



City of Glenwood Springs Transportation Commission

January 2022 Commission Regular Meeting Agenda

Tuesday, January 4, 2022, 7:30 – 9:30 am

**Meeting will be held virtually via Zoom, Webinar ID: 865 7086 8330**

Please click the link below to join the webinar:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/86570868330>

Or Telephone:

Dial(for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location):

US: +1 253 215 8782 or +1 346 248 7799 or +1 669 900 6833

or +1 301 715 8592 or +1 312 626 6799 or +1 929 205 6099

- I. Call to Order
- II. Approval of the December 7, 2021 Meeting Minutes. (5 min.)
- III. Comments from residents appearing for items not on the agenda
- IV. Parking
  - a) Discussion and recommendations to Council for upcoming 1-6 vote to continue program development
- V. Bike Share
  - b) Recommendation from the Commission on bike share expansion and funding
- VI. Update on 12/2 City Council session on Boards and Commissions
  - c) Prepare for Ralph's participation in the Boards and Commissions work session with City Council
- VII. Final Multimodal Options for a Vibrant Economy (MOVE) Report
  - d) Review of MOVE Traffic Forecasts
  - e) Traffic Report and Recommendations
- VIII. TDM Next Steps
  - f) Grant status and timing
  - g) Report on Council review of MOVE Study Appendix D, Pedestrian and Bike Improvements Plan
- IX. Clarification about how projects on the small capital priorities and SWAT list are developed, funded and advanced
- X. Agenda Planning for Next Meeting. (5 min.)

**City of Glenwood Springs, Transportation Commission**  
**DRAFT Minutes, regular meeting – December 7, 2021**

The meeting convened at 7:30am and adjourned at 9:40am.

**Participants** included:

Commission members: Sandy Lowell, Steve Smith, John Stephens, Ralph Trapani  
City council member Ingrid Wussow  
City staff: Linda DuPriest, Debra Figueroa, Terri Partch  
Guest: Jon Harman

**Minutes**

Proposed minutes for November 2, 2021 meeting were approved unanimously as final.

**MOVE study**

The commission undertook initial discussion of *Multi-model Options for a Vibrant Economy* (MOVE) report, Appendix F *Traffic and Safety*, highlighting several report details and proposals on which the commission intends to comment to city council.

Discussion will continue at January commission meeting, in anticipation of city council work session currently planned for February.

MOVE Appendix D *Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements Plan* will be discussed by city council in January, with previously submitted commission recommendations included.

**City boards and commissions**

City council work session on structure and responsibilities of city boards and commissions is scheduled January 27. *In anticipation, the commission's January meeting will include preparation for that session.*

**Capital projects updates and discussion**

**27<sup>th</sup>/Glen Avenue bicycle pedestrian underpasses**

Bids are in process now; bid selection expected in January; construction to begin spring.

**South bridge**

90% design plans will be presented to *Colorado Dept of Transportation* (CDOT) on December 7.

Current project cost estimate is \$58.4 million (est. 5% annual increase).

Depending on final details, environmental assessment may need to be revised:

- drainage

- timing of airport operations suspension for construction
- ROW and other impacts on homes east of Roaring Fork River

Special election is set for May 2022, process for selling or closing municipal airport (*vis a vis* south bridge routing and design).

#### **6&24 bicycle path**

2022 city budget includes funding for survey, geo-technical, and subsurface evaluations. City engineering staff have begun path alignment drawings (probably requiring retaining walls at some locations).

Subsequent steps will include city staff meetings with CDOT (owner of right-of-way that includes current path).

#### **Small projects implementation**

Commission asked for clarification of process for funding and implementing priority small capital projects (recommended by commission, approved by city council June 17, not specified in 2022 city budget). *Staff presentation and discussion is planned for January commission meeting.*

#### **Transportation Demand Management (TDM)**

Grant request was approved by city council and submitted November 19, seeking \$64,000 for two-years analysis of TDM program design. City match includes \$15,000 plus staff time.

#### **Managed parking**

City council discussed TDM in general, and management parking in particular, at November 18 work session. Additional council discussion, including previously submitted commission recommendations, is planned for early 2022.

#### **Bike share, first mile-last mile studies**

*Roaring Fork Transportation Authority (RFTA)* and consultants continue analysis of potential expansion of bike-share into Glenwood Springs, including discussions with technical advisory committee that includes city staff.

Simultaneous RFTA study analyzing infrastructure, services, and policies improving commuting connections to and from transit stops (bike-share, bicycle parking, shuttle buses, ride-sharing) also continues (not specific update presented).

*At its January meeting, the commission will discuss updated information on bike-share and first mile-last mile, intending to submit recommendations on both, vis a vis bicycling infrastructure needs within Glenwood Springs.*

#### **Transportation commission members, terms, appointments**

City council has postponed new appointments to boards and commissions until after January 27 work session (above).

