



City of Glenwood Springs Transportation Commission Regular Meeting Agenda

TUESDAY, JANUARY 3, 2023, 7:30 – 9:30 AM

CITY HALL, COUNCIL CHAMBERS

1. Call to Order / Agenda Modification 2 minutes
2. Approval of the December 2022 Meeting Minutes 2 minutes
 - a. *See attachment 2a*
3. Comments from Residents for Items not on the Agenda 5 minutes
4. Transportation Demand Management (TDM) 15 minutes
 - a. TDM outreach calendar and partners meeting(s)
 - b. TDM contractor activities
5. Multimodal Options for a Vibrant Economy (MOVE) 20 minutes
 - a. Integrate MOVE report/recommendations with origin-destination data, traffic volume/speed data, and TDM measures
 - b. Documentation of current bus services, regional and local
 - c. Bus rapid transit, route selection process and calendar
 - i. See final MOVE report at:
 - <https://www.rfta.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/move-final-report-4.pdf>
 - *See attachment 5a*
6. Capital Projects Updates 15 minutes
 - a. Project-specific updates
 - b. Calendar for commission review of project designs (e.g. Blake Avenue reconstruction, 6&24 shared-use path, safe streets project)
7. Capital Projects Priorities Ranking 20 minutes
 - a. Consider adjustments to commission recommendations
 - b. Clarify recommendations regarding West 8th Street
 - c. *See attachment 7a*
8. Safe Streets Project 10 minutes
 - a. Status, updates, opportunities for Commission engagement

9. Comprehensive Plan Update *10 minutes*
 - a. Report from all-commissions review meeting
 - i. *See attachment 9a*
 - b. Additional input from Commission (comments due January 6)
 - c. See draft comprehensive plan at <https://www.cogs.us/VisionGlenwood>
(Particularly Section 4.4 Transportation & Mobility, beginning page 66)

10. Commissioner Comments *15 minutes*

11. Agenda Planning for Next Meeting *5 minutes*

12. Adjourn (Next Meeting February 7, 2023)

City of Glenwood Springs, Transportation Commission
PROPOSED minutes, regular meeting – December 6, 2022

The meeting convened in city council chambers at 7:30am, adjourned at 9:35am.

Participants included:

- Commission members Jon Harman, Steven Smith, John Stephens, Ralph Trapani
- City council member Shelley Kaup
- City staff Steve Boyd, Jessica Bowser

Minutes

November 2022 minutes were approved unanimously.

Citizen comments, follow-up

Question was raised about status of recommendations previously presented to the Transportation Commission by *Take-a-Minute* campaign coordinator Diane Reynolds (south entrance sign/monument; move 8th Street crosswalks; adjust 15th/South Grand intersection). Related extracts from August and September commission minutes include:

(August) **Action:** Commission recommended city pursue installation of sign or monument, intended to define south entrance to city and to reduce motor-traffic speed. Recommendation was approved by vote 5-2 (Ray and Steve opposed).

(September) The commission, council members, and staff referred crosswalks idea to ongoing discussion of alleys reconfiguration plan, and they referred 15th Street concept (and related traffic signal timing) to broader safe streets planning.

Bike-share, proposed memorandum of understanding

On December 1, city council approved the proposed memorandum of understanding (MOU) with Roaring Fork Transportation Authority (RFTA) to investigate expansion of RFTA's bike-share program into Glenwood Springs. Phase one of the bike-share MOU partnership is study and design of details for a potential local program; phase one involves no City of Glenwood Springs funds.

City council will have opportunity to reconsider the bike-share partnership on one-year increments, including future phases that could require city expense. Anticipated schedule, if city council continues to agree, is: 2023 – study and design initial Glenwood Springs system; 2024 – order capital equipment; spring 2025 – install initial system.

Background materials for city council's discussion, and approval, of the MOU included formal recommendations from Transportation Commission (approved by the commission November 1, 2022).

