



City of Glenwood Springs Transportation Commission

May 2022 Commission Regular Meeting Agenda

City Hall, Council Chambers

Tuesday, May 10, 2022, 7:30 – 9:30 am

1. Call to Order / Agenda Modification
2. Approval of the April 5, 2022 Meeting Minutes (*Attached*)
3. Comments from Residents for Items not on the Agenda
4. Introduction and Welcome of New Commissioner – Ray Alexander
5. Idaho/Safety Stop *30 minutes*
 - a. Brief summary of new state statute (*Attached*)
 - b. Recommendations to City Council for local implementation (requested)
 - c. Sign Image from the Manual of Traffic Signs (*Attached*)
6. Bicycle-Pedestrian Engineering Standards Recommendations (*Attached*) *20 minutes*
 - a. Staff response
 - b. Next steps
7. Bike Share Recommendations (Roaring Fork Transportation Authority) *5 minutes*
(*Attached*)
 - a. Confirm delivery of commission’s January recommendations to City Council
 - b. Follow-up
8. 27th Street Underpass Recommendation (*Attached*) *5 minutes*
 - a. Confirm delivery of commission’s April recommendation to City Council
 - b. Follow-up

9. Capital Projects/Long Range Transportation Plan, Annual Update *20-30 minutes*
(2021 Approved Rankings Attached)
Link: [Glenwood Springs Long Range Transportation Plan 2015-2035](#)
 - a. First review
 - b. Preliminary recommendations
 - c. Research-assignments

10. May 3, 2022 City Election Results *10 minutes*
 - a. Implications for transportation planning

11. Consultations With Other City Commissions *10 minutes*

12. City Council Multimodal Options for a Vibrant Economy (MOVE) *5 minutes*
Calendar
 - a. Plan for preparing and delivering timely recommendations from Commission

13. Agenda Planning for Next Meeting

14. Adjourn (Next Meeting June 7, 2022)

City of Glenwood Springs, Transportation Commission
PROPOSED Minutes, regular meeting – April 5, 2022

The meeting convened in City Council Chambers at 7:30am and adjourned at 9:40am.

Participants included:

Commission members: Jon Harman, Dean Kinkel, Steve Smith, John Stephens, Betsy Suerth, Ralph Trapani
City council members Shelley Kaup, Ingrid Wussow
City staff: Linda DuPriest, Jenn Ooton, Terri Partch
Guest: Ray Alexander

Minutes

March 2022 minutes were approved.

Commission recommendations re Roaring Fork Transportation Authority (RFTA) bike-share study

Consultants to present governance proposal and updated cost estimates to study's technical advisory committee (TAC) on April 5. Linda is a member of the TAC.

Commission recommendations (approved January 2022) will be presented to city council at its second April meeting or first May meeting, along with update from the TAC presentation.

Other updates included:

- expansions and additions to bike-facilities in Aspen, Basalt, and Snowmass Village expected in 2022
- facilities in Carbondale tentative planned for 2023
- Facilities in Glenwood Springs contemplated for 2024

27th Street/Glen Avenue bicycle-pedestrian underpasses capital project

Bids have been received, reflecting cost 50% above original estimate; current project cost now projected at \$15 million. *Roaring Fork Transportation Authority* (RFTA) has asked *City of Glenwood Springs* to provide additional \$3 million. (City has provided \$750,000 so far.)

City council is deliberating whether to provide additional funding and, if so, from what sources. Possibilities include funds from *American Rescue Plan* (federal grant), city's capital projects reserve, and loan from RFTA. Decision is needed in early May.

Action: Commission formally recommended (motion by John, second by Ralph, supported unanimously) that city council approve additional funding to complete underpasses project on schedule.

South bridge capital project

Terri reported re-evaluation of environmental assessment is nearly complete, with right-of-way acquisition as next stage. Also, city council voted to proceed with current basic plan, including tunnel under municipal airport runway. Current estimated cost estimate is \$58.1 million (\$50 million for construction).

Status of project in state project rankings has shifted (via *Intermountain Transportation Planning Region*, see below), currently listed as active, but without funding (not on fiscally constrained priority projects list or on 10-years projects list).