Two citizens have applied to join Transportation Commission, with positive recommendations from council liaisons. One commission membership is open to non-city resident who lives within 81601 zip code; other members must be city residents.

**Next steps, potential future agenda topics, scheduling***Current, continuing, and timely topics*

- Clarify roles and duties of the commissions
- Recruit Transportation Commission applicants
- Transportation demand management (TDM), further research and recommendations, grant implementation, consultation with CDOT
- Aspen tour, managed parking & TDM
- Managed parking – next steps
- RFTA first-last mile mobility study, and bike-share study
- Transit coordination and refinements, RFTA and Ride Glenwood Springs
- Topical recommendations re final MOVE report and appendices
- TC as referral or review agency, development proposals
- Clarification of implementing small capital project priorities

*Standing topics, when timely*

- Updates and discussion, priority capital projects, large and small
- Reports and discussion, smaller/shorter-term transportation projects, studies, and initiatives

The next regular meeting of the Transportation Commission will be **January 4, 2022, 7:30am.**

## Transportation Commission

### *draft recommendations re RFTA bike-share expansion study*

December 2021

(for consideration at January 4 commission meeting)

**costs** – Bike-share study needs to provide total cost estimates, and local municipal cost estimates for possible Glenwood Springs expansion (latest update to RFTA board notes only that RFTA Destination 2040 funding “...would be insufficient to fund 100% of the project costs...”)

**bicycling infrastructure** – More complete, safe Glenwood Springs bicycling network should be implemented before using city funds even for bicycle-share expansion

**system size and locations** – Glenwood Springs bike-share stations needs to include effective mix of both origin and destination locationsThe *Toole* report appropriately notes that the size of the overall system—especially the location of stations—is important to success. (Of the 20 first-phase stations listed for Glenwood Springs, only six appear to serve residential connections)

**alternatives** - We suggest careful consideration of ideas that might be pursued, either instead of bicycle-share or before it is undertaken. Examples include:

- Establish a **threshold list of bicycling infrastructure projects** that must be funded and installed before city funds go into any bicycle-share system
- Create bicycle **partnerships** between city and private entities (and perhaps RFTA)—*e.g.* hotel bicycles for loan to guests; large employers provide internal bicycle-share/loan systems; engage with existing bicycle shops and rental services to provide more spontaneous bicycle access (while supporting those local businesses)
- Expanded citizen and municipal campaign **promoting use of personal bicycles** for more local trips, including access to transit.

**color** - The trademark *We-cycle* gray color for bicycles is a hazard for cyclists, essentially invisible to motorists. Bike-share bicycles in Glenwood Springs should instead be brightly colored, with extensive lighting and reflective features. In addition to improved safety, this change in appearance would help make the program more visible and promoted.

**MOVE study, Appendix D, *Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements Plan*  
analysis, Bicycle-Pedestrian Subcommittee report (updated)**  
to Glenwood Springs Transportation Commission August 2, 2021

**Infrastructure, site-specific** (*p. 3 et seq*)

Several of the report's recommendations for bicycle-pedestrian infrastructure improvements are good and timely, including

- RiverTrail connections – improve, repair damage
- 8<sup>th</sup>/Midland – widen/correct lack of safe continuity
- 8<sup>th</sup> Street – general improvements and updates
- 27<sup>th</sup> Street – widen north-side sidewalk to 10 feet
- 27<sup>th</sup>/Midland west roundabout, change grades to slow motor traffic, add flashing beacons for crosswalks (*subcommittee: plus refresh and maintain crosswalks*)
- East-west connections – add, improve existing \*

The report does not include some other essential improvements, highlighted as priorities in the city's transportation capital projects list, including:

- 27<sup>th</sup>/Glen Avenue underpasses
- more details for 8<sup>th</sup> Street improvements
- added flashing crosswalk beacon at Exit 114 roundabout
- 6&24 bicycle path replacement
- network-gap remedies on 6<sup>th</sup> Street and at Laurel roundabout
- other transit-connecting remedies and updates north of Colorado River

**Infrastructure, design and policy** (*pp. 2, 3, 6, 8*)

Several of the report's recommendations for design standards and policies also make sense, including:

- all multiple use paths at least 10 feet wide (minimum 8 feet)
- pedestrian-only sidewalks at least 6 feet wide
- include buffer between sidewalk (*or bikeway or multiple-use*) and roadway
- establish inventory of bi-ped system continuity gaps, plan for filling those
- improve way-finding signs and other guides, especially in downtown core
- prompt repair and frequent maintenance of bicycle-pedestrian routes

**Phasing**

The report's recommendations for phasing improvements, also read as categories by cost and complexity, can be helpful for projecting an implementation plan.

