Focus Group

Housekeeping

Involvement:
- The Focus Group will be the deliberating body. Questions will be taken from those attending as deemed appropriate and timely.

Member participation:
- Use of name tents.

Website:
- Taskforce and other working groups will have their own sites.
- Ours and other working groups meeting dates will be posted so that others and public can attend if desired.
- Data related to the task at hand will be placed under their particular headings.
- Support data (general) still remain on the web where it resides today.
Focus Group

Process

Steps leading up to an October/November Recommendation:

- Meeting 1: Establish a Baseline and Goal Setting. Include panel of local transportation and mobility experts.

- Meeting 2: Exploring Airport/Transit Connectivity. Charrette style discussion based on priorities of Meeting 1. Include Airport planner to discuss their experience at other airports.

- Meeting 3: Formalize recommendations – what does success look like for airport connectivity?
Tentative Process Timeline

August 12
Airline Panel & Workgroup

August 29
Focus Group - County Admin

August 28
Focus Group - County Admin

August 29
Community Character

September 11
Technical Group

September 18
All Groups - Aspen Meadows

October 2
All Groups - Aspen Meadows

October 3
All Groups - Aspen Meadows

November 13
All Groups - Aspen Meadows

November 3
All Groups - Aspen Meadows

November 3
All Groups - Aspen Meadows

August 23
Vision Committee - County Admin

September 23
Vision Committee - County Admin

September 24 & 25
Experience Group - Library

BOCC Recommendations
TBD

Vision Committee - Work TBD
EA Proposed Projects
Experience Working Group

EA Proposed Projects
Experience Working Group

Technical Working Group

EA Proposed Projects
Focus Working Group
Experience Working Group
Technical Working group

EA Proposed Projects
Focus Group

Our Guardrails

What’s **not** our Mission?

- To solve the entrance to Aspen nor the light rail debates.
- To recommend improvements that fall outside the EA clearance.
  - *Work within the constraints of the Airport property.*

What **is** Our mission?

- **How can we improve airport connectivity?**
  - *What would more convenient and easy ground transportation to and from the airport look like?*
  - *How can we enhance multi-modal transportation options and create seamless connectivity to transit?*
  - *How does the Airport fit into the broader surface transportation network of Aspen, Pitkin County and the Roaring Fork Valley?*

- Stay true to the agreed upon Quality of Life and Environment targets.
- Stay true to the shared common community values across all working groups.
Guiding Principles

• Reduce overall airport emissions (aircraft & facilities) by 20-30% [Target for Overall Airport Emissions]

• Reduce noise levels by 20-30% [Target for Airport Noise Intensity]

• Accommodate limited growth [Airport Commercial Enplanement Target of . 8%]
Focus Group

Aspen

Airport

Snowmass

Downvalley

Meeting #1

Meeting #2
Focus Group

Meeting #1 – Agenda (4-7pm)

Mission - How does the Airport fit into the broader surface transportation network of Aspen, Pitkin County and the Roaring Fork Valley?

- Panel of Experts – 90-100 minutes
  - Q and A – 30 minutes
- Break – 15 minutes
- Identify Shared Goals and Priorities – 45 minutes
  - What do we need in order to address and recommend our thoughts on:
    - What would more convenient and easy ground transportation to and from the airport look like?
    - How can we enhance multi-modal transportation options and create seamless connectivity to transit?
- Establish next meeting dates:
  - September 18th Plenary
  - September 19th or September 25th – Focus Group Meeting #2
  - October 2 – Plenary
  - October ??? – Focus Group Meeting #3 – Finalize recommendation
Focus Group
Our Panel of Experts

- **Ellen Sassano**: West of Maroon Creek Master Plan
- **David Pesnichak**: Highway 82 Record of Decisions (RODs), Comprehensive Valley Transportation Plan and role of EOTC, Upper Valley Mobility Study (UVMS)
- **Brian Pettet**: Highway 82 Access Control Plan, Current Transit Station Design
- **John Krueger**: Aspen Area Community Plan / airport transportation experience
- **David Peckler**: Snowmass / airport transportation experience
- **David Johnson**: RFTA / airport transportation experience
- **Cristal Logan**: Upper Valley Mobility Report (UVMR)
Panel Discussion
Ellen Sassano: West of Maroon Creek Master Plan
“Create a comprehensive Land Use Master Plan ... for the West of [Maroon] Creek Corridor that ensures planning is coordinated and recognizes the need for improved transportation services in the corridor before significant growth is allowed to occur in the area...” - 2012 AACP
AACP:  
✓ “Improve the convenience, reliability, comfort, affordability, safety, capacity, and quality of experience of transit services and improve efficiency and coordination between all related aspects of transportation in the West of [Maroon] Creek Corridor;” and
✓ Ensure safe and efficient pedestrian and bike connections exist within the West of [Maroon] Creek Corridor; and
✓ Connect the area to the Aspen downtown.