The commission (and city council earlier) discussed sources for city share of bike-share funding, including two basic considerations: a) city expenditures for bike-share should not compromise capital investment in, or maintenance of, local bicycling infrastructure; and b) additional investment in Ride Glenwood Springs is warranted.

One potential transit funding source highlighted is RFTA's First-Mile Last-Mile transit connection fund, which offers fifty percent match for local investment in local transit connections.

Further discussion of that funding source, and of bus system improvements in general, will be on the commission's January agenda.

Transportation demand management (TDM)

Since the commission's November meeting, staff has provided two public presentations on recent analysis of local traffic volume and speed. In anticipation of further discussion at a future meeting, please see the collection of staff presentations at:

<https://civicclerk.blob.core.windows.net/stream/GLENWOODSPRINGSCO/b1621a80-c614-4d18-b78f-5b9d50df65db.pdf?sv=2015-12-11&sr=b&sig=F%2B5xYrk%2FVJ1QpbbcpxLN1IpwqQA3B6ZJmuJ3491TsE%3D&st=2022-12-06T21%3A34%3A33Z&se=2023-12-06T21%3A39%3A33Z&sp=r&rscc=no-cache&rsct=application%2Fpdf>

The information at that link includes origin-destination analysis summary, plus separate traffic volume and speed analysis summary. (Watch this space for an attachment version of these materials.)

Additional discussion focused on degrees of usefulness and shortcomings of recently completed origin-destination analysis. Staff highlighted the importance of combining origin-destination data, traffic-volume/speed data, and crash data for composite picture of traffic patterns and management opportunities.

Commission members, council liaison, and staff reported that city council discussed managed parking at a November 3 work session, and that staff have pursued related details since then, with the following basic commitments:

- purchase license plate reading technology;
- increase enforcement of existing downtown parking restrictions and requirements (including increasing fines for repeat violations);
- improve incentives to hire and retain parking enforcement staff.

Staff reported that TDM outreach has included initial contact with knowledgeable and affected organizations and employers, in anticipation of focus meetings and public meetings beginning in early 2023. Examples of groups to be involved initially include *Hot Springs Pool, Valley View Hospital, Colorado Mountain College, City Market, Downtown Development Authority, Imagine Glenwood, Transportation Commission*.

Multimodal Options for a Vibrant Economy (MOVE)

Discussion of work calendar to review, update, and expand commission recommendations regarding the MOVE Final Report was postponed to the January commission meeting.

Meanwhile, topics highlighted for that discussion included:

- integrate MOVE report and recommendations with other relevant analyses, including origin-destination data, traffic volume and speed data, among others;
- decisions regarding bus rapid transit route should include and build on other TDM measures;
- additional documentation of current bus service is needed, including regional service delays, redundant regional and local bus routes, current expansion work on West Glenwood transit center.

Capital projects

Staff provided updates on several transportation capital projects.

Blake Avenue redesign and reconstruction

Request for proposal is expected soon for design work; public outreach and initial design is expected during 2023; first-phase construction will focus on Blake south of 14th Street.

6&24 bicycle path

Design work and easement negotiations continue; construction is included in 2023 city budget.

6th Street reconstruction

Design review process with *Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT)* will begin December 12. Subsequent steps include negotiations for temporary construction easements; construction schedule has not been set.

27th Street bicycle-pedestrian underpasses

Request for bid proposals is out now, with bids due December 12; construction anticipated spring 2023.

More extended discussion focused on *West 8th Street redesign and reconstruction*. While 90% design is completed for a version of that project, additional factors have delayed final decisions. Those factors include postponed action on confluence redevelopment; pending decisions regarding RFTA bus rapid transit route and station locations; interim needs for traffic flow, bicycle and pedestrian safety; and plans for affordable housing construction near 8th & Midland.

The commission intends to discuss 8th Street at its January meeting, including review of recommendations on capital project priorities.

