportation improvements (approved and planned) are considered in relation to the rail corridor. The overall goal is to make decisions using the best information possible.

Regional and Local Connectivity

All three jurisdictions (City of Longmont, Boulder County, City of Boulder) and several other stakeholders commented on the need for the study to address regional and local connectivity. Themes included:

The Diagonal rail corridor should support regional transit service, including a possible rail corridor to the north. Improvements to the Diagonal rail corridor should provide for connections to other corridors, including north I-25 and US 36. The Diagonal corridor could also be a key component in enabling regional rail service along the northern Front Range. To this end, it is important to understand how the Diagonal rail corridor would “fit” in relation to Front Range rail service (Ft. Collins to Pueblo). The study should be coordinated with the north I-25 Environmental Impact Study and with interested communities and transportation entities to the north.

It is important to provide local transit connections. In Longmont, it is important for the local bus system to provide efficient access to rail stations. In Boulder, it is important to have convenient connections to its three main activity centers— downtown Boulder (14th and Walnut), the Boulder Transit Village (30th and Pearl), and the University of Colorado.

Bus Service along the Diagonal

The majority of those interviewed commented on current bus service along the Diagonal, expressing a strong interest that the bus continue to serve those riders who choose it as a transit option. Themes included:

Current bus service along the Diagonal works well and it is important to continue to meet the needs of this travel market. Bus travel along the Diagonal is an important transit option for local riders. It works well because there is convenient access to bus stops, the bus operates frequently, and the bus travels directly to local destination points. There is concern that the addition of rail will disadvantage bus riders by decreasing corridor bus service levels. For example, it is important to ensure long-term success for the BOLT and J routes.

There is a sense that rail and bus would serve different travel markets. Although the rail may serve current bus riders, there is a sense that the two modes would serve different markets. For example, the bus would likely continue to serve local travelers while the rail may appeal more to regional travelers.

Candidate Station Locations

All of those interviewed commented on the location of rail stations. Many stakeholders indicated support for a station at the Sugar Mill site east of Main Street in Longmont and in Gunbarrel. However, more discussion is needed to clarify each community's vision, needs, and concerns for the candidate station locations. In addition to expressing views on specific station locations, other themes included:

There is a need for an End of Line rail station to the east of Hover Street/Highway 119 in Longmont. It is important to recognize that the City of Longmont does not view the Hover Street/Highway 119 area as being able to support an End of Line station. Reasons for this include traffic impacts, limited land availability, accessibility, and fewer opportunities for TOD. However, if the college remains at this location, the Hover/Pike site would be reconsidered and would potentially serve as a third station platform in the Longmont corridor in the future. The City may want to consider methods of preserving space for this potential site. These options can be explored in the future planning and environmental impact reviews for this project.

Other stakeholders indicated that a station(s) is needed to the east of Hover Street/Highway 119. The Sugar Mill site could serve as a transfer point to the Great Western rail line that could serve the I-25 corridor to the north.

Many of the candidate stations in the corridor serve different markets. Each candidate station is viewed as relatively different in relation to the riders that it would serve. For example, it is anticipated that the Hover Street/Highway 119 station would serve riders traveling to and from employment centers in the western part of Longmont. The downtown (Flour Mill) station would largely serve transit dependent and minority populations. The Sugar Mill station would serve commuters from east Longmont, Weld County, and further north. The same is the case on the southern end of the Diagonal. The Gunbarrel station would serve the local Gunbarrel community while the Highway 52/Highway 119 station would serve travelers entering the Diagonal from the east. Again, modeling information will be important in determining which markets the rail stations will serve and how the system can best do so.

There needs to be ample opportunity for discussion in the study process to inform decision-making about station locations. There is a need for open discussion about the station locations. Several stakeholders indicated that it would be helpful to know more about the community vision and plans for each of the candidate station areas. Discussions should also include information about the criteria for determining where stations should be located, including trade-offs between the number of stations and travel time, and ridership information to determine who the stations will serve. One goal for the corridor is to locate stations in a way that ensures the strongest system.

Open Space

The study needs to consider and be consistent with each community's comprehensive and sub-area plans. In particular, in modeling expected capacity increases, designated open space needs to be taken into account for the land use parameters it establishes. Impacts to open space and floodplains should be minimized.

Public Support for Rail along the Diagonal

Many of those interviewed indicated that public support for rail service will depend on the public being able to see a travel time benefit to riding the train.