WOMP: Recognize that “The Highway functions as:
✓ The main transportation corridor into and out of Aspen
✓ Supports local residential and worker traffic
✓ Provides access for tourists arriving by car and via the Pitkin County Airport to destinations up and down the Roaring Fork Valley
✓ Is a portal for several bike and pedestrian trails that serve as both commuter trails and recreational access to surrounding Federal lands.”
Plan Boundary/HWY 82 Corridor Activity Nodes
HWY 82 Corridor – Bicycle, Pedestrian & Nordic Trails
HWY 82 Corridor Transit Map – Shuttle Concept

Figure 10: Transit Map

NOTE: The preferred alternative in the 1998 CDOT Entrance to Aspen Record of Decision delineates a Light Rail Transit (LRT) corridor that follows the Highway 82 alignment through the WOMP area.
HWY 82 Access Control Plan

Note: BMC is also known as ProBuild
HWY 82 Corridor- Transportation Policy/Action Items
## HWY 82 Corridor Policies & Implementation Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Implementation Steps</th>
<th>Implementing Agency</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.6. Modify the Aspen UGB line established in 2000 to include the entire Aspen Snow Dump property immediately north of the Pitkin County Public Works facility. Limit uses to accommodate Snow Dump use or other related public purpose. See Figure 7. Aspen UGB Expansion.</td>
<td>I.6.a. Take action necessary to formally revise the Aspen UGB line established in 2000 to reflect direction in Policy I.6.</td>
<td>Aspen &amp; Pitkin County Community Development Departments</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation</strong></td>
<td>II.1.a. Set a standard/level of service on Highway 82 that’s acceptable in terms of safety and quality of life relating to vehicular travel. Consider the Highway 82 Access Control Plan, RFTA Bus Rapid Transit Improvements, the Pitkin County Airport Master Plan and the Entrance to Aspen Record of Decision as part of an analysis to determine acceptable carrying capacity for the Highway within the WOMP area.</td>
<td>Pitkin County Public Works &amp; Community Development Departments</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II.1.b. Develop and implement standards that require timing of new development to concur with any transportation improvements identified as necessary to maintain acceptable carrying capacity on Highway 82.</td>
<td>Pitkin County Public Works &amp; Community Development Departments</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II.1.c. Coordinate and improve all aspects of auto, air, transit, parking and trail function in the context of planned development or redevelopment of activity nodes in the corridor.</td>
<td>Pitkin County Airport, Colorado Department of Transportation, Pitkin County Public Works &amp; Community Development &amp; Open Space Departments</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II.1.d. Obtain updated data regarding daily traffic levels, including volume and time of day, between the edge of the Urban Growth Boundary (Pitkin County Airport area) and the Castle Creek bridge.</td>
<td>Colorado Department of Transportation, Pitkin County Public Works &amp; Community Development Departments</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.2. Ensure that development pays its proportional share of transportation improvements in the corridor.</td>
<td>II.2.a. Explore the creation of a special district to support transportation in the West of Maroon Creek corridor area. In addition to addressing the greater transportation issues, the special district should also address multi-modal transportation connectivity to pedestrian and bicycle trail systems, including safe road/highway crossings. Ensure that both new and existing development participate in the creation of this special district and the means to fairly allocate its start-up and on-going operational costs.</td>
<td>Colorado Department of Transportation, Pitkin County Public Works &amp; Community Development Departments</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II.2.b. Reduce entry points to Highway 82, consistent with the Highway 82 Access Control Plan (Figure 8.)</td>
<td>Pitkin County Public Works &amp; Community Development Departments</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## HWY 82 Corridor Policies & Implementation Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Implementation Steps</th>
<th>Implementing Agency</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II.3.b Coordinate transportation planning between Local, State and Federal transportation related agencies.</td>
<td>Colorado Department of Transportation, Pitkin County Public Works, RFTA, Elected Officials Transportation Committee, Federal Transportation Agencies, Pitkin County Airport, FAA</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.4.a Find funding and create a transit shuttle in the WOMP corridor connecting Aspen to Burlingame, Truscott, ProBuild, the ABC and North 40, Colorado Mountain College and the Pitkin County Airport (See Figure 10, Tranal Map).</td>
<td>Pitkin County Public Works, RFTA, Elected Officials Transportation Committee, Aspen Transportation Development, Aspen and Pitkin County Community Development Departments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.4.b Design street layout within the ABC and on the Pitkin County Airport to accommodate the loop transit shuttle referenced in II.4.a above.</td>
<td>Pitkin County Airport &amp; Public Works, &amp; Community Development Departments, RFTA,</td>