Comments from commission members

General observations and potential agenda topics for future meetings were highlighted by individual commission members; these included:

- Importance of West 8th Street and need to carefully plan its design to incorporate existing downtown, extensions of downtown activities, and safe traffic movement.
- Traffic congestion as a continuing difficulty, especially for pass-through commuters.
- Chairman's appreciation of good year of success and engagement among commission members, city council, and city staff.

Agenda topics for January 3 meeting

- Managed parking and transportation demand management, outreach plan
- *Multimodal Options for a Vibrant Economy (MOVE)* next steps, possible update of commission recommendations, format for bus rapid transit route selection
- Comprehensive plan update report and discussion
- Capital projects priority recommendations, especially West 8th Street
- Bicycle-pedestrian engineering design standards

Other topics for upcoming meetings

- Safe streets project, design review
- Roaring Fork Transportation Authority (RFTA) first-last mile grant opportunities
- Gutters-maintenance parking proposal (*affirming or updating commission recommendations*)
- Blake Street design review
- 6&24 shared-use path, design review
- Bicycle-pedestrian safety on South Midland sidewalk

The next regular meeting of the Transportation Commission will be **January 3, 2023**, at city hall.

Transportation Commission
collected comments, Multimodal Options for a Vibrant Economy
(MOVE)

December 2022

Summary and general responses – approximately October 2021

This document is an attempt to present in a condensed version some of the essential data and ideas from the Final MOVE report, Appendices A – J.

Appendix A: Corridor History, context, and Understanding

The Existing Conditions section, pp. 4 – 15, are of greatest interest.

Parking, page 5, briefly addresses parking downtown issues, but much more detail is given in Appendix E, so will not be discussed here

Bicycle and Pedestrian Network, pp. 6 – 7.

- Bicycle network, shared with pedestrians, largely supported by regional and local shared-used trails, Rio Grande, Midland, and Atkinson. On-street facilities are on Pitkin and Blake (bike lanes). Some sidewalks are designated for bicycle use, but insufficient for shared pedestrian/bike use.
- Sidewalks are inadequate or non-existent along many residential streets.
- Many gaps exist in bike and pedestrian network which hinder easy access to transit facilities. Lack of bike parking at transit stops limits access to cyclists.
- Numerous previous Plans recommend d completing and improving the sidewalk network in Glenwood Springs to provide continuous, wide, and safe walking routes between residential areas, downtown, and transit services.

Transit Operations, p. 8.

- 3 RFTA routes plus Ride Glenwood serve essentially the same stops on Grand Ave. and Wulfsohn Rd. representing significant duplication of service.
- Only Ride Glenwood serves Hwy 6&24 corridor.
- More analysis is provided in Appendix C.

Traffic Operations, pp 8 – 10

- The SH 82 retiming project has improved north/south travel along the corridor through Glenwood Springs with capacity for future growth.
- Side-street operations may experience congestion that is currently estimated to experience a LOS E or worse especially during the PM peak period.
- Level of Service on 3 intersections on 8th west of Grand were projected based on 2013 study due to covid restrictions.

Safety, pp 11 – 15

- Rear-end crashes are most frequent accident type and especially prevalent on Grand Ave. between 11th and 15th streets.
- Crashes involving pedestrians or bicycles were 4% of total accidents - above national average.
- Accidents involving transit were most frequent at 9th St. just west of Grand Ave.
- 18% of total accidents were injury related, below national average.

Previous Plans, pp 15 – 24

Prior existing plans are listed with summaries. These include plans developed by Glenwood Springs, RFTA, and Garfield County. No attempt is made to summarize these here.

Appendix B – Public Outreach Summary

Lots of process information and replication of outreach materials. Mostly interesting for reading the public comments to sense community response to various options.

Appendix C – Transit Services and Integrated Bus Services Report

Highly Redundant Current Transit Service

- Figure 1 on p. 3, Figure 2 on p. 5, and charts on pp. 6 – 7 all show high level of replication of service by current routes, with only the Ride Glenwood Hwy 6&24 section serving a unique segment of the city.
- Charts on pp. 6 – 7 reflect transit activity, i.e., both boarding and departures from buses at each location, and particularly at 27th will reflect a transfer from one bus to another as two activities.

