



# **Task 5 Technical Memorandum Coalition Meetings and Develop Guidelines**

**Draft**

December 2008





## Table of Contents

Section	Page
Introduction.....	3
1.0 Public Education Strategy.....	4
2.0 Development of Guidelines and Criteria .....	7
2.1 Corridor-Wide Criteria.....	9
2.2 Regional Criteria (County Level) .....	10
2.3 Site-Specific Criteria.....	11

### Attachments

County Working Group Round 3 Meeting Summaries



## **Introduction**

This technical memorandum summarizes the public education strategy for the project and details the results of the process with the I-70 Coalition jurisdictions to develop guidelines and criteria for siting regional transit station locations. The information from this task feeds into the Task 8 Station Site Identification Technical Memorandum, where the criteria developed herein are applied and results presented.



## 1.0 Public Education Strategy

This Land Use Transit Study was developed, in part, by the need to establish a dialogue among stakeholder agencies regarding a multi-modal transportation solution and supportive land use patterns for the I-70 Corridor. To accomplish this dialogue the study team established a collaborative forum for decision-making through the development of County Working Groups where the issues related to transit supportive land use and station locations were discussed and assessed. Through the process, stakeholders participated in issues identification, information sharing and resolution practices which are the key elements of any ongoing education strategy. This information sharing and idea generation should be an ongoing effort for the participating communities once this study concludes. Several avenues for this ongoing public education and agency involvement are identified below.

### Communication Approach

The public education strategy for the I-70 corridor regarding future transit operations and land use development is rooted in the open and collaborative process with stakeholder agencies established in this project. The planning discussions held through this study process are the ground work for future public education about advanced guideway system (AGS) operations, station location requirements and land use development patterns. This planning process is intended to initiate those conversations, broaden the corridor understanding of transit and land use decision-making parameters, and strengthen each community's ability to navigate it's own future for transit mobility. After this study concludes, it will be the role of each municipal or county agency to assimilate the information discussed through this process and share that with the public within its community. Presentation materials, reports and other informational tools developed during this process will be available through the I-70 Coalition website so that each agency can make it available at its community forums. The continued input from the public will be a significant part of shaping station sites in the future.

### County Working Groups

The County Working Groups were established as a way of organizing the many players in this corridor and providing a regional forum for group communication and decision-making. The Working Groups allowed representatives of the county, municipal and local organizations to stay updated on overall project progress and provide direct input to the desired role of transit and land use within the communities, the consideration of potential station locations, the development and application of evaluation criteria, and the eventual prioritizing of possible station locations and land use tools supportive of those decisions. Members of each group, along with the consultant team, shared experiences and expertise about station planning processes, land use considerations, and community visions for future character and mobility options.

The staff and elected officials involved in the County Working Groups will need to establish and maintain a dialogue with their communities, bringing forward an understanding of the process followed by this study and the results of that coordination.



## **I-70 Coalition Leadership and Participation**

The majority of the ongoing public education strategy for future AGS considerations will come through the I-70 Coalition and the Colorado Department of Transportation's (CDOT's) ongoing I-70 Mountain Corridor Coordinated Public Relations Plan. It will be important to continue the momentum established during this planning process, and maintain an increased communication level with local agency staff and their communities. The future forums for collaboration and information gathering will be the Coalition, CDOT's Public Information team for the corridor, and the I-70 Project Leadership Teams as they relate to individual corridor projects.

It will be imperative that the Coalition act, not only as collector of current I-70 information, but as a forum for discussion and input by participating agencies. The ability of the multitude of agencies to stay informed and involved rests in identifying a central location for that activity. The I-70 Coalition represents the broadest participation of agencies in or adjacent to the corridor and is a good conduit to this ongoing coordination.

The Coalition and member agencies in the corridor should follow closely the Final I-70 Mountain Corridor Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) that will document the Preferred Alternative for the corridor—a multi-modal solution including non-infrastructure components, a commitment to evaluation and implementation of an AGS, and highway improvements. This PEIS is scheduled for release and public hearings in late 2009 and early 2010, with a Record of Decision to be issued by the Federal Highway Administration shortly thereafter.

The Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS) process being developed through CDOT and eventually implemented on corridor projects will provide effective guidance, integration and coordination for interrelated CDOT studies both through its decision-making process, and its Guidance Manual. The principles contained in this process will help to ensure local agency participation in corridor projects, and public input to project outcomes. This education and participation element will take place project by project along the corridor.

It is also important that over the next eight months or more, that the Coalition and its participating agencies continue to coordinate with the Rocky Mountain Rail Authority (RMRA) study, examining whether inter-city high speed rail is technically, financially and economically feasible for I-70. The outcome of this study will help determine whether high speed rail is feasible, whether the corridor is eligible for potential designation as a High-Speed Rail Corridor with specially targeted federal funding, and where station locations may make sense based on technical considerations. The RMRA study is to give strong consideration to the community interests for station locations identified during the Coalition's Land Use Transit Study, however, the technical considerations for alignment may need to be reconciled with the results of this study. It will be important to clarify the components of each study for the public and the resulting outcomes. It will also be critical to identify a path for decision making and information going forward.

Finally, CDOT will be responsible for keeping elected officials engaged and opinion leaders up to date through the development of the FEIS. CDOT's government relations staff will provide



updates on the corridor throughout the state. But, most importantly, elected officials will play a significant role in passing information on to constituents and stakeholders. Municipal and agency staff will in turn, want to keep local community members updated on these corridor issues and projects. The I-70 Mountain Corridor website will be essential to the dissemination of new and updated information to staff and the public.



## 2.0 Development of Guidelines and Criteria

Development of guidelines and criteria is a critical step for siting potential transit station locations along the I-70 corridor. The purpose of the criteria is to provide a list of evaluation factors that communities can use to identify and screen potential locations within their communities in a manner that is consistent with other communities in the I-70 corridor. Developing criteria before station locations are chosen provides a fair and uniform set of standards for which each potential location can be evaluated, as well as compared to other locations. The criteria will be used to identify potential locations, compare locations to each other, and assist local jurisdictions prioritize key locations for regional transit stations.

The study process was focused on developing community based recommendations for “trunkline” or regional transit stations. However, input on all levels of transit stations was considered with the variation that some transit stations will be regional in nature while others might be more local in nature.

As a starting point, the land use project team brought together an initial list of criteria from industry standards and previous projects, the I-70 Coalition Transit Criteria, and the I-70 CSS project. Relevant criteria from these sources related to station and geographic siting were summarized and organized into corridor-wide, regional (county-wide) and site-specific categories to address a wide range of needs. Corridor-wide criteria cover the entire I-70 corridor and provide an overall framework for station siting that supports a successful regional transit system. Regional or county-wide criteria address more localized needs within a county. Site-specific criteria were assembled to help towns and resorts evaluate specific parcels within their boundaries that best meets their values.

The initial list of criteria was then discussed with each of the five county working groups to obtain input and refine the list. The following discussion details the sources of information used to develop the list of station siting criteria.

### **Transit Industry Standards**

Development of a regional transit system through the mountainous terrain and historic context of the towns and resorts along the I-70 corridor requires a unique set of standards. However, there are some basic requirements that all technologies must consider to operate successfully. For example, locations where stations can be sited are strongly encouraged to have less than 1% grade and space for a tangent (straight) section of track for the length of the platform. Additionally, while not yet determined, consideration must be given to locations that will generate the greatest number of riders. There must also be enough land for supporting infrastructure such as passenger and freight accommodations, access roads, bus pickup and drop-offs, and water and sewer hookups. Finally, past experience with recognizing community values, such as connections to employment centers, strengthening desired development patterns and enhancing connections to other modes of travel provided additional criteria for working groups to consider.