6th Street reconstruction capital project

Terri reported that final design is not yet completed, and city now is seeking new design contractor. Construction likely will be moved to 2023.

City is pursuing additional state grant funding for 6th Street (not for 6th & 8th streets combination).

Engineering design standards for bicycle-pedestrian infrastructure

Bicycle-Pedestrian Subcommittee presented recommendations to revise or expand the city' *Engineering Design Standards* to address five bicycle and pedestrian structures:

- crosswalks (minimum width, with corresponding curb-cuts; standard pavement markings using piano-keys lay-out with 1:1 ratio marking bare pavement)
- shared-use paths (minimum width; continuous poured concrete with saw-cut joints)
- bicycle lanes (affirm *American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials/Colorado Department of Transportation (AASHTO/CDOT)* standards, or write AASHTO/CDOT standards into city standards); white-lines pavement markings (not colored pavement); minimize use of "sharrows")
 - sidewalks (increased minimum width)
 - curb-cuts (smooth transition, without sharp lip)

Discussion included:

- changes in engineering design standards may require corresponding changing in development code
- access for travelers with disabilities should also be considered

Action: The commission referred the subcommittee's recommendations to city engineering staff or analysis and response.

Bicycle-pedestrian travel network review

In behalf of Bicycle-Pedestrian Subcommittee, John presented maps and narrative describing existing bicycle-pedestrian travel network, highlight gaps and inadequacies in that network.

The maps and accompanying documents will serve as a) continuing reference in proposing corrective actions, b) background to update recommendations for *Long Range Transportation Plan*, and c) contribution to city's comprehensive plan update.

Long Range Transportation Plan, annual review and update

City annual budget process will begin in June-July. Transportation Commission will corresponding prepare recommendations by then.

Commission deliberations will begin at its May 4 meeting and conclude at its June 1 meeting. Recommendations will focus both on ranking for transportation capital projects and on narrative/policy components of the long range plan.

Transportation Demand Management (TDM)

Staff have issued request for proposals (RFP) for consultant assistance in designing a transportation demand management program (TDM). Commission members complimented staff on the thoroughness and clarity of the RFP.

The RFP and continuing staff work on this effort has included assistance from *Association for Commuter Transport* and from *Colorado Department of Transportation's (CDOT) Office of Innovative Mobility*. Ralph highlighted similar effort and information through *Aspen Institute's* mobility forum.

Intermountain Transportation Planning Region (IMTPR)

Until and unless city establishes a transportation management authority or organization (TMA or TMO), TDM and other multi-jurisdictional transportation planning/funding is coordinated through the *State of Colorado's Intermountain Transportation Planning Region (IMTPR)*.

Part of the city's pursuit of funding for local projects proceeds through IMTPR, including south bridge project (as noted above) and Highway 6&24 bicycle path reconstruction (Linden to Donegan).

Specifically, the city is seeking funds for 6&24 bicycle path from the state's *Multi-modal Options Fund (MMOF)*. Meanwhile, design work is proceeding, as funded in current city budget (\$50,000).

Ingrid will serve as city's new representative to IMTPR.

Multimodal Options for a Vibrant Economy (MOVE), topical review calendar

Three components of the MOVE study await city council review and decisions:

- bus rapid transit, next phase of route alternatives analysis (including public review and comment process on route selection)

- local transit connections and service patterns
- general operational analysis, Highway 82 and 8th Street

Staff will coordinate calendar for city council work sessions and decision meetings regarding MOVE components, with opportunity for commission review and comment. Meanwhile, commission will review its earlier comprehensive memorandum of recommendations regarding MOVE.)

Tasks, homework, follow-up

- Staff convey to city council commission's recommendations regarding RFTA bike-share study
- Staff review and respond to bicycle-pedestrian engineering design standards recommendations

Agenda topics for May 10 commission meeting

- Staff initial response to bicycle-pedestrian engineering design standards recommendations
- First review, capital projects ranking and *Long Range Transportation Plan* recommendations
- Commission roles and responsibilities update
- Others as timely or needed

Agenda topics for June 7 commission meeting

- Complete recommendations, capital projects ranking and *Long Range Transportation Plan*
- MOVE transit components review, update recommendations
- Additional consideration and/or action, engineering design standards

Other anticipated topics, when timely

- Review citywide emergency access plan

Standing topics, when timely

- Updates and discussion – priority capital projects, large and small
- Reports and discussion – studies, and initiatives, and shorter-term and maintenance projects

The next regular meeting of the Transportation Commission will be **May 10, 2022, 7:30am**, City Hall.