Summary of Input from Station Planning and TOD Workshops

The first two station planning and TOD workshops were held to gather public input about the opportunities and issues associated with each candidate station location. After a presentation about station planning and TOD issues, participants divided into small groups and examined maps of the areas surrounding the potential stations sites. Comments were recorded during the small group discussions. The following summary of “issues and opportunities” resulted by combining the small group reports from both station workshops:

Hover/Pike Site Opportunities

- DCULLO PABLC Land
- Front Range Community College access
- Connection to SH 119
- 95th Street widening
- Plan for access to area (feeder buses)
- Surrounding residential for riders
- Future development
- Opportunity for good design/landscape
- park-n-Ride potential
- Possible tunnel/walk

Hover/Pike Site Issues

- Limited existing pedestrian connections
- Existing high traffic volume/congestion
- Hover and SH 119 intersection is at capacity
- Existing development pattern is low density
- Shuttle system may be needed for some nearby employers
- Development timing could be critical as site is likely to develop prior to rail
- No grade separations

1st and Terry (Flour Mill site) Opportunities

- No access from major streets– train crossing Main Street/HWY 287 is currently a problem
- From 17th to 1st – can feed a lot of riders into system (north-south along Main)
- Could build a parking structure, but not a great site for end of line (EOL)
- Potential for feeder connections from the station to the west into industrial areas
- Lots of opportunities to serve downtown at this site

- Could enclose electric substation, then build around (screening has been considered, relocation is probably not an option, very difficult, lots of lines everywhere, cost considerations, would be hard to find another site)
- Potential to locate station along 1st, east of Main, not as many right-of-way (ROW) issues, better traffic flow, more room to configure station, would serve city government buildings better, still could use 1st as a feeder to the west, also
- Collyer could feed into station from the north, support east of town (ConAgra site may be a barrier to pedestrians here)
- A pedestrian bridge across Main and 1st would make area pedestrian friendly and provide access to city buildings
- Fence and guard along Main next to ConAgra site would make area user (pedestrian) friendly

1st and Terry (Flour Mill site) Issues

- No EOL
- Water table is high (can't put anything underground)
- Size of substation (power) remains – can't be changed – as a constraint – no change configuration either (footprint will stay largely the same)
- Crossing Main Street, concern about waiting, safety
- Area to south and east of Main = 100 year flood plain.

Sugar Mill Site Opportunities

- Rogers/Great Western Road extension will provide future access through the site east of the Sugar Mill connecting to the SH 119 Extension.
- Great Western Railroad access spurs from the BNSF line.
- The Sugar Mill presents a large redevelopment site and offers a place to store trains.
- The Sugar Mill is within the scenic entrance overlay zone for the City of Longmont.
- Bike and pedestrian connections are planned for 3rd Avenue from SH 119 Extension/Ken Pratt to Martin Street (north side of street; both sides at Lashley)
- St Vrain Greenway extension is planned on the south to the ball fields out east.
- Extension of Colorado Blvd. From Thornton – Weld County
- There is potential to extend rail to Weld County and east to I-25 on GWRR.
- There is potential to rezone some of the adjacent and nearby properties, some discussion is already underway between the property owner and the City from industrial to commercial mixed use (north of SH 119), and from industrial to high density residential (south of SH 119).
- There may be future improvements to County Line Road to improve north-south access.
- The property north of the GWRR line is for sale (Klug ownership currently).
- A tunnel connecting the silos at the Sugar Mill site currently exists.
- There are between 6 to 9 existing rail spurs on Sugar Mill site.

Sugar Mill Site Issues

- How to develop to ensure both commercial and residential development
- Where will 287 drivers access commuter rail (CRT)?
- \$2 million environmental clean up of Sugar Mill site
- Impacts on County Line Rd.
- Extension of Pace
- Concerns about SH 119 Extension – model indicated marginal use if connection was made
- Elevation/grade issues
- City owns ROW
- 55 feet of calcium carbonate south of site from slurry from sugar mill
- How many people from Tri-Cities and Weld County are coming and going where?
- If EOL how much parking is needed
- Wetlands north of BNSF
- BNSF is within the floodplain

Other Issues (Niwot Meeting)

- Concerns related to traffic impacts as a result of the commuter rail train (48 trains a day versus 6 or 7 freight trains existing on the line today).
- Property acquisition process and concern about loss of property, eminent domain/fair market value.
- Safety of at grade crossings, likely improvements.
- Noise impacts from horns – potential for ‘quiet zones’ and DMU technology.
- Development pressures and preservation of community character, particularly in Niwot, which is currently defined as a “semi-rural community service area” in the Boulder County Comprehensive Plan.
- Accurate long-term forecasting of ridership in the corridor. (2025 forecast numbers)
- Compatibility with the City of Longmont, Boulder County and the City of Boulder’s plans.