## **I-70 Coalition Transit Criteria**

The I-70 Coalition developed corridor-wide transit criteria that Coalition members believed were important for a regional transit system to meet. The criteria cover a wide range of topics related to a transit system, from alignment to technology considerations. Because of this range, not all criteria are applicable to station siting, but all were considered nonetheless. The I-70 Coalition Transit Criteria include:

- Noise (external) – less than highway noise levels.
- Elevated – more than just for short spans like bridges.
- Weight – refers to minimum/maximum passenger and light freight carrying capacity.
- Travel Time (express) – at least as fast as unimpeded vehicle travel on highway.
- Grade – accommodate demand between Denver and Glenwood Springs without significant degradation of speed and efficiency.
- Safety – grade separated crossings and weather considerations.
- Weather – all weather.
- Wind – withstand wind shear in excess of extreme alpine wind storms.
- Scalability – expansion of alignments and carrying capacity over time and peak/off-peak.
- Passenger Comfort and Safety – be able to have coffee and work on laptop, accessible and seating for all passengers, and acceleration considerations.
- Carry “Stuff” – bring luggage/outdoor gear and minimize station boarding times.
- Light Freight Compatibility – consumer freight off hours.
- Energy Efficiency – incorporates green technology for power sources.
- Growth – ability to accommodate 50 years of growth in demand.
- Accommodate express and local traffic simultaneously.
- Tunneling Considerations – if needed.
- Adaptable to future technological developments.
- Reliability – consistent, predictable travel times in all weather conditions.
- Frequency – headway times capable of addressing peak period demands.
- Operational efficiencies and low maintenance costs.
- Equipment Design Flexibility – accommodate multiple needs for passengers and freight.
- Apply context sensitive solutions (CSS) principles in construction and operations.





## **Context Sensitive Solutions Core Values**

The I-70 CSS project is a process that assists in the integration and coordination among corridor studies, processes and projects along the corridor. The I-70 CSS process has developed a context statement and set of core values that to give guidance to current and future plans, such as this transit land use study. The following CSS core values were considered during the development of station siting criteria:

- Sustainability
- Decision Making
- Safety
- Healthy Environment
- Historic Context
- Communities
- Mobility and Accessibility
- Aesthetics

## **County Working Group Input**

During July 2008, the third round of meetings with the county working groups from Jefferson, Clear Creek, Summit, Eagle, and Garfield Counties were held. The purpose of these meetings was to present and discuss the list of station siting criteria to be applied to potential station locations as recommended by each group. Working group members provided key insight to criteria important to their communities such as whether a location has community support, minimizing impacts to historic properties, providing opportunities for renewable/alternative energy and maintaining key view sheds. Minutes from these meetings are attached at the end of this memorandum.

## **2.1 Corridor-Wide Criteria**

Corridor-wide criteria cover the entire I-70 corridor and provide the overall framework for station siting. These criteria are broad in nature and were grouped into two categories: communities and mobility/accessibility. Corridor-wide criteria agreed to by the county working groups are listed in **Table 1**.



**Table 1: Corridor-Wide Criteria for Potential Station Locations**

Category	Criteria
<b>Communities</b>	Serves a role on the I-70 corridor, i.e. resort destination, work force connection, residential
	Has community support
<b>Mobility and Accessibility</b>	Supports express travel time through the corridor
	Accommodates local and express service simultaneously
	Enhances connections to resort areas
	Close proximity to resorts, employment centers, activity centers or residential centers
	Maximizes connections to local/regional transit system
	Meets transit ridership

## 2.2 Regional Criteria (County Level)

Regional criteria address transit station needs at the county level and provide a basis for comparing multiple locations within a county, such as at towns or resorts. These criteria are more detailed in nature and were grouped into six categories: safety, healthy environment, historic context, communities, mobility/ accessibility and aesthetics. Regional criteria agreed to by the county working groups are listed in **Table 2**.