Colorado safety stop legislation update and analysis

for consideration by City of Glenwood Springs Transportation
Commission

May 3, 2022

Recently approved and signed state amendment to *Colorado Revised Statutes* implements **statewide allowance for what are known as safety stops** (also sometimes called Idaho stops) by operator of a bicycle and other “low-speed conveyance” (bicycles, electric bicycles, electric scooters (not including mopeds), wheelchairs)—essentially allowing those operators to **treat stop signs as yield signs and to treat red lights as stop signs**.

As the amended, select portions of the relevant statute 42-4-1412, now reads:

A pedestrian or a person who is fifteen years of age or older or who is under fifteen years of age and accompanied by an adult and who is operating a low-speed conveyance and approaching a controlled intersection with a stop sign shall slow down and, if required for safety, stop before entering the intersection. If a stop is not required for safety, the pedestrian or person operating a low-speed conveyance shall slow to a reasonable speed and yield the right-of-way to any traffic or pedestrian in or approaching the intersection. After the pedestrian or person operating a low-speed conveyance has slowed to a reasonable speed and yielded the right-of-way if required, the pedestrian or person operating a low-speed conveyance may cautiously make a turn or proceed through the intersection without stopping ... For purposes of this subsection (1) subsection (2)(a), a reasonable speed is ten miles per hour or less...

(municipalities may adjust that minimum speed locally)

... A person who is fifteen years of age or older or who is under fifteen years of age and accompanied by an adult and who is operating a low-speed conveyance and approaching a controlled intersection with an illuminated red traffic control signal shall stop before entering the intersection and shall yield to all other traffic and pedestrians. Once the person operating a low-speed conveyance has yielded, the person operating a low-speed conveyance may cautiously proceed in the same direction through the intersection or make a right-hand turn. When a red traffic control signal is illuminated, a person operating a low-speed conveyance shall not proceed through the intersection or turn right if an oncoming vehicle is turning or preparing to turn left in front of the person operating a low-speed conveyance ...

(additional clarifications regarding left-turns and other movements are included)

... If a county or municipality has placed a traffic sign or a traffic control signal at a controlled intersection and the traffic sign or traffic control signal provides instructions only to one or more specified types of low-speed conveyances, the operator of a low-speed conveyance to which the traffic sign or traffic control

signal is directed shall obey the instructions provided by the sign or traffic control signal ...

As summarized by staff at *Bicycle Colorado* (the lead organization advocating for this new law):

- This new law means that when an intersection is clear and they already have the right of way, bicyclists ages 15 and older may now treat stop signs as yield signs and treat stop lights as stop signs.
- Younger bicyclists may perform the maneuver if accompanied by an adult.
- Bicyclists can yield and then proceed through a stop sign-controlled intersection at up to 10 miles per hour.
- Intersections where bicyclist-specific lights or signs are present that prohibit the maneuver are exempt from the new law.

Analysis and observations from *Glenwood Springs Bicycle Advocates*:

- Safety stop allowance at stop signs is a good idea, reducing awkward stop/restart movements and helping more quickly clear intersections for other travelers.
- Safety stop allowance at stoplights generally is not a good idea, for two basic reasons:
 - motor traffic on routes with traffic-control lights tends to be faster, higher-volume, and with less attentive drivers
 - the public-relations image of a bicyclist riding through a red light is not a good one.
- Extensive education, of cyclists and drivers, will be essential to properly understanding the new law and to keeping all travelers safe.

Options for *City of Glenwood Springs* response to the new law include:

- Place signs at all or some affected intersections, prohibiting or restricting use of the new law;
- Place signs at all or some affected intersections, specifically instructing bicyclists (and perhaps other low-speed conveyance operators) how to proceed in using the new law (obey pedestrian signal *e.g.*);
- Take no new traffic-control action;
- Assist with public education campaign to clarify rights and responsibilities under the new law.