Compilation of Station Input from July and August Public Meetings

In addition to the first round of station planning and TOD workshops, participants at the July 29 and August 4 public meetings provided input about the candidate stations. The comments, both written and verbal, were compiled and categorized in relation to each proposed station site. The project team provided the following compilation of input about stations to the jurisdictions and CCCT to help inform the station screening and evaluation discussion.

**Compilation of Public Input
Candidate Station Locations and Station Planning
August 31, 2004**

The following are comments made by citizens along the Longmont Diagonal Corridor that pertain to station locations and planning. They include input received from the study's inception through August 31, 2004. Comments were submitted by email, telephone, and at the July 29 and August 4 public meetings (written and verbal). This compilation does not include comments gathered through key person interviews and from TOD/station planning meetings.

Longmont Stations

- Multiple stations in Longmont would make sense given the larger projected traffic and employment increases in that area for the next 20 years. (07/29/04 Public Meeting)

1st and Terry (Flour Mill)

- People living in and around Longmont will not use stations that are not conveniently located. The Hover Street and Sugar Mill sites seem inconvenient. In contrast, the Flour Mill site is pedestrian friendly and in the center of the community and is therefore more likely to attract users than the other candidate stations. (07/29/04 Public Meeting)
- This will mean a complete overhaul of bus service within Longmont. Do not use the Flour Mill site. Locate the stations at Pike Road/Hover first, then the Sugar Mill. (08/04/04 Public Meeting, written comment, Fay Reynolds)
- I think this station should be a transportation hub that works well with RTD bus lines. I prefer the 1st and Terry site in that it is in close proximity to Pratt Parkway, 287 (Main Street and downtown), and 119. I also think that it is very possible to have a stop at FRCC and a station at Main Street. I went to school on the Main Line (Philly) and commuter rail made these types of stops without any problem. (08/04/04 Public Meeting, written comment, Leo Schumacher)
- [See "Train Station on the East side of 1st & Main", Proposal for a Location, by Alex Laguna, July 12, 2004, at the end of this document.]

Other Proposed Station Locations

- Consideration should be given to having an end-of-line station near highway 66 on BNSF. Maybe only to be used for 2 or 3 peak period trains each morning and afternoon with the higher frequency trains operating from 1st and Terry. Traffic from Berthoud, Loveland & Ft. Collins will overload 287 through Longmont going to the park-N-Rides at the south end of town. (07/29/04 Public Meeting, written comment, Keith Dameron)
- Is the existing mall (Twin Peaks) a potential station site? Why not? (08/04/04 Public Meeting)
- Have you given any thought to putting a station further north of Longmont? (08/04/04 Public Meeting)
- Where does the train come from? Will it travel further north in the future? Is there any reason why you haven't looked at Highway 66 for a station site? (08/04/04 Public Meeting)

Other Issues and Questions

Questions

- *Who is doing the planning for the proposed station sites?* The consultant team and the Corridor Communities Coordination Team, the public advisory group for the study, are working with the relevant jurisdictions. (07/29/04 Public Meeting)
- *Would you have to make transfer to get from Longmont to Denver?* Possibly—some trains would probably provide direct service, while others might travel only a certain segment of that trip. (07/29/04 Public Meeting)

- *If FasTracks passes, when will decisions be made about the locations of the stations?* We will make recommendations at the end of this study. (08/04/04 Public Meeting)
- *Would RTD be interested in using LEED certification as a goal to build their stations?* (07/29/04 Public Meeting, written comment, Kai Abelkis) (Note: LEED certification promises the buildings are constructed with sustainable materials according to high efficiency and sustainable building practices).
- *When you look at station locations and frequency of trains do you consider the impact on surrounding traffic?* Yes, although an EIS is when we get into the detailed analysis. (08/04/04 Public Meeting)

Parking

- There needs to be a place for people to park at any potential station. (07/29/04 Public Meeting)
- *What size parking lot are you looking at if the Sugar Mill and community college sites are selected for stations?* We're looking at the studies. 500 spaces is the average starting point then you work up and down. We try to use 2025 numbers to project and then increase the numbers by 25-50%. Complications include acquiring the land needed for parking spaces. (08/04/04 Public Meeting)

Access (bus and pedestrian)