<td>Underway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.5.a Coordinate City and County trail planning and construction to readily accommodate bicycle and pedestrian access between residential and other uses in the WOMP area, to local recreation and commuter trails, and to Aspen and downvalley communities. (See Figure 9, Trails Map.)</td>
<td>Pitkin County &amp; Aspen Community Development &amp; Open Space &amp; Trails Departments</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.6.a Ensure that HWY 82 setbacks, rights-of-way and easements where necessary to preserve and maintain flexibility for location of future transit and/or trail alignment alternatives.</td>
<td>Pitkin County Community Development, Open Space &amp; Trails &amp; GIS Departments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.6.b Implement the signage guidelines in the WOMP Scenic Guidelines to facilitate way-finding, user-friendly access and circulation guidance for residents and guests, pedestrian and vehicular traffic – particularly in the immediate vicinity of the ABC.</td>
<td>Colorado Department of Transportation, Pitkin County Public Works &amp; Community Development Departments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.7.a Collaborate with the Colorado Department of Transportation and the U.S. Forest service where applicable, to determine the appropriate number and location of signs on Highway 82 necessary to improve way-finding without cluttering appropriate signage options.</td>
<td>Pitkin County Community Development Department</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.7.b Amend the Pitkin County Sign Code to reflect changes necessary to improve sign effectiveness and appearance within the WOMP area.</td>
<td>Pitkin County Community Development Department</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.7.c Collaborate with the City and County Open Space &amp; Trails Departments to develop a sign plan for trails throughout the WOMP area.</td>
<td>Aspen &amp; Pitkin County Community Development Department</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Airport Node-Transportation Policy/Action Items
## Policies & Implementation Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pitkin County Airport Activity Node</th>
<th>Implementation Steps</th>
<th>Implementing Agency</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II.1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit uses on the Pitkin County Airport to those that are primary, supporting and transportation-related, customarily associated with commercial airports - excluding hotels, motels and lodging as these terms are defined in the Pitkin County Land Use Code.</td>
<td>1.1.a Incorporate the direction of Policy II.1 as part of any long term improvement plan for the Pitkin County Airport, and in the preparation and review of location and extent review(s) for the Pitkin County Airport.</td>
<td>Pitkin County Airport, Pitkin County Community Development Department, Planning &amp; Zoning Commission, BOCC</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II.1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve efficiency and coordination between all related aspects of transportation in the WOMP area.</td>
<td>1.1.a Develop the “Airline Trail” through the Pitkin County Airport property to Sky Mountain Park; and connect to trailhead parking at the Stapleton lot (See Figure 9, Trails Map).</td>
<td>Pitkin County Airport, Pitkin County Open Space and Trails</td>
<td>Underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.b Accommodate and develop a potential future trail connection for a “Buttermilk Connector” single track trail on the west side of Owl Creek Road that would link Sky Mountain Park and Buttermilk. (See Figure 9, Trails Map)</td>
<td>Pitkin County Airport, Pitkin County Open Space and Trails</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.c Coordinate the location of RTFA Bus Rapid Transit stations at Buttermilk and at the Pitkin County Airport with safe pedestrian access across Highway 82.</td>
<td>Pitkin County Airport, Pitkin County Engineer, RTFA, CDOT</td>
<td>Underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.d Examine best practices found to be effective at other airports and implement appropriate measures to improve conditions for travel from and to the Pitkin County Airport.</td>
<td>Pitkin County Airport, RTFA</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.e Encourage the use of alternative modes of transportation and diminish reliance upon rental vehicles and parking. As one option, explore the feasibility of final destination bag delivery for Pitkin County Airport arrivals to make it more feasible for arriving airline passengers to utilize public transportation.</td>
<td>Pitkin County Airport, Aspen Commercial Core &amp; Lodging Commission (CCCL)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.f Preserve the dedicated transit corridor that runs the length of the Pitkin County Airport property to accommodate a future mass transit system. Any future trail alignment in this vicinity should be designed to be compatible with the transportation corridor as defined in the Entrance to Aspen Record of Decision.</td>
<td>Pitkin County Airport, RTFA, CDOT</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.g Provide/maintain a Pitkin County Airport terminal transit interface adjacent to Highway 82 and the RTFA Bus Rapid Transit station.</td>
<td>Pitkin County Airport, RTFA, CDOT</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
David Pesnichak: Highway 82 Record of Decisions (RODs), Comprehensive Valley Transportation Plan and role of EOTC, Upper Valley Mobility Study (UVMS)
What is the Elected Officials Transportation Committee (EOTC)?