R9-5

Bicycles Use Ped Signal

Sign image from the Manual of Traffic Signs <<http://www.trafficsign.us/>>
This sign image copyright Richard C. Moer. All rights reserved.

Updating and clarifying city engineering design standards bicycle and pedestrian facilities

April 5, 2022

*revised from April 5 consideration by Transportation Commission
March 8 recommendations from Bicycle-Pedestrian Subcommittee*

Engineering standards for various public works projects and contracts are described in city document *Engineering Standards*, approved/last updated by city council August 2, 2018.

In general and as basic standards, the city adheres to provisions of the *Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices* (MUTCD), a) for consistency and b) as often required for projects using federal or state funding.

Additional guidances are available from *Federal Highway Administration* (FHWA) publications, from *American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials* (AASHTO), and from *Colorado Department of Transportation* (CDOT). Guides and standards from these sources generally are consistent with MUTCD or, in some cases, provide more detail. Additional insights come from certain states' standards, particularly Massachusetts and Washington.

Crosswalks

Proposal

- minimum width 8 feet, or wider to match width of connecting sidewalks or multi-use paths, with curb-cut width to match
- pavement markings use piano-keys/zebra-stripes format, marking-to-bare-pavement ratio 1:1
 - possible exception using colored concrete/pavement, allowed only at signalized intersections, should include white lines at edges

Current CITY standard – no width or marking standards specified; 1:1 marking ratio general practice (but not universal) since 2004 recommendations from city council-appointed bicycle-pedestrian task force

MUTCD – using white side lines min 6 feet width; for piano-keys, “...*design of lines and gaps should avoid wheel paths if possible, and the gap between the lines should not exceed 2.5 times the width of the ...lines*”

AASHTO – “*When a standard or ladder-type crosswalk is located on a residential or local street, the width of the crosswalk (distance between transverse lines) shall be 8 feet on center. When the crosswalk is located on a collector or arterial street, the width of the crosswalk shall be 10 feet on center.*” “...*marked crosswalks should desirably be at least as wide as the sidewalks they connect...*”

Multi-use/shared-use paths

Proposal

- minimum width 10 feet two-way; 8 feet in highly selective exceptions for short distances in physically constrained areas
- concrete surface using continuous pour/saw-cut joints

Current CITY standard (Section 5.2, tables 5-1, 5-2, 5-3, 5-4, 5-7; Section 5.5 per AASHTO guide) – 10 feet width two-way; 5 feet one-way (4 feet if constrained); saw-cut joints from RiverTrail design standards 1993

MUTCD – no standard or minimum width

AASHTO – 10 feet minimum width; 8 feet in constrained areas; 12-14 feet in heavy-use areas

CDOT – minimum width 10 feet, wider if higher-volume use; 8 feet width “...may be used only for short sections of constrained conditions...” (with conditions); “On Portland cement concrete pavements, the transverse joints should be saw cut, rather than tooled...”

Bicycle lanes

Proposal

- retain/affirm AASHTO/CDOT width standards (below)
- pavement marking use parallel white lines (MUTCD) (not colored overlay)
- no use of sharrows where right-of-way width is sufficient to meet bicycle lanes standards; generally avoid use of sharrows

Current CITY standard (Section 5.2, tables 5-1, 5-2, 5-3, 5-4, 5-7; Section 5.5 per AASHTO guide) – 6 feet width, 4 feet min

MUTCD – no standard or minimum width

AASHTO – not including curb/gutter & no parking 4 feet width; including curb/gutter & no parking 5 feet (no more than 2 feet in gutter pan)

FHWA – widths same as AASHTO; interim guidance on sharrows

CDOT – same as AASHTO, except if include gutter 6 feet recommended

Sidewalks

Proposal

- preferred width 8 feet, at all locations
- minimum width 8 feet in commercial areas and other heavy-use locations
- minimum width 6 feet at any location

Current CITY standard (Section 5.2, tables 5-1, 5-2, 5-3, 5-4, 5-7; Section 5.4) – 8 feet wide commercial areas; 5 feet residential (6 feet if high-use)

MUTCD – no standard or minimum width

AASHTO – residential 4-6 feet width; main street 6-12 feet; suburban 6 feet-plus; urban arterials 6 feet-plus

CDOT – 5 feet minimum; 4 feet in constrained areas; if less than 5 feet, must provide passing spaces (min 5 feet) at 200-foot intervals

Curb-cuts – intersections, crosswalks, refuge islands, driveways, etc.