Transit Service Analysis Level 2 Screening

- Pp. 8 – 17 provide maps, descriptions and cost analysis for BRT extension to 3 downtown transit centers and to West Glenwood PNR via these centers.
- Chart on p. 17 gives estimated Operations and Maintenance (O&M) cost increase above current levels for each option. Of note, O&M cost increases nearly the same for Rio Grande and Grand Ave. options for extension to West Glenwood PNR. Costs of new Transit Center, if built, or Rio Grande bus lanes not included in estimates.
- It is not stated if current BRT service to West Glenwood PNR is factored into the estimates of incremental cost increases. In addition, calculations in Appendix C for incremental cost increases are incorrect: in only one instance did it appear that current costs were subtracted from anticipated costs. Figures in chart on p. 17 and p. 49 appear to be correct.

Integrated Bus Service Concepts with BRT

- This section is best understood by looking at proposed bus route concepts with BRT extension to downtown and to West Glenwood PNR, pp 20 -25.

- Of particular interest, if BRT is extended, Hogback route is projected to end at either West Glenwood or a downtown transit center. This offers less redundant service on Grand Ave. the opportunity for cost savings on the route and improved service in the Rifle – West Glenwood corridor.
- Each proposed concept has strengths and weaknesses and should not be viewed as either/or set choices. Many other options exist.

Pre-BRT Extension Transit Optimization Concepts

Offers a number of concept options to consider prior to BRT extension. These should be evaluated for their viability. Most of these appear to minor tweaks to Ride Glenwood service with RFTA routes remaining intact as currently provided. Reduced number of stops on Grand Ave. were suggested for BRT and Hogback routes traveling from West Glenwood.

Appendix H – MOVE concept Designs, Cost Estimates, and BRT Implementation

I have skipped to Appendix H as it more logically follows the previous discussion of BRT Extension routes. This section provides detailed drawings of typical sections of BRT routes on Grand Ave. and Rio Grand Corridor. These drawings show proposed changes to existing infrastructure and allow a visualization of the changes proposed.

Grand Ave. Route:

- Sheets 1 & 2: Items of note include under-highway access beneath SH 82 and 27th St. – construction scheduled for 2022 – and extension of dedicated NB bus lane from 27th to 23rd St. with bus priority signalization at 23rd. Widened sidewalks on east side of SH 82.
 - 27th underpass is a major safety improvement for pedestrians and cyclists as well as improving traffic flow by limiting conflicts with pedestrians and cyclists.
 - Extending bus lane with signal priority at 23rd should improve bus travel and may actually improve general traffic flow by allowing buses to clear intersection before other traffic, minimizing delays later on Grand Ave.
- Sheets 3 & 4: Widened sidewalks both sides of Grand Ave. Bus stop at 20th for local buses only.
- Sheet 5, 6 & 7: BRT stops at 14th, create dedicated bus lane from 13th to 9th or 8th depending on BRT route alignment. Dedicated bus lane removes parking, all mature trees, and bulb-outs on both sides of Grand. Possible BRT stops on Grand at 9th st. Continued widened ADA compliant sidewalks both sides of Grand Ave.
 - Consider creating pull-off bus stops at 14th, potential priority signal for NB buses
 - If BRT NB turns left at 9th, consider moving BRT stop onto 9th west of Grand Ave, eliminating parking on north side of 9th between Grand and Colorado. Local buses continuing north on Grand Ave. to north Glenwood continue to use existing bus stop.
 - Reject dedicated bus lanes between 8th and 13th streets. These lanes will have major negative impact on the character of this

critical portion of town while providing minimal improvement in BRT travel time. Any time saved may well be lost due to longer crossing time for pedestrians as well as increased difficulty in merging with traffic to make left turn at 9th. Priority signal at 14th NB would allow bus to rapidly move into left lane for turn at 9th.