**Table 2: Regional Criteria for Potential Station Locations**

Category	Criteria
<b>Safety</b>	Platform can be accommodated on a 1% grade or less
	Site can accommodate tangent track for the length of the platform
<b>Healthy Environment</b>	Noise should be less than highway noise
<b>Historic Context</b>	Preserves historic character and scale
<b>Communities</b>	Synergizes with or is integrated with future local land uses
	Protects community character or preserves key characteristics
	Contributes to local “values” about community
	Strengthens desired development patterns in community
	Has potential availability of land
	Increases future economic opportunities
	Opportunity for affordable housing
	Allows for growth potential
	Minimizes number of parcels impacted
	Provides joint development opportunities
	Serves a role on the I-70 corridor, i.e. resort destination, work force connection, residential
Has community support	
<b>Mobility and Accessibility</b>	Maximizes connections to local/regional transit
	Compliments future transit plans
	Meets transit ridership
	Compatible with light freight needs
	Connects to employment centers
<b>Aesthetics</b>	Location of station fits within context of future character
	Minimizes visual impacts - maintains key view sheds

### 2.3 Site-Specific Criteria

Site-specific criteria address transit station needs at the town or resort level and provide a basis for comparing multiple parcels within a town or resort. These criteria are even more detailed in nature, but were still grouped into the same categories as the regional criteria: safety, healthy environment, historic context, communities, mobility and accessibility and aesthetics. Site-specific criteria agreed to by the county working groups are listed in **Table 3**.



**Table 3: Site-Specific Criteria for Potential Station Locations**

Category	Criteria
<b>Safety</b>	Platform can be accommodated on a 1% grade or less
	Site can accommodate tangent track for the length of the platform
<b>Healthy Environment</b>	Noise should be less than highway noise
	Does not impact wetlands
	Does not impact wildlife or threatened and endangered species
	Minimizes impacts to hazmat and other potential hazardous sites
	Minimizes impacts to publically-owned properties such as parks
	Minimizes impacts to environmental justice properties
	Provides opportunities for renewable/alternative energy sources
<b>Historic Context</b>	Minimizes impacts to historic properties
	Preserves historic character and scale
<b>Communities</b>	Synergizes with or is integrated with future local land uses
	Protects community character or preserves key characteristics
	Contributes to local “values” about community
	Strengthens desired development patterns in community
	Consistent with local transit and land use plans
	Increases future economic opportunities
	Provides opportunities for affordable housing
	Allows for growth potential
	Has potential availability of land
	Serves a role on the I-70 corridor, i.e. resort destination, residential, work force connection
	Has community support
<b>Mobility and Accessibility</b>	Proximity to resort, activity center, employment center or residential
	Existing road network can handle additional capacity or has ability to be expanded
	Enhances or links to bike or pedestrian connections within community
	Maximizes connections to local/regional transit
	Compatible with light freight needs
	Has storage capability-baggage, recreation equipment
<b>Aesthetics</b>	Location of station fits within context of future character
	Scale of services required fits into the scale of site
	Passenger comfort and safety – for multi-use passengers
	Minimizes visual impacts - maintains key view sheds



## **Attachments**

### **County Working Groups Round 3 Meeting Summaries**



## Meeting Summary

**Date:** July 16, 2008

**Subject:** Jefferson County Working Group Meeting #3  
Forum Recap, Project Work Flow and Status, and Development of Criteria  
for Evaluation of Potential Station Locations

**Attendees:** Jeanie Rossillon, Jefferson County  
John Wolforth, Jefferson County  
Tim Carl, Jefferson County  
Will Kerns, Jefferson County  
Zeke Zebauers, Jefferson County  
Steve Glueck, City of Golden  
Rick Muriby, City of Golden  
Jennifer Merer, Jacobs Carter Burgess  
Brian Werle, Jacobs Carter Burgess  
Beth Ordonez, Ordonez & Vogelsang, LLC

**This meeting summary highlights the round table discussion on the development of criteria that can be used to evaluate potential station locations.**