Proposal

- width to match, at minimum, widest non-motor connecting way (sidewalk, multi-use path, crosswalk, etc.)
- smooth transition sidewalk to pavement (no formed or troweled lip)

Current CITY standard – no width standards

MUTCD – no standard or minimum width

AASHTO – recommended width equal to full width of sidewalk; “...transitions from the curb ramp to gutter or road surfaces, or both, must be flush (level) and free of abrupt surface changes...”

**Updating and clarifying city engineering design standards
bicycle and pedestrian facilities
sections-specific version**

April 15, 2022

*companion to April 5 outline considered by Transportation Commission
changes to engineering design standards Chapter 5 may prompt corresponding
changes to city development code*

Crosswalks

existing provisions

section 5.2.4.D.3.h

Crosswalk markings will usually be installed at the following locations:

- At controlled intersections
- At any intersection located along a formally established “School Route”
- At any intersection with a formalized bike/pedestrian trail
- By request, with approval of the City Engineer

(no specified standards for crosswalk dimensions, materials, or installation)

proposed changes/additions

5.2.4.D.3.h and/or other appropriate sections (perhaps section 5.4)

Retain existing provisions.

Add:

High-contrast ladder-type/piano-keys/zebra-stripes pavement marking shall be used for all crosswalks. (Exception: Colored pavement marking may be substituted for crosswalk only at signalized intersection; colored-pavement crosswalk should include high-contrast transverse white lines defining lateral edges of the crosswalk.)

Design of ladder lines/bars and gaps should avoid wheel paths if possible, and the gap between the lines shall equal width of lines (1:1 ratio, marking:bare pavement). Width of lines/bars in ladder-type crosswalk markings shall be 24”.

Crosswalk pavement markings shall be high-contrast, reflective (either paint or thermal plastic).

When crosswalk is located on a residential or local street, the minimum width of the crosswalk shall be 8 feet on center. When the crosswalk is located on a collector or arterial street, the minimum width of the crosswalk shall be 10 feet on center. Beyond those specified minimums, marked crosswalk should be at least as wide as the widest sidewalk or shared-use path the crosswalk connects.

section 5.4.5

Add:

Minimum width of curb cuts and refuge-island cut openings installed to accommodate marked crosswalk shall equal width of the crosswalk.

rationale

- Crosswalks need to be sharply visible to approaching drivers from a distance that allows driver caution and yielding.
- High-contrast, dense pavement marking best serves this visibility purpose.
- Ratio 1:1, marking:bare pavement, is significantly more visible than wider spacing. 1:1 spacing, installed carefully, can place motor vehicle tire tracks between crosswalk markings.
- Crosswalk-marking at 1:1 ratio has been Glenwood Springs' typical practice (if not formal standard) since 2004. It should be codified in the engineering standards.
- Colored-pavement crosswalks are not visible to drivers at any effective distance. The low-contrast invisibility of this technique is exacerbated within a few years of travel and on wet pavement. Colored crosswalks should be used only where supplemented by traffic lights.
- Crosswalks frequently are called upon to serve a simultaneous combination of pedestrians, cyclists, wheelchairs, strollers, *etc.*—in effect a multi-use/shared-use passage. Crosswalks correspondingly need to be at least as wide as the exception-minimum for shared use—that is, at least 8 feet wide.
- Curb-cuts narrower than approaching sidewalks or shared-use paths create dangerous bottlenecks. Matching width of cut with width of crosswalk facilitates safer, unfettered passage at an inherently vulnerable location.