Rio Grande Configuration:

- Sheet 1: Shows proposed option for BRT to cross SH 82 at 27th, continue to round-about at S. Grand, use S. Grand to connect at 23rd to dedicated busway along Rio Grande ROW. No indication here of how multiuse trail would interface with new busway and 23rd St.
- Sheets 2-5: Busway continues along Rio Grande ROW with possible station at GSHS. Some realignment so current trail shown.
 - Fencing or railing shown on east side of Busway with crossings at old Safeway, Coach Miller Dr., Riverside Dr., and GSES. No railing of fencing shown between busway and current multipurpose trail.
- Sheet 6: Shows configuration of busway with transit station on RFTA property and intersection with 8th St.
 - This intersection will require some realignment of 8th with left turn lane from 8th into busway. Transit priority signal is anticipated here. Obviously, potential conflict with flow of regular vehicular traffic on heavily travelled portal to downtown.
- Sheets 7&8: Show alternatives for SH 82 and 23rd St. with busway on Rio Grande. Both require left turn from SH 82 for NB BRT buses. One or both require closing S. Grand at 23rd.
 - Unclear how signalization would be done for left turn. Potential for negatively impacting traffic flow on SH 82.
 - Closing of S. Grand at SH 82 will have effect of pushing existing traffic onto 27th and SH 82 intersection. This effect needs to be considered both for SH 82 traffic flow and for impact on BRT, especially turns at 27th and SH 82.

Cost Estimates:

Grand Ave. Configuration: \$3,300,000 – 3,600,000

Rio Grande Busway: 17,682,000 (p 48 of 61 on pdf)

With Supplemental Costs: 30,628,000 (p. 61/61 on pdf)

(includes fencing, landscape improvements, optional utilities work,

etc.)

Appendix G: BRT Extension Report

This Report repeats much of the information presented previously in other Appendices. Items I found of particular interest are provided below.

1. “The City and RFTA also decided that a downtown transit center was not desirable, and that inline BRT stations would better serve the community. Consequently, they requested evaluation of BRT connections to the West

Glenwood Springs park-and-ride to facilitate bus connections via 8th/Midland and via US 6 as shown in the map below.” (p. 33)

2. Conceptual presentations of how Grand Ave. and Rio Grande options would appear once constructed. (pp. 36 – 45)
 - a. Drawings of dedicated bus lane show mature trees in one drawing and no trees in another. My understanding from earlier appendices is that trees would be removed to make room for the bus lanes in 8th – 13th section. This creates a starkly different environment than currently exists.
 - b. Drawing of Rio Grande corridor shows rail dividing bus and multimodal trail. It is unclear whether this rail is included in basic cost estimates of busway or is in the Supplemental Costs estimates discussed previously.

3. Screening Results Summary (p. 50)

“The Level 2 screening, with a finer grain evaluation using three times as many criteria as Level 1, draws the following conclusion:

- With equal weighting of all criteria, either the Grand Avenue or the Rio Grande Corridor alignment would provide a good option for the BRT extension.
- However, despite its higher construction cost, the Rio Grande Corridor would provide significantly more benefits in terms of better travel time and reliability, lower service hours and O&M costs, and higher ridership.
- Extending the BRT service to the West Glenwood Springs park-n-ride will allow future extensions to other communities along the I-70 corridor as needed.”

The third statement is critical in evaluating any alternative. A primary objective of any extension of BRT service has to heavily weigh the extent that it may diminish the growth of traffic into and through Glenwood. Much, though not all, of this growth is driven by commuter traffic originating west of Glenwood. A broad array of TDM measures will undoubtedly need to be implemented, including expansion of transit service.

The second summary statement is open to considerable question. Data presented in Appendix C , Table 5, p. 15, shows less than a 2-minute difference in travel time between Grand Ave. and Rio Grande options per trip. Table 7 on p. 17 shows a difference in total annual O&M costs of \$16,000 between the two options. I have been unable to find any estimate of ridership for presented options in any MOVE documents. It is difficult to understand how the Rio Grande option running on the western edge of potential ridership and employment area would be more attractive to riders than the Grand Ave. option running through the heart of the ridership area and closer to employment centers.