The project total cost of only \$1 million is encouraging, if perhaps understated.

**\* East-west connections** (*pp. 3, 4 (map), 7 (map), 9 (map)*)

The report's specific recommendations for expanding and improving east-west bicycle-pedestrian connections include a mix of good and less good ideas. Subcommittee recommends the following clarifications and refinements:

- East-west crossings of Grand Avenue should be highlighted only at intersections either protected by traffic-control lights, or grade-separated: 7<sup>th</sup>, 9<sup>th</sup>, 10<sup>th</sup>, 11<sup>th</sup>, 23<sup>rd</sup> (especially 10<sup>th</sup> Street safe route to school)—plus 27<sup>th</sup> until replaced with underpasses

- At 8<sup>th</sup> Street, emphasize only portion west of Grand Avenue
- 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> streets have sufficient width to accommodate bicycle lanes (not rely on “sharrows” or similar make-do pavement markings), both streets 46 feet wide
- 12<sup>th</sup> Street Ditch route should be highlighted only after comprehensive reconstruction
- 14<sup>th</sup> Street should not be used (instead improve safe access to crossing at 15<sup>th</sup>)

### **BRT connections** (*p. 8 et seq*)

Generally, the reports discussion of bi-ped connections to BRT is inadequate. Subcommittee recommendations include:

- Grand Avenue should not be used for BRT route if doing so would result in damage to existing bicycle-pedestrian safety and access features—bulb-outs, bi-ped crossing lights *et al* (although sidewalk improvements/buffers recommended in Appendix D are good ideas in any case)
  - If RiverTrail corridor is used for BRT route:
    - Connections with/across riverside BRT route must have foolproof bus control to protect bicycle and pedestrian access and safety
    - Do not include BRT stop behind high school (or at other interim stops between 8<sup>th</sup> and 27<sup>th</sup>)
    - Do not drastically separate trail from current route (especially, do not add steep grades)
    - Reconsider advisability of trail access behind old Safeway

### **Funding**

The report’s list of potential funding sources is helpful.

### **Questions, next steps**

- Who is to fund and implement the MOVE Appendix D plan?
- What is schedule for implementation (especially items related to new BRT route)?
- How integrate bi-ped plan with RFTA first mile-last mile study?
- Other?

## Traffic Forecasting Assumptions Memo

**PARSONS**

Date: 5/18/20

This document provides the proposed traffic growth rate that will be used to develop future traffic volumes. The growth rate will be globally applied to the six key intersections for the future traffic analysis. The six intersections include the following:

- Grand Avenue & 8<sup>th</sup> Street
- Grand Avenue & 9<sup>th</sup> Street
- Grand Avenue & 14<sup>th</sup> Street
- 8<sup>th</sup> Street & Midland Avenue
- 8<sup>th</sup> Street & Colorado Avenue
- 8<sup>th</sup> Street & Pitkin Avenue

Two sources of information were reviewed that provide estimated growth projections based on different methodologies:

1. **RFTA Integrated Transportation Strategic Plan (ITSP): Population and Employment Growth Projections for Roaring Fork Valley:** The RFTA ITSP growth projections were developed in 2016 to provide a 20-year (2036) transportation vision for the region. The growth rates were developed using the RFTA Ridership Estimation Tool spreadsheet that incorporates population and employment within specified zone areas to determine projected future trips. Comparing the 2016 and 2036 average weekday person-flow trip table data specifically for the Glenwood Springs area, a 20-year growth rate of 44.8% was calculated. This equates to a **1.9% annual compounded growth rate**.
2. **CDOT Online Transportation Information System (OTIS):** Each of the statewide count stations along state highway facilities provides a 20-year growth factor. The growth factor is a traffic forecasting statistic that when multiplied by the current AADT yields an estimate of AADT for 20 years in the Future. There is one continuous count station (Station 000214) located on SH 82, south of 27<sup>th</sup> Street. The other count stations along the corridor will not be considered as these are short-term locations and may not provide a reliable growth factor when basing the growth on historic trends. Station 000214 provides a 20-year growth factor of 1.24 (this equates to a 24% overall growth rate). This results in a **1.1% annual compounded growth rate**.

There is a noted disparity between the two sources where the CDOT projection provides a minimum threshold and the RFTA ITSP provides a maximum threshold. Due to possible changed travel patterns in the future as a result of COVID-19 and other uncertainties, the project team recommends being conservative and using the higher growth rate for future traffic analysis. The **1.9% annual compounded growth rate** will be used to represent future traffic conditions. We recommend taking this more conservative approach in order to determine and analyze what we believe is the worst-case scenario. If the resulting bus travel speeds and times and traffic LOS are not reasonable, we can always revisit the growth rate.