### Potential Station Locations Discussed for Criteria Screening:

- East Terminus Project Area
  - I-70 Hogback Area
  - I-70/US 6 Interchange Area
  - Downtown Golden
- El Rancho

### Comments/Input From Participants:

- Representatives from Jefferson County reiterated their concern about the type of freight service that would be accommodated by the regional transit system. Light freight service for daily consumables would be preferable over heavy freight. They would be opposed to heavy freight that included shipments of hazardous waste and had the look and feel of an industrial freight service (visual impacts). The type of freight service for the system should be clearly defined prior to acceptance by the county.
- Other important considerations for Jefferson County include maintaining key view sheds along the corridor and minimizing wildlife impacts. Views from the Genesee exist are particularly important as it frames a visual gateway to the Colorado Rockies as people leave Denver on I-70.
- Participants believed that it would be important for any station location at the east terminus of the project area to connect to the FasTracks system. Depending on the alignment that RMRA pushes through from DIA, there are several options for station



locations in eastern Jefferson County including the I-70 Hogback area, I-70/US 6 interchange area, and downtown Golden.

- Representatives from Golden suggested that we evaluate an alignment that travels along US 6 from Golden, through Clear Creek. This alignment would allow for a station in the downtown Golden area with greater “walkability” within Golden. However, it was recognized that an alignment in this location would not serve riders in the more developed parts of the mountains in Jefferson County, such as at El Rancho.
- The group further discussed the merits of a potential station location in downtown Golden. Golden would like to see either the FasTracks Gold Line or West Corridor be extended into downtown Golden in the future. Potentially, LRT could be directly connected to the I-70 transit system downtown. This would enhance economic activity in an existing activity center and generate sales tax within the community. However, Golden recognized a number of constraints that would have to be addressed including the provision of a park-n-ride, required roadway infrastructure to support vehicular access, and the availability of land within the downtown area.
- Evaluation criteria should look at the secondary impacts to roads and other infrastructure and resources. This includes facilities not directly impacted by the proposed improvements, but rather those that people would use to access the system. This aspect is captured in the site-specific criteria for mobility and accessibility.
- The I-70/US 6 interchange area was also discussed. There would be more availability of land in this location and would provide a connection to the West Corridor line.
- The C-470/Rooney Road interchange location, brought up at the Transit Forum, was discussed by the group. While this location will be a future activity center, the location is south of likely alignment alternatives. This location, therefore, was dropped from further consideration as a main trunk line station. A future connection between the FasTracks system or the regional I-70 system and this interchange would be important though.
- The group considered the pros and cons of a station at El Rancho versus Floyd Hill if it were to come down to only one location between the two. Participants believed that El Rancho would serve a larger ridership base since it would serve Bergen Park and Evergreen. Also, residents at Floyd Hill who travel to Denver for work can easily drive to El Rancho using the existing road network since they already do that. It would be more challenging for residents in the El Rancho area to travel west to Floyd Hill to take the system east to Denver.
- Input to the screening criteria included:
  - Add a corridor-wide criterion to mobility that includes “connection to the regional transit system”.
  - Add “potential availability of land” to the site-specific criteria.
  - Remove “phasing from bus to rail” from regional criteria.



## Meeting Summary

**Date:** July 1, 2008

**Subject:** Clear Creek County Working Group Meeting #3  
Forum Recap, Project Work Flow and Status, and Development of Criteria  
for Evaluation of Potential Station Locations

**Attendees:** JoAnn Sorensen, Clear Creek County  
Trent Hyatt (for Fred Rollenhagen), Clear Creek County  
Cindy Olson, Idaho Springs  
Cindy Condon, Idaho Springs  
Chuck Stearns, Georgetown  
Kresimir Koev, Easter Seals  
Flo Raitano, I-70 Coalition  
Craig Gaskill, Jacobs Carter Burgess  
Brian Werle, Jacobs Carter Burgess  
Jennifer Merer, Jacobs Carter Burgess  
Beth Ordonez, Ordonez & Vogelsang, LLC