Integrated Bus Service Final Report

The Final Report largely repeats information provided in Appendix C, summary provided above. The Final Report does provide additional alternatives for integration of the 3 RFTA routes and Ride Glenwood. Discussion and drawings of possible integration plans are provided on pp. 20 – 35. Despite there having been public discussion of possible extension of the Valley Local onto Hwy 6&24 in North Glenwood, this was not addressed in any of the alternatives presented. All of the options presented are simply concepts and should not be considered final solutions. All options also are contingent on expansion of regular BRT service to West Glenwood PNR. The summary statement is copied below.

Summary and Next Steps

“ All four routes currently operating in Glenwood Springs provide service on Grand Avenue. Due to this redundant service on Grand Avenue, and building demand for the direct connection between the 27th Street P&R and the West Glenwood P&R, RFTA along with the City have been considering various BRT alignment extension options. This report focuses on service specifics for the BRT alternatives and provides concepts of how various bus services would integrate after BRT is extended. In addition to improving service on Grand Avenue, especially in the Downtown region, public feedback and earlier studies have suggested a need for service in North Glenwood areas, as well as service improvements to existing service such that there are overall more connections, higher frequency. A need for improved first and last mile connections and better access to South Glenwood also was suggested. Analysis results from travel time estimates, operating statistics including annual hours, miles, and peak buses, as well as the O&M Costs, were presented. Elements of these statistics and costs were used as evaluation criteria for Level 2 analysis. (The resulting Level 2 evaluation matrix is provided for reference in Appendix D.) Integrated bus concepts were developed to take advantage of connecting with a potential new transit center, while providing connections to areas in North and South Glenwood that are underserved currently. These concepts would require modification if a new transit center is not pursued, to instead ensure route connections at West Glenwood PNR. Finally, concepts were presented to optimize transit service before BRT service is extended. Concepts focus on routing in North Glenwood, introducing skip stops for BRT and Hogback routes along Grand Avenue, a possible deviation on Blake Avenue, and potential markets for alternate service delivery. Next steps include the following:

- Consider pre-BRT extension optimization concepts, including the viability of an in-line stop at West Glenwood PNR and modification of service to better penetrate North Glenwood.
- Consider a pilot introducing skip-stop service on BRT and Hogback routes to assess whether these changes lead to improved operations and safety along Grand Avenue, and whether these improvements offset any potential loss in rider convenience/ridership.
- Review/interview other agencies that have initiated alternate service delivery to consider whether to pursue in Glenwood Springs.
- Pursue potential funding for alternate service delivery pilot program

Appendix D: Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements

This section provides fairly detailed, phased improvements in pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure. Most of these improvements are independent of the BRT Extension project and are designed to significantly improve both convenience and safety of walking and cycling in Glenwood thereby increasing active transportation and reducing vehicular congestion.

This section is short and specific in its recommendations, so will not be summarized here. Numerous possible funding sources are suggested and the city should aggressively pursue funding for suggested infrastructure, as well as for similar projects in areas of the city not covered by the MOVE study.

I suggest that in evaluating future walking and cycling infrastructure the city consider the impact of rapidly growing new modes of personal transportation including e-bikes and electric scooters. These are rapidly advancing from last-mile options to primary mobility options that can largely replace vehicles for a majority of personal trips within town and easily as far as Carbondale.

Accommodation for these options does require planning for wide adoption.

Appendix E: MOVE Parking Final Report

As the downtown parking issue is currently receiving significant attention from the city and the community, I am not going to address it at this point. I would, however, highlight 3 RFTA related issues in the report.

