

Report on Airport Connectivity and Mobility

December 5, 2019



Table of Contents

Preamble.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Working Group Meeting History.....	1
Executive Summary	2
Issues and Summary Responses	3
Report.....	4
Introduction.....	4
Issues and Detailed Responses	5
What would more convenient and easy ground transportation to and from the airport look like?	5
Public Transportation.....	5
Luggage.....	6
Rental Cars.....	7
Parking	7
Signage/Guidance:.....	8
General.....	8
How can we enhance multi-modal transportation options and create seamless connectivity to transit?.....	9
How does the airport fit into the broader regional surface transportation network in the Roaring Fork Valley?.....	11
Additional Comments	13
Appendix A: Previous Studies	15
Appendix B: Minority Reports	17

Preamble to the ASE Vision Process:

Focus Group **Building Today for Tomorrow's Future**

Introduction

In February of 2019, the ASE Vision Kick-Off meeting was held at the Aspen Meadows Doerr-Hosier Center. This was the first gathering of all Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) appointed members serving as a formal public body in an advisory capacity. The Airport Advisory Groups consist of individuals from various neighborhoods, businesses, civic interests and other engaged individual community members.

The ASE Vision process was established to help advise the BOCC on determining how the Aspen/Pitkin County Airport should be modernized to accommodate the community's air service needs and keep up with changes in the air service industry and reflect the character and values of the community.

The Focus Group, made up of [49 community representatives out of the 123 formally appointed](#), was one of four working groups formed to report out to the overarching Vision Committee. The Focus Group played an important role in refining concepts and helping to share information throughout the visioning process with respect to one of the ten [community values established by the ASE Vision Committee](#). That community value is **Convenient and Easy Ground Transportation**. Contained within that value are two supporting requests to consider: **Multi-modal transit options** and **seamless connectivity to transit**.

The Focus Group also discussed and concluded that their recommendations are generally aligned and not in conflict with the conclusions provided by the [Community Character Working Group](#).

As a basis for decision making, the Focus Group also considered the guiding principles established by the Vision Committee, which call for reduced overall airport emissions (aircraft & facilities) by 20-30% [Target for Overall Airport Emissions]; reduced noise levels by 20-30% [Target for Airport Noise Intensity] and accommodating limited growth [Commercial Enplanement Target of .8%].

Working Group Meeting History

Since February of 2019 the Focus Group has been meeting in both plenary and breakout styled meeting formats. During that process, the Vision Committee tasked the Focus Group with addressing three key questions associated with the community value of Easy Ground Transportation:

- What would more convenient and easy airport ground transportation look like?
- How can we enhance multi-modal transportation options and create seamless connectivity to transit?
- How does the airport fit into the broader regional surface transportation network?

The report which follows is the result of the Focus Group's effort to address these three questions. In preparing to do so, the group held the following meetings:

Focus Group Meeting #1 - Wednesday, August 28, 2019, 4pm – 7pm at the Aspen Police Department Community Room (540 E. Main Street). The overall meeting consisted of presentations from a panel of seven local experts representing current and past studies with a transportation component. Those topics included the West of Marron Creek Master Plan; Highway 82 Record of Decisions (ROD'S); Comprehensive Valley Transportation Plan and role of EOTC; Upper Valley Mobility Study (UVMS); Highway 82 Access Control Plan, Current Transit Station Design; Aspen Area Community Plan – Airport Transportation Experience; Snowmass – Airport Transportation Experience; Roaring Fork Transportation Authority (RFTA) – Airport Transportation Experience and the Upper Valley Mobility Report (UVMR). The studies presented in that meeting provided recommendations, some of which have been addressed over time and others unaddressed. Those studies with the unaddressed recommendations are cited in the Addendum of this report.

Focus Group Meeting #2 - Thursday, September 19, 2019, 4pm – 7pm, Pitkin County Offices (530 E. Main Street). The meeting identified shared goals, values and priorities. The Group reviewed innovative ground transportation examples from other airports. The group then prioritized ground transportation options by mode based on community values and then evaluated the modes of transportation by priority and space allocation. Those results can be found [online here](#). Focus Group member Barry Vaughan was appointed by the group to produce a draft report based on the submittals from the group addressing the three questions posed.