**This meeting summary highlights the round table discussion on the development of criteria that can be used to evaluate potential station locations.**

### Potential Station Locations Discussed for Criteria Screening:

- Loveland – one location at base of ski area
- Bakerville – one location
- Georgetown – one location by the lake
- Empire – two potential locations at the I-70/US 40 junction and at the flats
- Idaho Springs – five potential locations at the east side ball fields, Argo Mill site, downtown parking lot behind BoJo's, USFS building, or high school football field
- Floyd Hill – one location at the top of the hill

### Comments/Input From Participants:

- The project team described a process for narrowing down the list of potential stations to 2 or 3 locations throughout the county. Potential locations would be screened using the criteria provided and discussed at this meeting. The locations that best met the criteria would be prioritized along with rationale. The goal would be to pass on the priorities and rationale to the RMRA study, which would then apply technical criteria applicable to the transit technology considered.
- The group discussed the concept of having more stations, some that serve express trips and others that serve local trips. This is an option to keep on the table, but it would be important for the county to identify “must have” station locations as technical considerations from the RMRA study become known. Also the station planning process





would need to consider sidings for the stations to allow the express service to bypass the station.

- Participants believed it would be important for county representatives to conduct the screening since they know more about the potential station locations.
- There was also discussion about how community members would be involved in the selection process for station locations. The CSS project will be having open houses in which information about the station location process can be provided. However, it will be up to the jurisdictions to conduct detailed public involvement programs at the appropriate time. The Coalition can provide information to assist jurisdictions with the public involvement.
- Input to the screening criteria included:
  - Add “potential hazards” such as propane facilities to the safety criteria.
  - Move the freight compatibility criteria from the healthy environment category to the mobility category.
  - Add opportunities for renewable energy to the healthy environment category.



## Meeting Summary

**Date:** July 9, 2008

**Subject:** Summit County Working Group Meeting #3  
Forum Recap, Project Work Flow and Status, and Development of Criteria  
for Evaluation of Potential Station Locations

**Attendees:** Bill Linfield, Town of Silverthorne  
Mark Leidal, Town of Silverthorne  
Melissa Wyatt, Dillon  
John Roberts, Summit County  
Chris Kslich, Town of Breckenridge  
Peter Grosshuesch, Town of Breckenridge  
Jennifer Merer, Jacobs Carter Burgess  
Brian Werle, Jacobs Carter Burgess  
Beth Ordonez, Ordonez & Vogelsang, LLC

**This meeting summary highlights the round table discussion on the development of criteria that can be used to evaluate potential station locations.**

### Potential Station Locations Discussed for Criteria Screening:

- Keystone – no specific locations discussed.
- Breckenridge – four potential locations including the City Market area, Downtown (Gondola Lot), Block 11, and the Stan Miller property (north Breckenridge).
- Silverthorne – one potential location in the outlet mall area.
- Lake Hill – one potential location generally between I-70 and Lake Dillon and between Frisco and Silverthorne.
- Frisco – one potential location in the Best Western area.
- Copper Mountain – no specific locations discussed.

### Comments/Input From Participants:

- There was considerable discussion by participants about who the regional transit system would serve. Some believed it would mostly serve Front Range day trippers traveling to the ski resorts in the winter time. The belief was that serving these users would remove the most vehicle traffic from I-70. Others believed the system would best serve visitors coming to the local communities and traveling to multiple locations within in the county, both the winter and summer. Serving the towns would also accommodate light freight and local community members who want to take transit to Denver. Most participants believed it would be important to have as few transfers as possible between the regional system and local transit systems for people getting to their destinations. For Summit County, transfer centers will need to be emphasized either way.
- An important factor for potential station locations is whether the regional transit system alignment would use the Eisenhower Tunnel or Loveland Pass to enter Summit County.