Established: 1993

Committee Makeup:
- City of Aspen – City Council
- Town of Snowmass Village – Town Council
- Pitkin County – Board of County Commissioners

Charge: Administering 0.5% Transit Sales and Use Tax

Purpose: Finance, Construct, Operate, or Maintain Mass Transportation in Roaring Fork Valley

Mass Transportation: “any system which transports the general public by bus, rail, or any other means of conveyance moving along prescribed routes...”
EOTC
Guiding Plan
(Adopted 1993)
Parking

Park and Ride Lots
Restricted and Paid Parking
Corridors

- Enhanced Down Valley Bus System ("The B-Line")
- Higher Only with Separated/Dedicated Transit Way – Owl Creek Road ("The C-Line")
- Future Dedicated Rail System – Glenwood Springs to Basalt
- 4-Lane Highway w/ 2-Lanes HOV – Basalt to Buttermilk
- Rural Road w/ Shuttle – Brush Creek Road
- 2-Lane Highway w/ Separated/Dedicated Transit Way – Airport to Aspen ("The A-Line")
Highway 82 Record of Decisions (RODs)
NEPA Overview

• National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1970 – Requires Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

• EIS Required if Project could have “Significant Impact”

• EIS Results in Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) and Record of Decision (ROD)

• ROD Identifies a Preferred Alternative (PA) from EIS analysis

• Federal Highways Administration (FHWA) is Approving Entity
Highway 82 Records of Decision
Pitkin County

• 2 ROD’s in Pitkin County:
  ▪ “East of Basalt to Buttermilk Ski Area” – Issued 1993
  ▪ “Entrance to Aspen” – Issued 1998

• “East of Basalt to Buttermilk Ski Area”
  ▪ Completed

• “Entrance to Aspen”
  ▪ Completed from Buttermilk to Maroon Creek Roundabout
  ▪ Incomplete from Maroon Creek Roundabout to 7th Street

• RODs do NOT have Regulatory Expiration
Highway 82 Records of Decision
Buttermilk to Aspen (Entrance to Aspen)

• EIS Started in 1994 and ROD Issued in 1998
• Environmental Reevaluation in 2007 (ROD Upheld)
• EIS Considered 43 Alignment and Mode Alternatives
Highway 82 Records of Decision
Buttermilk to Aspen (Entrance to Aspen)

Components of ROD Preferred Alternative (“Modified Direct”):

- Combination of Highway and Intersection Improvements
- Phased Transit System (Bus Only System to be Converted to Light Rail)
- Incremental Transportation Management Program
  - Set Community Threshold for Vehicle Traffic at Castle Creek Bridge to 1993 Levels

Preferred Alternative Construction Progress:

- Complete – Buttermilk to Maroon Creek Roundabout
- Incomplete – Maroon Creek Roundabout to 7th Street
  - CDOT has obtained ROW through Marolt-Thomas Open Space (Exchange for Mill Ranch)
  - City of Aspen Vote allows Light Rail through Marolt-Thomas Open Space (2007)
Highway 82 Records of Decision
Buttermilk to Aspen (Entrance to Aspen)

Necessary Next Steps to Complete:
- City of Aspen Vote - allow Bus Transit through Marolt-Thomas Open Space
- City of Aspen Council Vote - allow construction to proceed
- Identify Funding