Multi-use/shared-use paths***existing provisions***

section 5.2, including tables 5-1, 5-2, 5-7

- Separated multi-use path or paths are required
- 10' minimum width required in two-direction, 5' minimum width required for single-direction travel
- Separated paths shall be separated by a minimum of 5' wide landscaping buffer

section 5.5.2.C

Off-street bike trails or paths shall be at least 10 feet wide and shall conform to the Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities.

section 5.5.3

- Off-street bike paths and trails shall be constructed per CDOT M&S Standard Plan M-609-1. Minimum concrete thickness shall be 5 inches.
- Bike paths and trails shall be CDOT Class B, or other approved air-entrained concrete.
- Root barrier fabric shall be placed under bike path or trail prior to placing of the materials.

Form and subgrade inspection by the City is required before the sidewalk is poured.

proposed changes/additions

section 5.2; section 5.5.2.C

Retain existing provisions.

Add:

section 5.5.2.C

A path width of 8 ft. may be used for a short distance due to a physical constraint such as an environmental feature, bridge abutment, utility structure, fence, and such.

section 5.5

Retain existing provisions.

Add:

5.5.3.D. Apply broom finish perpendicular to trail. Use sawcut ¼" joints 1 ¼" deep, minimum every 10' along trail/path.

rationale

- The current standards' minimum width for shared-use paths is correct at 10 feet, to safely and conveniently accommodate the variety of travelers and devices using the paths.
- As bicycle, pedestrian, and other uses increase, 10 feet minimum width will become increasingly essential.
- Selective short narrower sections of shared-use path, down to 8 feet, should be added as an allowance, but treated as exception only for discrete, unavoidable hazards or physical constraints—not as a full-project design dimension, and not for the purpose of construction-cost savings.
- Use of continuous-pour concrete, with saw-cut joints, was established as shared-used path guideline in 1991 *Glenwood Springs Trailsystem Plan*; this guidance should be codified in engineering standards.

Bicycle lanes

existing provisions

section 5.2, including tables 5-1, 5-2, 5-3, 5-4, 5-7

minor arterial, commercial collector, neighborhood collector

- To be provided on both sides of the street, unless separated multi-use path is provided.
- 6' width is preferred for one way travel. Lesser widths down to 4' may be acceptable on existing streets with width constraints.
- Bike symbol pavement markings are required.

proposed changes/additions

section 5.2, tables 5-2, 5-3

Consider changing bike symbol pavement marking requirement to preference or recommendation (to reduce maintenance effort and expense).

Otherwise retain existing provisions.

Clarify that "...lesser widths down to 4' may be accessible..." is not to include gutter pan in bicycle lane dimension (per AASHTO, CDOT).

Add:

High-contrast, white longitudinal pavement markings shall be used to define bicycle lanes.

Bicycle lane pavement markings shall be parallel high-contrast, reflective lines (either paint or thermal plastic), longitudinal lines width 6".

Shared lane marking ("sharrow") pavement markings may be used to assist bicyclists with lateral positioning in lanes that are too narrow for a motor vehicle and a bicycle to travel side by side with the same traffic lane. Sharrows shall not be used on streets of width sufficient to include standard bicycle lanes. Generally avoid use of sharrows.

rationale

- Engineering standards reference to AASHTO geometric design, with specific dimensions noted in the city's standards, are appropriate and should be retained.
- Recent experiments with colored-pavement or painted bicycle lanes have proven ineffective and inappropriate due to driver confusion, rapid wear, and complexity/cost of maintenance. These low-contrast markings do not catch the eye of drivers, compared to standard reflective white lane markings. Better to stick with traditional two-line, high-contrast bicycle lane markings.
- Sharrows have proven confusing for drivers and cyclists, prompting unsafe behavior and irritation, with no increase in bicycling use or safety. Sharrows never should be used on high-volume streets. Where street dimensions allow, traditional two-line bicycle lanes provide more clear sense of separation and safe traffic flow.

Sidewalks

existing provisions

section 5.2, including tables 5-1, 5-2, 5-3, 5-4, 5-7

Sidewalks required on both sides of street unless alternative bicycle and pedestrian facilities meeting these criteria are provided within the corridor.

- 8 ft. width in commercial areas
- 5 ft. width in residential areas. 6 ft. width should be provided in high pedestrian volume areas with frequent two-way foot traffic.