Another factor would be whether the system would prioritize serving resort destinations or the local towns. For example, if the system were to prioritize resort destinations, then an alignment following Loveland Pass, through Keystone, Breckenridge, and Copper Mountain would best serve these resort destinations. If the system were to prioritize local towns, then an alignment following Eisenhower Tunnel, through Silverthorne/Dillon, Lake Hill/Frisco, and Copper Mountain would best serve the towns. Copper Mountain would likely be served under either scenario.

- The merits of a potential location at Lake Hill were discussed. This location would provide a central access point for Summit County and could serve travel in all directions. It is also one of only a few areas where there is room for new development. However, the area is owned by the USFS and would require a land swap or purchase. The location is also in a sensitive view shed and not close to existing town centers. Development of this location could breakup an existing community separator between the Frisco area and the Silverthorne/Dillon area. Furthermore, the future use of the Dillon Dam road is in question and it is unclear if local bus transit can adequately serve this area.
- Representatives from Dillon mentioned that unlike other parts of the county, Dillon is ready to accommodate additional residential growth.



## Meeting Summary

**Date:** July 28, 2008

**Subject:** Eagle County Working Group Meeting #3  
Forum Recap, Project Work Flow and Status, and Development of Criteria  
for Evaluation of Potential Station Locations

**Attendees:** Eva Wilson, Eagle County  
Rachel Friede, Town of Vail  
Greg Hall, Town of Vail  
Keith Montag, Eagle County  
Lana Gallegos, Town of Gypsum  
Cindy Schwartz, Town of Gypsum  
Mike Budd, Berry Creek  
Kelley Collier, ECO Transit  
Jenny Strehler, Town of Avon  
William Gray, Town of Eagle  
Matt Gennett, Town of Avon  
Bob Narracci, Eagle County  
David Johnson, Eagle County  
Jason White, RFTA  
Tom Gosiorowski, Town of Eagle  
Peter Kozinski, CDOT  
Brian Werle, Jacobs Carter Burgess  
Flo Raitano, I-70 Coalition, Director

**This meeting summary highlights the round table discussion on the development of criteria that can be used to evaluate potential station locations.**

### Potential Station Locations Discussed for Criteria Screening:

- Vail
- Avon
- Edwards
- Walcott
- Eagle (town)
- Eagle Airport
- Gypsum
- Dotsero (recommended to eliminate)



## Comments/Input From Participants:

- Participants recommended removing Dotsero from the list of potential stations for consideration. The area is not likely to be a destination for users of a future transit system nor is the residential population likely to be large. However, some consideration should be given to this location if the regional transit system alignment were to go through Glenwood Canyon.
- A representative from Avon noted that the town has several potential sites that could be appropriate for a station location. Other towns in the county may also have multiple sites identified.
- Participants discussed the relationship between a regional transit system and a local one. There are local needs for workers in the county to get to employment areas, but this might be a somewhat divergent need from a regional transit system which moves people and goods to and from areas outside the county. A local system would need to serve towns and employment areas on a more frequent basis, whereas a regional system would likely be less frequent.
- It was discussed that a regional system would not likely stop at all the towns in Eagle County, rather only at a couple locations. A local system would be needed to connect to the regional system to provide connections to all the towns and resorts. It was generally discussed that Eagle County Airport should be considered as one of the locations for a connection to the regional system. Another location(s) in the central and eastern portion of the county should be considered. It will be up to county representatives to decide on the best connections to the regional system.
- Eagle County Airport provides a regional service to tourists coming to the county as well as for residents traveling elsewhere. It is anticipated that the airport will increase capacity in the future and is located in a central area of western Colorado.
- Participants recognized that the county would have to be responsible for determining and planning a local system to serve local needs.
- Spur lines to Leadville and the Roaring Fork Valley were discussed. In previous meetings, representatives from Leadville indicated a preference for connecting to Copper Mountain. Since the Rocky Mountain Rail Authority (RMRA) will be considering alignments from Denver to Grand Junction, the Roaring Fork Valley would likely be on the main trunk line anyway. The Roaring Fork Valley could be served by an alignment that goes either over Cottonwood Pass or through the Glenwood Canyon. Either option is likely to have large environmental issues. The RMRA will be looking at these options during its feasibility study.
- It was noted that an alignment option using Cottonwood Pass would likely eliminate the need for a bridge over the Colorado River at the eastern end of the Glenwood Canyon.
- There were no additions or revisions to the proposed station screening criteria.