Cost to Complete (2017):
- Bus Only Option (7th St to Maroon Creek Roundabout) - $106 Million
- Light Rail Option ($70.2 – $86.5 Million / Mile)
  - Rubey Park to Brush Creek (6.1 Miles) - $428 - $527.8 Million
  - Rubey Park to RFTA Aspen Maintenance Facility (3.7 Miles) - $260 - $320 Million
Highway 82 Records of Decision
Buttermilk to Aspen (Entrance to Aspen)
Highway 82 Records of Decision
Buttermilk to Aspen (Entrance to Aspen)

- Maroon Creek Bridge
- Moore Property Station (Current Kiss and Ride)
- Realigned Highway 82 (2 Traffic Lanes, 2 Bus Lanes)
- Cut and Cover Tunnel (400’) and New Bridge

Abandon Portion of Hwy 82, Castle Creek Bridge to Remain
Existing S Curves
Seventh Street Station
Rubey Park and In-Town Stations
Upper Valley Mobility Study – 2017

• Study Commissioned by EOTC

• Examined Feasibility, Alignment, and Cost of Bus Rapid Transit (BRT and Light Rail Transit (LRT)

• Between Brush Creek P&R and Aspen

• Recommended Pursuing BRT, not LRT

• Recommendation for BRT Due to:
  ▪ Cost (construction and operation – LRT Cost Double BRT)
  ▪ Similar Ridership Predictions for BRT and LRT

• Airport BRT Station and Underpass Existing
Brian Pettet: Highway 82 Access Control Plan, Current Transit Station Design
Aspen/Pitkin County Airport: Underpass to Terminal
John Krueger: Aspen Area Community Plan / airport transportation experience
Aspen Area Community Plan + Pitkin County Airport
Background

- First completed in 1993; updated in 2000 and 2012.

- “The purpose of the plan is to serve as a guide and philosophy for the future. It is a vision, a map and a plan of action for achieving community goals.”

“Implementing... the 2012 AACP is not solely the responsibility of City and County government, but will require collaboration and cooperation among public sector agencies, businesses, private non-profits, local institutions and the general public.”
Area

• Includes areas of unincorporated Pitkin County: Red Mountain, East of Aspen, the AABC, the Airport, Buttermilk, portions of the Castle / Maroon Creek valleys.

Philosophy

• The AACP supports the UGB in an effort to limit and control sprawl.
Planning Area | West of Castle Creek

Area
- Gateway to Aspen and home to a variety of uses:
  - Airport
  - AABC
  - Buttermilk
  - Affordable housing

Philosophy
- The area should not become an urbanized tunnel-like corridor.

Transportation
- Improve transit services and improve efficiency and coordination between all aspects of transportation in the area.
**Philosophy**

- Use TDM to accommodate additional trips.
- Continue to limit AADT to 1993 levels.
- Strive to reduce AADT to below 1993 levels.

**Update**

- 26 years of AADT at or below 1993 goal due to increased transit service, TDM measures and paid parking
- 2019 AADT year to date -3% compared to 2017
- Peak hourly period AADT has spread
Vehicle Traffic Trends

MONTHLY TRAFFIC COUNT COMPARISON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JAN</th>
<th>FEB</th>
<th>MAR</th>
<th>APR</th>
<th>MAY</th>
<th>JUN</th>
<th>JUL</th>
<th>AUG</th>
<th>SEPT</th>
<th>OCT</th>
<th>NOV</th>
<th>DEC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993 Community Goal</td>
<td>23,800</td>
<td>24,300</td>
<td>24,800</td>
<td>18,800</td>
<td>19,300</td>
<td>26,200</td>
<td>28,600</td>
<td>28,600</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>20,500</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>25,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>22,766</td>
<td>23,486</td>
<td>23,405</td>
<td>17,781</td>
<td>17,985</td>
<td>23,986</td>
<td>26,489</td>
<td>25,193</td>
<td>23,246</td>
<td>19,823</td>
<td>17,910</td>
<td>22,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>22,418</td>
<td>21,871</td>
<td>22,650</td>
<td>14,528</td>
<td>11,294</td>
<td>21,218</td>
<td>25,979</td>
<td>24,690</td>
<td>17,474</td>
<td>14,307</td>
<td>16,431</td>
<td>22,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>21,262</td>
<td>21,717</td>
<td>21,792</td>
<td>18,519</td>
<td>17,443</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Red: 1993 Community Goal
- Yellow: 2017
- Blue: 2018
- Green: 2019
Philosophy

• The airport is an important component of our multi-modal transportation system.