- Parking at 27th St. station is poorly regulated, extremely inadequate for BRT demand, and expansion is a high priority.
- West Glenwood PNR is very under-utilized, never more than 1/3 full. (As a resident of West Glenwood, I almost never use the PNR there as BRT service is inconsistent, creates blocks to using the service from this location.)
- While not addressed in the MOVE document, the community uses parking at West Glenwood Mall by the bus stop more frequently than the official PNR lot. This probably reflects use by riders of Ride Glenwood commuting into downtown. This pattern potentially is of benefit to the Mall as it redevelops by bring customers to the Mall. The lack of bicycle parking at this location needs to be addressed.

Pedestrian and bicycle components – November 4, 2021

Observations and responses to bicycle and pedestrian assessments and recommendations in the MOVE final report (August 2021) and in accompanying Appendix D – *Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements Plan* (April 2021)

General

• In general, the observations and recommendations for bicycle and pedestrian travel, variously included in the report and appendix, are accurate and well described. Some proposed implementation details need refinement.

- Success of bicycle and pedestrian improvements will be affected by, and should be integrated with, details presented in other MOVE report categories, particularly traffic/safety, transit, and BRT alignment.

Existing conditions

- Both the report and the appendix accurately highlight inadequacies at some locations in the existing Glenwood Springs walking and bicycling infrastructure network, including inadequate or non-existing sidewalks (as highlighted in previous studies), bicycle-pedestrian network gaps, need for more bicycle parking.
- The documents also highlight successful and popular routes that generally are functioning well, including (including multi-use Rio Grande, West Midland, and Atkinson trails, and pavement-marked bicycle lanes).

Infrastructure improvements

- Bicycle-pedestrian improvement recommendations are helpfully organized in three phases, with increasing levels of cost and complexity.
- That phased outline includes a useful list of needed improvements, but the list a) is not complete, and b) needs to be better integrated with the city's transportation capital projects priority rankings.
- Design details presented for some improvements need to be further refined and not necessarily implemented as described—configurations for east-west bicycle routes e.g.
- Most of the improvements listed are needed, and can be implemented, independent of decisions or work on a BRT extension. Prioritized work on such improvements should begin without delay.
- Changes in municipal design standards are needed (minimum widths for sidewalks and multiple-use paths, crosswalk configurations, buffers from roadways, accommodations for electric-assist bicycles e.g.)

BRT route selection

- The selection of a preferred or final route for bus rapid transit (BRT) extension must be made very carefully in general, and with particular attention to potential effects (good and bad) on bicycle and pedestrian travel (see p. 53).

Responsibilities, implementation

- Appendix D is entitled a plan but does not delegate or otherwise clarify responsibility for funding and implementing that plan, nor does it include a recommended or anticipated calendar for implementation.
- List of potential funding sources is helpful. The city should aggressively pursue funding for recommended multimodal improvements and incentives.

City of Glenwood Springs Transportation Commission
Recommendation: Long Range Transportation Plan annual review

unanimously approved by Transportation Commission July 5, 2022

Transportation Commission recommends Glenwood Springs City Council approve the following priority rankings, and narrative clarifications, for inclusion in the city's 2023 budget documents:

Large projects

- #1 – south bridge
- #2 – 27th Street/Glen Avenue bicycle-pedestrian underpasses
complete installation in 2023
- #3 – 6&24 shared-use path reconstruction
full reconstruction of functional bicycle-pedestrian path from Donegan to

Linden

- #4 – 6th Street reconstruction (Olive to Maple)
include on-street and separated bicycle facilities; reconfigure/reconstruct bicycle-pedestrian crossing at Laurel Avenue
- #5 – 8th Street reconstruction (Pitkin to river bridge)
widen two lanes; center median; two 10'-wide shared use paths