## Meeting Summary

**Date:** July 8, 2008

**Subject:** **Garfield County Working Group Meeting #3  
Forum Recap, Project Work Flow and Status, and Development of Criteria  
for Evaluation of Potential Station Locations**

**Attendees:** Kristin Kenyon, RFTA  
Dave Sturges, Glenwood Springs  
David Pesnichak, Garfield County  
Jennifer Merer, Jacobs Carter Burgess  
Brian Werle, Jacobs Carter Burgess  
Beth Ordonez, Ordonez & Vogelsang, LLC

**This meeting summary highlights the round table discussion on the development of criteria that can be used to evaluate potential station locations.**

### Potential Station Locations Discussed for Criteria Screening:

- Glenwood Springs – three potential locations at the downtown “Wye” area, west Glenwood RFTA Park-n-Ride, and Roaring Fork Market Place in south Glenwood.
- Garfield County (between Glenwood and Carbondale) – one location at the CMC and Cattle Creek intersection area with US 82.
- Carbondale – three potential locations at the RFTA Park-n-Ride, the Town Hall, and at Catherine’s Store.

### Comments/Input From Participants:

- An important factor for potential station locations is whether the regional transit system alignment would use Glenwood Canyon or come over Cottonwood Pass and eventually back to I-70 and on to Grand Junction. If the alignment were to use Glenwood Canyon, then it would be unlikely that there would be stations south of Glenwood. However, if the alignment was to use Cottonwood Pass, there would be the potential for station locations in Carbondale, between Carbondale and Glenwood, and in Glenwood.
- Cottonwood Pass would have several alignment options on the west side. However, any alignments in this area would likely have to address considerable public concern from residents of high-end developments. Development of future subdivisions and other environmental issues would need to be considered.
- The group discussed the merits of a downtown Glenwood station at the Wye. Benefits include availability of City- and RFTA-owned land for redevelopment, future connection of 8<sup>th</sup> Street over the Roaring Fork River, multi-modal transportation opportunities, urban redevelopment opportunities, serves people arriving from the east, and walkup opportunities. The existing sewage treatment plant located in this area will be relocated in about 2 years. Also, RFTA property must be preserved for a future rail corridor.
- A potential location at the west Glenwood RFTA Park-n-Ride would serve workers arriving from west Glenwood, enhance existing transit service from this location up



valley, and provide more opportunities for growth and parking. A categorical exclusion was previously prepared for this property.

- If the alignment were to use Cottonwood Pass, the Roaring Fork Market Place in south Glenwood is a central retail area and has opportunities for growth. The proposed BRT system will serve this location.
- If the alignment were to use Cottonwood Pass, a location between Glenwood and Carbondale at the CMC and Cattle Creek intersection area with US 82 would provide a good mid-valley location. There are development opportunities and existing light freight facilities. The proposed BRT system will serve this location.
- If the alignment were to use Cottonwood Pass, potential locations in Carbondale include the RFTA Park-n-Ride, the Town Hall area, and Catherine's Store. The Park-n-Ride location has the benefits of current proactive land use code, potentially higher density opportunities, traffic demand from CO 133, and an adjacent existing rail corridor. Catherine's Store could face some obstacles in the development of existing rural/farm land to higher density mixed use, including minimal community support. Additional input from representatives from Carbondale would be required to further consider these locations.
- Input to the screening criteria included:
  - Add a criterion for "connection to employment centers".
  - Add a criterion for "consistency with transit and land use plans".