- There needs to be good access to stations to avoid long walks. (08/04/04 Public Meeting)
- As part of your bus feeder services to northern Longmont and other areas to the north, are you looking at creating Park n Rides outside of the immediate station areas that then feed in to the stations?. (08/04/04 Public Meeting)
- Are the stations stand-alone stations or transportation stations? The stations should be multi-modal— a place where trains interface with bus routes. (08/04/04 Public Meeting)
- In order for people to want to ride the train they will want it to stop close to home and they will not care if they have to make a few more stops along the way. It would take more time and planning to commute to the train stop. People will be compelled to use the train if it comes frequently and stops frequently. (It should be like a bus that can avoid traffic!) (07/29/04 Public Meeting, written comment, Nicholas Raabe)

Station Design

- You may be able to reduce the length of the platform at each of your intermediate stations to less than the currently projected 800 feet if passengers with intermediate destinations are directed to a car or cars aligning with these stations. (07/29/04 Public Meeting)

Train Station on the East side of 1st & Main

Proposal for a Location, by Alex Laguna – July 12, 2004

It was a treat to participate at your meeting last Friday 7/9. The project sparked many thoughts in me and I could not help to keep thinking about it. From my experience living on the North-East end of town, knowing many people in the community, and from former co-workers who commute from communities North of this town, I came up with some ideas. Another source of inspiration is my experience, as a user, when the subway system was installed in Mexico City. I also used to have a large Lionel train set, which I re-configured every so often! If this plan is indeed for 10 to 20 years into the future, it just seems natural to me to think about possible expansions of the system. With all this in mind, please find attached a file with some ideas for the project.

Thank you very much for your attention.
Sincerely,
Alex Laguna.

Advantages

- The railroad switch at 1st Ave. due North and East is a natural intersection for future extension of services. On the East to the Tri-Cities, and on the North to Berthoud, Loveland, and Fort Collins.
- That is why this proposal is for locating the Station on the East side of 1st Ave. and Main Street.
- The spur track going East is a natural location for storage as an end-of-line terminal, while allowing for future expansions. A future second Terminal in Longmont could be located at Highway 66.
- Bus service along (North) Main and South on 287 is a natural feed for the Station
- Bus depot (temporarily shut) at South Main would naturally relocate to the terminal, as people have been used to it, for years.
- A parking structure is needed in this area of town. Parking can be shared with several organizations. Users would be the Police Station, City Offices, ConAgra Plant, Station users/commuters, Bus terminal, and public in general. In addition, public events along Main could be more easily attended as parking around the downtown area has become scarce.
- Land along Second and First can be refurbished. Along Second Ave, many old buildings could be replaced with the new parking structure. Along 1st Ave., the land could be used for a second track and the terminal; the traffic currently along 1st would need a new street south of the new Terminal.
- Feeding arteries for cars and buses. See next few bullets...
 - Many people live on the East side of town, who travel along North-South streets such as Lashley, Pace, Kimbark, Collier, Martin.
 - Commuters from East of Longmont could access the Terminal from the new Extension, from Rogers Road, and from 3rd Ave. into Martin Street.
 - Commuters to/from the West side of Longmont can travel along 1st Ave. due West connecting to Boston, or Main to Ken Pratt to Nelson, and Main to Pike Rd. There are several industrial areas on the West end of town.
 - The existing campus for Front Range Community College is not its final site. They might relocate at a later date nearby the Museum on South Main and Quail.
 - From the new Extension, traffic can turn North on Main toward the Station
 - A large medical facility is on Main and Pike, south of the Station.
 - Commuters from the Tri-Cities could have access from Highway 52 into South Main (287)
- The Downtown District (LDDA) might be extended South from 3rd to 2nd, making the Station almost part of it. The LLDA extends from about 8th Ave to 3rd Ave, along Main and one or two block on either flanks of Main. It contains two bus terminals, one on 6th & Kimbark, and the other on 8th & Coffman. These terminals attest to the high density of population surrounding the downtown area.
- The neighborhood surrounded by Main, Pike, and Ken Pratt Blvd has a large population that would be users of the Terminal.
- Hispanic population – City officials have maps of population densities for this segment. The group currently comprises at least 25% of the population in town, and is expected to continue growing.


Issues

- A second track along 1st Ave. can only be laid down south of the existing one, forcing to move the traffic further south, perhaps even behind the proposed terminal building, operating like at airports
- The proposed location is in the 100 year flood region, due to nearness of the river
- Water table is probably high. However, terminal building can be raised.
- If terminal is raised, then a pedestrian overpass can be built to cross the ConAgra plant on the East end, by the railroad switch. The land is a tradeoff with ConAgra in exchange for parking space.
- A pedestrian overpass would be needed at the intersection of 1st and Main, for people to cross East-West above the vehicle traffic lanes.