All sidewalks and intersections with vehicle lanes should meet ADA specifications.

proposed changes/additions

section 5.2, including tables 5-1, 5-2, 5-3, 5-4, 5-7

Adjust/replace existing provisions:

Sidewalks required on both sides of street unless alternative bicycle and pedestrian facilities meeting these criteria are provided within the corridor.

- 8 ft. minimum width in commercial areas
- 8 ft. width preferred at all locations
- 6 ft. minimum width at all locations, including residential areas

All sidewalks and intersections with vehicle lanes should meet ADA specifications

rationale

- While current minimum-width standard (5 feet) may meet minimal spatial needs of one user, it is insufficient for passage of two adults, is wholly inadequate for passage of pedestrians and wheelchair, and creates a hazard for use by inexperienced young bicyclists in the presence of other users.
- As pedestrian and young cyclist use of sidewalks increases, 6 feet minimum width, with preference for 8 feet width in many locations, will be increasingly important.

Curb cuts – intersections, crosswalks, refuge islands, driveways, etc.***existing provisions***

No provisions regarding width of curb cuts associated with bicycle or pedestrian facilities.

proposed changes/additions

section 5.4.5 and/or other appropriate sections

Add:

Minimum width of curb cuts and refuge-island cut openings installed to accommodate marked crosswalk shall equal width of the crosswalk.

For all curb cuts, transitions from the curb ramp to gutter or road surfaces, or both, must be flush (level) and free of abrupt surface changes.

rationale

- Curb-cuts narrower than connected crosswalks create unsafe bottlenecks. Matching width of cut with width of crosswalk facilitates safer, unfettered passage at an inherently vulnerable location.
- High tooled-edge lump a bottom of curb-cut (crosswalks, shared-use crossings, and driveways) creates oblique-angle hazard for cyclists, barrier for wheelchairs, and inconvenience for strollers. Smooth transition avoids those problems.

overall proposal rationale

- The collection of proposed adjustments and expansions to the city's transportation engineering design standards will help fulfill the goal and objectives included in the standards document itself (*at 5.2.3*), including:

Goal

The City transportation system should encourage alternate mode use, especially walking and bicycling, by working toward a safe balance of all street users, including automobiles, trucks, bicycles, and pedestrians.

Objectives

1. Standards should create safer routes for all modes.
 2. Standards should optimize the use of the limited physical capacity of streets and balance street design that does not favor motorized traffic.
 3. Intermodal connections within the transportation system should be created, enhanced, and improved.
 4. Street design should enhance bicycle safety for its own sake and as a traffic calming measure.
 5. Street design should and enhance and improve the pedestrian safety and comfort and encourage non-motorized modes of travel.
 12. Standards should assure that drainage facilities do not create hazards for cyclists and pedestrians.
- These proposals also help fulfill goals and purposes stated in the *city's Long Range Transportation Plan 2015-2035*, including:

Goals (p. 1-1)

Connectivity
Safety
Accessibility
Convenience
Livability

Why Invest in Walking and Bicycling Facilities (p. 1-4)

“Walking and bicycling helps people meet recommended physical activity levels and cultivates a healthier community.”

“Investing in bicycling and pedestrian facilities stimulates the local economy by supporting local businesses, generating tourism revenue, and creating jobs.”

**Transportation Commission
recommendations re RFTA bike-share expansion study**

approved January 4

for relay to city council (in anticipation of March 10 RFTA board 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 locations The *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.

City of Glenwood Springs Transportation Commission

Recommendation: fund 27th Street bicycle-pedestrian underpass

Unanimously approved by Transportation Commission April 5, 2022

Transportation Commission urges Glenwood Springs City Council to approve additional funding for the proposed 27th Street/Glen Avenue bicycle-pedestrian underpass project, sufficient to complete the project on schedule during 2022.