Focus Group Meeting #3 - Wednesday, October 2, 2019, 4pm – 7pm, Aspen Meadows Doerr-Hosier Center. After the plenary session, the group broke out to review and discuss the draft report compiled based on information received. The group then appointed Jean Dodd to refine the draft based on additional information discussed that evening and additional submittals received up until October 9th. On October 14th the revised draft was sent to the entire Focus Group for review.

Focus Group Work Session Meeting #4 – Monday, October 21, 4-7pm (Airport Operations Center (AOC), 1001 Owl Creek Rd. Aspen, CO, 81611) A number of those in attendance at the October 2nd meeting offered to meet and work to develop a final draft of the consensus document. The updated version was distributed and posted to the webpage on October 22.

Focus Group Final Meeting #5 – Monday, November 4, 4-7pm (Airport Operations Center (AOC), 1001 Owl Creek Rd. Aspen, CO, 81611): Meeting to review/approve final consensus document and vote on Focus Group submission to Airport Vision Committee. The Focus Group summary document was approved by a significant majority vote of 12 “in favor” and 2 “opposed” with group members requesting that their names be associated with their vote as follows:

- **12 Votes In Favor:** Barry Vaughn; Jean Dodd; Evan Marks; Tami Solondz; Brandi Rice; Kate Spencer; Elijah Goldman; Mary Manning; Tom Coggins; Heather Dresser; Debra Mayer; Amos Underwood
- **2 Votes In Opposition:** Sue Binkley Tatem; Tim Mooney

More information about all Focus Group meetings and related materials can be found at: www.ase-vision.com/focus-group/

Executive Summary Issues and Summary Responses

“How can we improve airport connectivity?”

- What would more convenient and easy ground transportation to and from the airport look like?

Summary Response: More convenient and easy ground transport would include a mix of public and private modes of transportation to and from the airport. Consideration should be given to a variety of mass transport possibilities including light rail, monorail, gondola and greater utilization of RFTA, if feasible. A new multimodal transportation facility located primarily within the existing airport property perimeter, the new terminal and Highway 82, would serve all travelers. To enhance convenient movement to and from the terminal, and from and to the air traveler’s chosen ground transport mode, weather-protected facilities are important. There should be a coordinated balance of facilities for adequate parking, car rental, shuttle, taxi and private drop-off and pick-up. Additionally, coordinated management of traffic through the facility will maximize traveler convenience while minimizing energy consumption.

- How can we enhance multi-modal transportation options and create seamless connectivity to transit?

Summary Response: Facilitate the future development of a terminal with an integrated, multi-modal transportation and vehicular circulation facility that will simultaneously accommodate the convenient movement of mass transportation systems such as BRT, airport circulator buses, taxis, and hotel and rental car shuttles and rail-oriented transportation. Hire the appropriate design/engineering and funding consultants with demonstrated experience and expertise in multimodal airport ground transport projects and to engage local ground transportation stakeholders in the design process with public review and input during the process as is appropriate.

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

Summary Response: The Airport should be an integral part of the upper Roaring Fork Valley transportation network. Its efficient, safe and environmentally friendly operation is essential to the economic vitality of the community. Many factors in the coming years will affect the Airport’s ability to serve this function while helping to maintain the character of the Roaring Fork Valley community and the community’s values. Increasing public transport to and from the airport while minimizing disruption with existing forms of transport or increasing transportation inefficiencies will be challenging but worth the effort.

Report

Introduction

The following responses represent a diverse consensus of Focus Group opinion regarding the questions listed above. The method of creating this document was first to circulate proposed responses generated by one of the group's members and then to solicit additional responses from all Focus Group members who wanted to express their responses to these questions in their own words. All such responses have been included in this report without substantial revision, editing or consolidation. Only minor editing has been done in the interest of readability.