• It is essential to integrate the airport with alternative modes of transportation to diminish reliance upon rental vehicles.
**Philosophy**

- “...support a valley-wide Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system that efficiently connects to transit hubs, the airport and trails.”
- “…commitment to alternative modes of transportation helps reduce traffic congestion, improves air quality, reduces greenhouse gas emissions, promotes public health and reduces our dependence on non-renewable resources.”
Transportation | The Airport

**Policies**

- Strengthen the Airport’s role in the regional valley-wide transportation system.
- Increase the quality and availability of information on travel options.
- Improve the efficiency and reliability of Airport services while reducing environmental impacts.
Policies

• Improve the overall quality of the Airport experience in a manner consistent with community character.

• Reduce the negative impacts of operations on the surrounding area.

• Improve the convenience, efficiency and environmental impacts of ground transportation options available at the Airport.
David Peckler: Snowmass / airport transportation experience
Transportation Mode Comparison Summer Guests 2017-2018

Aggregate Transportation Trends

- Drove
- Flew to Aspen
- Flew to Denver, Drove
- Other

2017 vs. 2018
Winter Guest Destination Airport (2014/15 - 2018/19)
David Johnson: RFTA / airport transportation experience
RFTA/Airport
Transportation Experience

ASE Vision Process
Focus Group Meeting #1
August 28, 2019
• In 2013, downvalley and upvalley Airport/AABC stations upgraded significantly with implementation of BRT
• New bike/ped underpass of SH82 constructed to connect the two stations
• Existing upvalley boarding area moved slightly further upvalley to align with airport and ped crossing
Existing BRT Station and Airport Layout
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>On</th>
<th>Off</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rubey Park</td>
<td>4257</td>
<td>3591</td>
<td>7848</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowmass Mall</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>1440</td>
<td>2438</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brush Creek Intercept Lot</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>1656</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbondale BRT</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>1548</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspen Highlands</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>1277</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27th Street BRT</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>1207</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basalt Avenue BRT</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paepcke Park</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Jebel BRT</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallam/8th</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buttermilk BRT</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buttermilk Ski Area</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Related Destination
2040 Projects

• New Buses (Replacement and Expansion)
• Electric Buses
• Greater frequency and consistency for BRT, Valley Local and Snowmass Routes
• TOSV Transit Center ($500,000)
# Airport Connection Trade-Offs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Create pedestrian walkway between terminal and BRT station | Least Operating Cost  
Simple Option  
Convenient for those who are willing and able to walk | Could be capital intensive  
May deter people who do not wish to walk or have lots of bags |
| Move BRT alignment to airport                    | Simple, fast connection                         | May have significant capital and operating costs  
Re-routing the downvalley station particularly problematic  
May reduce overall BRT travel time |
| Site airport closer to BRT Station               | Simple, fast connection                         | May pose challenges with overall site layout |
| Airport Specific Bus Route                       |                                                 | Significant capital and operating costs |
Cristal Logan: Upper Valley Mobility Report (UVMR)
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The Community Forum

31 Citizens Taking a Fresh Look

Rose Abello
Pam Alexander
John Bennett, co-chair
Dan Blankenship
Bill Budinger
Markey Butler
Barry Crook
Nina Eisenstat
Brent Gardner Smith
Ward Hauenstein
Tom Heald
David Houggy
David Hyman
Bill Kane, co-chair
Michael Kinsley
John Krueger
Melony Lewis
Cristal Logan
Mirte Mallory
Tom Melberg
Michael Miracle
Maria Morrow
George Newman
Jon Peacock
David Peckler
Greg Rucks
Sheri Sanzone
John Sarpa
Steve Skadron
Ralph Trapani
Katie Viola
Task Force Process

Expert Speakers
Research
Dialogue
Our Goals

Improve Upper Valley Mobility

Reduce Traffic Congestion
# Values Based Transportation System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essential Community Values</th>
<th>Operating System Values</th>
<th>Minimum System Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Character</td>
<td>Traffic/Congestion Reduction</td>
<td>Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Quality</td>
<td>Social Equity</td>
<td>Financial Viability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Convenience/Comfort</td>
<td>Functionality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adaptable to Future</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Options Matrix & Scoring System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPTIONS</th>
<th>Essential Community Values</th>
<th>Operating System Values</th>
<th>Minimum System Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Character Quality</td>
<td>Traffic &amp; Congestion Reduction</td>
<td>Social Equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ride Sharing Systems</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ride Hailing Systems</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Rail Transit (LRT)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenway &amp; Recreational Trails</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain to Mountain Connection</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit-Oriented Affordable Housing</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Motorized Pedestrian &amp; Bicycle Network</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility Management Strategies</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airports/Transit Connectivity</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Highway Capacity</td>
<td>-35</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Option/Value Rating System

