



City of Glenwood Springs Transportation Commission

February 2022 Commission Regular Meeting Agenda

Tuesday, February 1, 2022, 7:30 – 9:30 am

**Zoom Meeting**

Please click the link below to join the webinar:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84856942504>

Or One tap mobile :

US: +16699006833,,84856942504# or +12532158782,,84856942504#

Or Telephone:

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

US: +1 669 900 6833 or +1 253 215 8782 or +1 346 248 7799 or +1 929 205 6099 or +1 301 715 8592 or +1 312 626 6799

Webinar ID: 848 5694 2504

International numbers available: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84856942504>

- I. Call to Order.
- II. Approval of the January, 2022 Meeting Minutes. (5 min.)
- III. Comments from residents appearing for items not on the agenda
- IV. City Council /Commissions work meeting update
- V. TDM Grant update
- VI. MOVE Pedestrian Bicycle Recommendations (review - already complete)
- VII. Small Capital Projects Implementation Protocols
- VIII. Managed Parking Update
- IX. Confluence Planning Update
- X. Agenda Planning for Next Meeting. (5 min.)

**City of Glenwood Springs, Transportation Commission**  
**DRAFT Minutes, regular meeting – January 4, 2022**

The meeting convened (via *Zoom*) at 7:30am and adjourned at 9:40am.

**Participants** included:

Commission members: Sandy Lowell, Steve Smith, John Stephens, Ralph Trapani

City council members Ingrid Wussow, Shelley Kaup

City staff: Linda DuPriest, Debra Figueroa, Terri Partch

Guest: Betsy Suerth

**Minutes**

Proposed minutes for December 7, 2021 meeting were approved unanimously as final.

**Managed parking/paid parking**

In anticipation of city council consideration of options for downtown managed parking (*on council agenda January 6*), the commission discussed potential recommendations. Discussion and update points included:

- managed/paid parking program should include, in addition to city policies and enforcement, participation by large employers
- availability of free parking promotes driving
- among other parking initiatives, *Roaring Fork Transportation Authority* (RFTA) has purchased property at northwest corner, Glen Avenue and 27<sup>th</sup>, for additional commuter parking.

The commission unanimously endorsed “program 2” in staff report for January 6 council agenda:

- increase enforcement of existing time and location limits for parking downtown
- employ license-plate recognition technology and other new methods to support enforcement
- continue residential parking permits within enforcement area
- implement paid parking in downtown area
- employ graduated parking-fees, escalating ticket penalties, and other incentives for compliance (*e.g.* free parking first half hour, increased fines for repeat violations)
- provide and publicize longer-term free parking at old sewer plant lot (emphasize use by downtown employees)
- consider providing RFTA transit passes, free or discount parking for car-pools, and other incentives and assistance for employees

**Bike-share expansion**

The commission discussed emerging RFTA proposal, and accompanying consultant analyses, for expanding bike-share network and facilities into Glenwood Springs.

Linda reported that final details of total cost and municipal cost proportion are not yet complete. Consultant's preliminary recommendations include three phases of implementation in Glenwood Springs, with first phase capital cost estimate approximately \$680,000. A portion of that (perhaps 85%) would be paid by RFTA, costs and funding sources for subsequent phases not yet specified.

More detailed consultant presentation and RFTA board discussion/decisions is anticipated at March 10 RFTA board meeting. In anticipation, the commission approved recommendations for consideration by city council and relay through city's delegates to RFTA board. Detailed recommendations are in separate document, generally summarized as:

- clarify potential cost to city if bike-share is expanded
- clarify bike-share system proposed for Glenwood Springs—size and station locations
- investment in local bicycling infrastructure should be first priority for use of city funding, before investing in bike-share system
- consider alternatives (interim or permanent) to bike-share infrastructure, including partnerships with lodging, large employers, bicycle shops, among others
- use more safety-visible color for bike-share bicycles, if deployed in Glenwood Springs.

### **City boards and commissions, redesign and purposes**

City council will meet with delegates from all boards and commissions on January 27. Each commission is to submit initial recommendations by January 20; the commission will submit a separate document for this purpose. Meanwhile, in response to questionnaire distributed by city council, the commission agreed to recommend:

- priority topics for 2022 are transportation demand management and comprehensive review of city's long range transportation plan (including ranking of large and small capital projects)
- transportation commission should continue to meet monthly
- documented statements of purpose for transportation commission (city charter, internal commission mission statement) should replace the term "investigate" with more collaborative term (*e.g.* explore, assess, research)
- commission should facilitate citizen engagement on transportation issues and proposals
- mechanics and protocols for submitting commission recommendations should be clarified.

### **Transportation demand management/traffic volume projections**

Terri presented and explained calculations and data used to project motor-traffic increases in and through Glenwood Springs, as part of *Multi-model Options for a Vibrant Economy (MOVE)* study. Sources include 2010 *Corridor Optimization Study*, Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) modeling, and OTIS real-time traffic-counts history.

Resulting rates of traffic-volume increase range from .7% to 2.8% per year. Projections do not consider potential effects of transportation demand management (TDM).

Discussion focused on methods for projecting and enshrining goals for TDM, intended to reduce traffic volumes, or at least reduce rate of growth in traffic volumes. Such goals could be set by city council relative to local traffic. Regional traffic goals (Highway 82) would need to involve other entities and authorities, including CDOT, federal transportation agencies, other local governments, and RFTA.

Access to certain programs and funding sources for TDM may require establishment of metropolitan planning organization (MPO) or similar inter-governmental entity; implementation of local TDM measures might be employed within existing governance structures and authorities.

### **MOVE pedestrian-bicycle improvements**

Discussion of commission analysis and recommendations regarding (MOVE), Appendix D *Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements Plan*, was postponed until February 1 commission meeting.

### **Small capital projects**

Discussion of mechanics for implementing small capital projects—prioritization, funding, installation—was postponed until February 1 commission meeting.

### **Agenda topics for February commission meeting**

- Update from city council/commissions work meeting
- TDM grant-request update, first steps of implementation
- MOVE pedestrian-bicycle recommendations (*in anticipation of city council work session and regular meeting, tentatively scheduled February 3 and 17*)
- Small capital projects implementation protocols

### **Other next steps, potential future agenda topics**

#### *Current, continuing topics*

- Aspen tour, managed parking & TDM
- 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

#### *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 **February 1, 2022, 7:30am.**

**MOVE study, Appendix D, *Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements Plan*  
analysis, Bicycle-Pedestrian Subcommittee report (updated)**

August 2, 2021

*for consideration at February 1 Transportation Commission meeting*

**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?