- A protective fence at the sidewalk from 1st to 2nd, along Main, might be needed for safety of pedestrians moving north.

Summary of Issues and Themes from Public Meetings

At the July 29 and August 4 public meetings, public input was gathered and themes related to conceptual issues and alternatives were identified. At the September 17 and 23 public meetings, public input was gathered and themes related to study recommendations were identified. The following tables provide these thematic summaries according to study issue or recommendation and source.

 THEMATIC SUMMARY OF PUBLIC INPUT BY ISSUE AND SOURCE			
<p>This is a summary of comments made by key stakeholders and members of the public in Longmont and along the Diagonal corridor. It includes information gathered from the Key Person Interviews and first two public meetings. Themes corresponding to Conceptual Issues and Alternatives are identified on page one. All other comments are included on page two. Comments raised in a given context by two or more individuals are included in this summary.</p>			
CONCEPTUAL ISSUES	KEY PERSON INTERVIEWS	PUBLIC MEETING NIWOT, JULY 29, 2004	PUBLIC MEETING LONGMONT, AUGUST 4, 2004
Stations/park-n-Rides	<p>Many stakeholders indicated support for a station at the Sugar Mill site east of Main Street in Longmont and in Gunbarrel.</p> <p>There is a need for an End of Line rail station to the east of Hover Road/Highway 119 in Longmont.</p> <p>Candidate stations in the corridor serve different ridership markets.</p> <p>There needs to be ample opportunity for discussion in the study process to inform decision-making about station locations.</p>	<p>Participants supported numerous conveniently located stations. For example, multiple Longmont stations were favored over any single option.</p> <p>The location and size of stations should minimize impacts to the environment. Specifically, there is an interest in focusing transit-oriented development and stations in already developed areas to discourage sprawl.</p>	<p>The study should consider users coming from the north and include a possible station to the north, preferably at Highway 66.</p> <p>Participants expressed support for a Gunbarrel station and a station in downtown Longmont because they would best serve the local community in these places.</p> <p>Participants expressed support for placing stations near existing communities and activity centers.</p> <p>Stations should be transportation hubs that link bus, rail, bicycle, pedestrians, and cars from multiple sources.</p>
Feeder Bus Service	<p>It is important to provide local transit connections.</p>	<p>Participants supported ancillary bus services to those areas without stations.</p>	<p>Participants expressed interest in ancillary bus service to those areas without stations (e.g. Front Range Community College).</p>
Parallel Bus Service	<p>Current bus service along the Diagonal works well and it is important to continue to meet the needs of this travel market.</p> <p>There is a sense that rail and bus would serve different travel markets.</p>		

OTHER ISSUES	KEY PERSON INTERVIEWS	PUBLIC MEETING NIWOT, JULY 29, 2004	PUBLIC MEETING LONGMONT, AUGUST 4, 2004
Travel Demand	<p>The rail corridor is intended to serve several ridership markets, including commuters from Longmont to Boulder, transit dependent populations, and riders from Weld County, Larimer County, and the communities along the Diagonal, including Gunbarrel.</p> <p>It is very important to have accurate and complete information to support study decision-making.</p>	<p>Several in attendance voiced concern about whether passenger rail would be utilized and provided recommendations for ensuring that it would be. In some cases, support for rail appeared to rely on such assurances.</p> <p>Participants emphasized the importance of capturing all potential users including those outside the study area and non-business commuters.</p>	<p>The study should accommodate users coming from the northern part of Longmont, including a possible station at Highway 66.</p>
Regional Connectivity	<p>The Diagonal rail corridor should support regional transit service, including a possible rail corridor to the north.</p>		<p>The study should consider connections to the north and east, including those areas along Highway 287 and Weld County.</p>
Impacts	<p>The study needs to consider and be consistent with each community's comprehensive and sub-area plans. Impacts to open space and floodplains should be minimized.</p>	<p>Participants expressed concern about noise in residential areas, particularly near crossings.</p>	<p>Participants expressed concern about noise in residential areas, particularly near crossings.</p>
Public Support	<p>Many of those interviewed indicated that public support for rail service will depend on the public being able to see a travel time benefit to riding the train.</p>	<p>Participants were generally supportive of the possibility of rail service. Some wanted assurance that voting favorably on FasTracks would ensure implementation. The timing of the build was also important.</p>	<p>Participants were generally supportive of the possibility of rail service. Some wanted assurance that voting favorably on FasTracks would ensure implementation. The timing of the build was also important.</p>
Bicycle Access			<p>Participants expressed a desire to bring bikes on rail cars.</p>