To the extent that there is redundancy, diversity of opinion and variation in writing style in the responses, this reflects the importance contributing Focus Group members attached to the questions posed and their desire to contribute to the discussion in their own words. Additionally, comments on issues considered important by some Focus Group members but not easily catalogued under the one of the three questions assigned to the Focus Group are presented below as "additional comments."

All the comments expressed in this report reflect a wide variety of the participating Focus Group opinions that are worthy of the county commissioners' consideration in moving forward with the renewal and rebuilding of the Aspen-Pitkin County Airport. In addition, at the end of this document is a summary list of the recommendations made as the result of past studies of transportation issues in the Roaring Fork Valley, which the Focus Group has taken into consideration in its work.

Issues and Detailed Responses

What would more convenient and easy ground transportation to and from the airport look like?

The airport connectivity component of operations at ASE has primarily two facets: terminal interface and ground transport interface. Recommendations regarding possibly improving ground transportation systems beyond the airport's boundaries, such as whether to reconfigure the Entrance to Aspen, enlarge the intercept lot, alter RFTA operations, or modify Highway 82's design are understood to be for the most part beyond the scope of the Focus Group's assignment. With these thoughts in mind, this first question appears to be a broad-brush conceptual question calling for a general, non-technical response rather than a detailed design/implementation plan. With that understanding, the Focus Group's wide variety of thoughts as to what "more convenient and easy ground transportation to and from the airport" would involve are as follows:

PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION

- Create a covered connection to transit to increase the desirability and usage.
- RFTA could improve service from the airport to Aspen and Snowmass, with frequent direct options. An electronic display board in the arrivals area could direct passengers to "free bus to Aspen or Snowmass" with updated real time departures.
- More use of mass transportation like busses and light rails.
- Easy walking access from buses to the terminal. It's not terribly far now, but you do have go down and then back up regardless of going up valley or down valley. You are also at the mercy of the weather.
 - If data shows buses to be a non-issue this also becomes a non-issue.
- Long Term: Integrate the scheduled Airport Circulator Bus into RFTA's route system in order to fully utilize the Valley's existing BRT infrastructure.
- Provide public busses that loop through the airport. There is something demeaning about dragging all your luggage out to the highway. Especially in a snowstorm.
 - We definitely need more data on the practicality of buses for air travelers.
- Create a bus stop by the arrival terminal.
- Make it easier to transport luggage on the bus. For guests that may mean some kind of luggage delivery. For locals it may be an area to put luggage on a bus.
- Schedules must align or be frequent enough to make people want to use it. It's no fun sitting at the bus stop for 45 minutes. There really isn't anywhere to hang out and wait at the terminal either.
- Need to create discrete spaces for the current mass transportation options.
- Long term parking somewhere along the BRT route may encourage more locals to bus it.
- Current RFTA ridership by Roaring Fork residents and guests for air travel through ASE appears surprisingly low. RFTA reports its ASE ridership to be less than what occur at Willits and other down-valley locations, and many of RFTA's ASE riders are believed to be airport employees or going to and from the ABC (Airport Business Center) and adjacent residential areas. The Focus Group believes that the consultants hired by the County to design and help implement the multimodal transit center should be charged with maximizing the potential for, and desirability of, RFTA access at the airport without sacrificing or eliminated the convenience and accessibility of private vehicular access, shuttle, taxi, rental, etc., for those who prefer it. A dialogue should also be started with RFTA regarding improvements RFTA could make, such as increased luggage capacity, to capture more ASE traffic.
- If personal vehicle use is to be discouraged, create a user-friendly and efficient shuttle areas - not only at the Brush Creek Intercept lot but also in Basalt and Carbondale. Pitkin County

residents who don't live in Aspen or Snowmass must drive themselves at least part of the way to airport and having a shuttle lot will be vital to making this work.