Commission members participating: Jon Harman, Dean Kinkel, Steve Smith, John Stephens, Betsy Suerth, Ralph Trapani

2021 "Large" Project List - over \$1,000,000			
<u>Type</u>	<u>2021 Approved Rank</u>	<u>Project / Improvement</u>	<u>6/21 Status</u>
Bridge and Multi Modal	1	South Bridge.	Design in Progress, 90% design review scheduled for 10/14/21. ROW planning and negotiations underway. Project is funding dependant.
On Street Bike Facilities	2	6th Street / North Glenwod Landing Reconstruction and reconfiguration - including on-street and separated bicycle facilities, and including clarifying / reconstructing the bicycle/ped crossing at Laurel.	Design Kick Off to be scheduled, Design Contract approved 6/17/21.
Intersection Improvement	3	27th St. and SH 82 - Grade separated crossing	Construction Bids anticipated in August with construction to begin in October.
Bike / Ped Shared-use Path	4	Hwy 6 Corridor shared use path - Full reconstruction of a functional bike / ped separated path from Donegan to Linden, incl. design, engineering and construction.	Design process not yet begun.
Bike / Ped On-& Off- Street Improvement	5	8th Street Extension Completion - East side of bridge to School St: widening- 2 lanes plus center median plus 2-10' wide sidewalks	Design in Progress, 90% completed internally. Project is funding dependant.

2021 "Small" Project List - under \$1,000,000			
<u>Type</u>	<u>2021 Approved Rank</u>	<u>Project / Improvement</u>	<u>6/21 Status</u>
Bike / Ped On-& Off- Street Improvement	1	8th St. Interim Safety improvements - Full width path on the north side of 8th Street from 7th St. to City Building when full funding available; move crosswalk across 8th St. to the West of intersection with 7th.	Design process not yet begun. Some funding is available in the 2021 budget.
Bike / Ped Shared-use Path	2	Two Rivers Park - 6&24 Connection - Completion of a coherent Ped / Bike Connection from Two Rivers Park to Highway 6 & 24 bus stop, including improved access to northern terminus of the pedestrian bridge on the east side of Devereux.	Working to get CDOT Mainstreets grant in place. Project expected to be complete 2021.
Intersection Improvement	3	8th St. and Midland Ave. Intersection Safety Improvements - Widen the east-side sidewalk along Midland Ave. from Overlin Dr. to 8th Street to full width path, separating it from motor traffic, constrain or eliminate merge lane 8th Street to Midland.	Design process not yet begun.

Intersection Improvement	4	RRFB - I 70 Exit 114 @ Westbound off-ramp	Not yet scheduled.
Intersection Improvement	4	RRFB - 8th St @ 7th St. crosswalk (plus move)	Not yet scheduled.
Intersection Improvement	4	RRFB - Hwy 6 & 24 @ Soccer Field Rd. - bus stop	Not yet scheduled.
Intersection Improvement	4	RRFB - Wulfson Rd. @ Midland Ave.	Not yet scheduled.
Intersection Improvement	4	RRFB - Hwy 6 & 24 @ CR 135 - bus stop	Not yet scheduled.
On Street Bike Facilities	5	10th Street Surface Improvements – Blake Ave to School Street. - on street bicycle facilities, constructed bulb outs, warning lights, and restricted car parking near corners (sight distance).	Not yet scheduled.

2021 TDM Program Priority List				
Type	2015 Rank	2021 Approved Rank	Project / Improvement	Status
Program	n/a	1	TDM Program Development - Continue to develop comprehensive strategy for implementing, monitoring and evaluating a long-term TDM program for Glenwood Springs	Initial steps taken for Downtown TDM program; employee travel survey completed and distributed 6/23/21. Funding for larger program to be explored in 2022 budget process beginning 7/21

Program	n/a	2	Parking Program - Establish Parking Enforcement and Development Lead position to implement and develop MOVE Paid Parking Recommendations / Program / Enforcement enhancements	Parking program development in progress.
Program	n/a	2	Rebranding of Ride GWS - Handoff Hwy 6 & 24 service to RFTA to be incorporated in a re-routed Valley Local service.	MOVE Study final recommendations going to Council October 2021
Program	n/a	2	Bike-Share Program - Establish a seasonal Bike Share program focused on Tourist / Lodging areas in North Glenwood and Downtown	RFTA-led regional bike share expansion study is underway. DRAFT governance model presented to RFTA board July 8.
Program	n/a	2	Seasonal Tourist Tram Circulator Program - Purchase two electric shuttles and begin running free, limited shuttle service along Highway 6 & 24 to downtown during peak summer hours on a trial basis, funded by bus tax, grants, and advertising revenue	Not yet scheduled.