- **3** = Fully consistent with this value. Substantial progress
- **2** = Adequately consistent with this value
- **1** = Minimally consistent with this value
- **0** = Neutral or Not Applicable
- **-1** = Inconsistent with this value
- **-2** = Extremely inconsistent with this value. Detrimental impacts
The Role of Induced Traffic

“Increased roadway capacity induces additional vehicle miles traveled (VMT) in the short-run and even more VMT in the long-run.”

University of California, Davis 2015
A Universal Principle

How Road Capacity Expansion Generates Traffic

Traffic Volume With Added Capacity
Traffic Volume Without Added Capacity
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“Widening roads to ease congestion is like trying to cure obesity by loosening your belt.”

– Roy Kienitz
Former Under Secretary of Transportation
“Public transit does not reduce traffic levels.”

– Gilles Duranton, University of Pennsylvania
Matthew Turner, Brown University, 2011
“Add a new subway line and some drivers will switch to transit. But new drivers replace them. It’s the same effect as adding a new lane to the highway: congestion remains constant.”

Systems... Not Silver Bullets!
The Solution: A Balance of Carrots and Sticks

“The efficient solution to congestion is to use pricing or other incentives to test consumers’ willingness to pay for road space...

“Congestion pricing can provide travelers with an incentive to reduce their peak period trips and use travel alternatives, such as ride sharing...”

– Victoria Transport Policy Institute 2017
The Integrated Mobility System
Integrated Mobility System
Integrated Mobility System
Integrated Mobility System
Integrated Mobility System
The Integrated Mobility System

- Phased BRT Enhancement
- Ride Hailing
- Ride Sharing
- HOV Lane Enforcement
- Congestion Reduction Measures
Long-Term Success

- Fewer traffic jams
- More mobility options
- Commuters gain time for families & work
- Visitors enjoy more vacation time
- Less traffic, noise, pollution
- Reduced carbon emissions
Integrated Mobility System

A Shift in Strategic Thinking: *Operational Innovation*

Invites Experimentation

Flexible

Reversible

Affordable
What Does Success Look Like?

An integrated mobility system
Reflecteds community values
Innovative options
Works for residents, commuters & visitors
Focus Group
Our Panel of Experts

- **Ellen Sassano**: West of Maroon Creek Master Plan
- **David Pesnichak**: Highway 82 Record of Decisions (RODs), Comprehensive Valley Transportation Plan and role of EOTC, Upper Valley Mobility Study (UVMS)
- **Brian Pettet**: Highway 82 Access Control Plan, Current Transit Station Design
- **John Krueger**: Aspen Area Community Plan / airport transportation experience
- **David Peckler**: Snowmass / airport transportation experience
- **David Johnson**: RFTA / airport transportation experience
- **Cristal Logan**: Upper Valley Mobility Report (UVMR)
Shared Goals and Priorities
Focus Group

• Identify Needed Materials, Shared Goals and Priorities – 45 minutes

• Let us know what you need in order to assess and address in order to make a recommendation on connectivity:

• Meeting 2: Exploring Airport/Transit Connectivity
  ▪ Read/review data provided, use as reference material
  ▪ Present case studies/scenarios of innovative approaches other airports are taking
  ▪ Facilitate planning charettes by mode/use- potential topics include:
    • Transit/multi-modal
    • Vehicles and parking (private/rental)
    • Hotel shuttles
    • Ride sharing
    • Circulation/connectivity
    • Funding opportunities
Focus Group

• Identifying shared goals and priorities – round robin on the first strategic question:
  ▪ How can we improve airport connectivity? (opportunities and challenges)
Next Steps
Focus Group

• Establish next meeting dates:
  ▪ September 18th Plenary
  ▪ **September 19th or September 25th** – Focus Group Meeting #2
  ▪ October 2 – Plenary
  ▪ October ???? – Focus Group Meeting #3 – Finalize recommendation