Small projects

- #1 – 8th&Midland safety improvements
widen east-side sidewalk along Midland Avenue, Oberlin Drive to 8th Street, to full-width path; evaluate reconfiguration of merge lane to improve pedestrian safety and access
- #2 – rapid flashing beacons (four locations)
I-70 exit 114 westbound off-ramp; 8th @ 7th crosswalk; Highway 6&24 @ Soccer Field Road – bus stop; Wulfsohn Road @ West Midland; Highway 6&24 @ CR135 – bus stop
- #3 – 12th Street (Riverside) reconstruction/repaving
remove metal bars parallel to east edge of River Trail; remove railroad rails and worn crossing pads; repair or replace damaged pavement, full length of street between trail and Pitkin Avenue
- #4 – 10th Street school-access safety improvements
on-street bicycle facilities; constructed bulb-outs; warning lights; reduced car parking near corners (sight distance)

Policies and narrative

Include updated cost estimates in budget documents for all projects, large and small.

Name all ranked projects, large and small, in city budget documents.

Continue programmatic evaluation and work on transportation programs and services, including: Transportation Demand Management; parking management; rebranding Ride Glenwood Springs; bike-share network; seasonal tourist circulator.

What has changed in the plan since the last Steering Committee meeting?

1. Mobile Homes – Lack of specificity on Mobile Homes as natural affordable housing
 - a. Updated 5.7.B Action to include Mobile Homes (page 107)
2. **Transportation, Jobs, Housing – Lack of connection on how transportation impacts and related to jobs and housing**
 - a. **Updated Transportation background (page 66) – Added paragraph: “The relationship between Glenwood’s transportation networks, regional housing and economic systems are intertwined and have interrelated impacts. Given the constraints on transportation corridors and the regional relationships of job centers and housing, Glenwood should support economic development that incentivizes competitive and diverse commerce, industries and services that balances in-town travel and regional travel patterns.”**
3. **Transportation – Strengthen GWS as Leaders in Regionalism**
 - a. **Updated Develop a regional traffic model and regional transportation master plan (page 71) – Added sentence: “The City of Glenwood should take a proactive leadership role in regional transportation planning and problem solving to benefit goals of Glenwood such as safety and quality of life.”**
4. Areas of Change –Missing areas of change
 - a. Added 6th Street, 1331 Blake Avenue as “Other Opportunities” (page 47)
 - b. Expanded City Market Secondary Center (page 45)
5. **South Bridge – Missing entirely**
 - a. **Created South Bridge Strategy (page 69) – Added section: “South Bridge - The South Bridge project would provide a critical second access between State Highway 82 and the western side of the Roaring Fork River in the south Glenwood Springs area. This new route would improve emergency evacuation, emergency service access, and affect local land use access. As of this comprehensive plan update, the South Bridge project is at a 90% design level. This design includes a tunnel underneath the runway of the Glenwood Springs Municipal Airport.**

Cost benefit analysis modeling using fire rates of spread from fires that occurred in the state during 2020 has shown that having the bridge in place substantially reduces loss of life in the southern corridor of the city. The South Bridge project will reduce out of direction travel and associated greenhouse gas release for approximately 1,700 residents that commute daily from the southern corridor to 27th Street Bridge and then south on SH 82.

South Bridge will create another north south route through Glenwood Springs for travelers moving through Glenwood to western Garfield County. Traffic calming has been added to the project to reduce speeds across the project area. However, due to current congestion on SH 82 it is anticipated that the South Bridge project will relieve some of the congestion that occurs on SH 82. The completion of South Bridge would be a game changer for Glenwood Springs. Given the far reaching effects that the project could have on Glenwood Springs and beyond, completing a sub area plan contemporaneously with the construction of South Bridge that acknowledges impacts to transportation, economy, land use and housing would be important to appropriately respond and/or prepare for its substantial changes to conditions in Glenwood Springs.”

- 6. Move Study – Concern to focus actions on implementation without full adoption**
 - a. Deleted action 4.1.B. “Advance the recommendations of the MOVE Study while preserving the River Trail” as related to Move Study (page 104)**
7. Natural Resources - Partnering to protect federal lands against mining and limestone quarry
 - a. Updated the Participate In Regional Planning Efforts And Work Regionally To Protect Natural Resources strategy (page 90)