- Schedules are the biggest obstacle to using the busses. If you are late for a bus, you have to wait a long time for the next one ... 30 minutes for the Cross Town, or if it is too full, so the airport would end up with a lot of waiting and the busses would leave before the late planes arrived. Big waiting areas with seats would be necessary. I bet the people who missed a bus would hop in the taxis.
- Build in escape clauses for transportation that does not work so you are not stuck with the commitment. Thought experiment: What if we decided that RFTA did not live up to expectations. How would we get rid of this expensive mistake?
- An alternative view on RFTA is that the RFTA system is unsuited to airport transportation for a variety of reasons, such as traveler preference for other transportation modes, RFTA inefficiencies, lack of toilet facilities and baggage space on the current RFTA fleet, and the resistance of upscale travelers to using buses. Although this view is a minority position, it does highlight potential hurdles that would need to be overcome if RFTA airport ridership were to play a significant role in the future airport transportation mix.
- Many of our flying guests are rich enough to travel, and expect they are traveling to a luxury destination. They will not like riding busses. Period. But they are our "our business." Busses are not door to door. Busses have schedules that are hard to meet and cause a lot of waiting. It doesn't matter if you have a handicap lift into a bus, if you can't walk to get to it. Busses are packed and sealed in with people who have diseases to share.
- Commuter buses and air travelers are not a good mix. It would be important to gather data that demonstrates how popular buses are with air travelers before expending huge amounts of time and money on something people don't want. There is already some evidence that Uber and other ride-hails are cutting into mass transportation numbers.
- Put a RFTA and Grey Hound terminal in the Airport Terminal.
- Have RFTA include routes to AMTRAK in Glenwood Springs and Eagle/Vail Airport.
- Build a large European cable car type gondola that would not disrupt/would minimally disrupt the Marolt Open Space.
- I have always thought a gondola from the airport to town would be amazing (and it is listed on our vision statement). What an exceptional way to start your Aspen experience arriving in town on a gondola, then being picked up by electrical vehicles to be taken to your hotel/residence. Or being shuttled by an electrical vehicle to taken to Highlands, SMV, Buttermilk. Every time we visit Zermatt, we are impressed by the use of electric and alternative (horses) means of transportation from the train. There are no gas vehicles allowed in the town. From the town, you take either electric shuttles, trains, gondolas or walk to get around. Of course, the Swiss will engineer anything to the extreme! I'd love to see our town without gas vehicles - people come here for the natural beauty and the sporty experiences - why not start the experience from the airport and continue through you stay. Walk around town rather than drive you gas vehicle. There could be electric shuttles to take folks from town to various trailheads in the summer.
- Cooperation between various entities needs to be realized for any type of 'multimodal facility' to exist. The 'zero carbon' goals of the county and city of Aspen need to be taken into account. Except for the purchase of electric buses for RFTA, no effort has been taken for the county or city to electrify other fleets, not to mention rental cars.

LUGGAGE

- A luggage delivery system, if implementable.
- Movement of luggage directly from planes to traveler destinations.

- Presently, only delayed luggage gets this treatment. A company at the airport provides this service, which is paid by the appropriate airline.
- People will obsess about where their bags are. They will take cabs to the airport and back to pick up their bags rather than waiting for a delivery.
- Based on my observations, luggage is a big problem. Luggage delivery is a moot point if the bags never get here. I'd like to see some data on how long it takes to process a lost luggage claim for one person, with four claim tickets.
- An important fact to note. Unlike Denver, where DIA is 24.8 miles to Union Station, Aspen downtown is approximately only four miles to ASE. In our experience, very often a shared side trip to the Ritz is not desirable nor convenient for the individual who wanted to go to the Hotel Jerome.

RENTAL CARS:

- Rental cars are an important component. Flight cancellations result in passengers having to find alternate transport in or out of the valley. However, they could be relocated further away from the terminal, similar to long-term parking, rather than off-site.
- A targeted approach to minimize the usage of rental cars. All electric fleets for rental cars. Car share program for visitors.
- A remote lot would be great. The intercept lot is only three minutes' drive to the airport entrance. Electric vehicles with CDOT approved 'snow' tires (not 'all season') would be a plus.
- Move the rental car business and their parking /drop off/pick-up lots and service to the Aspen Dog Shelter area that Pitkin County owns. Move it off the airport entirely.

PARKING:

- Initially: Create ample but TEMPORARY surface-only parking areas for passengers and employees close to the Terminal (*Lots to Include*: Kiss and Go, Cell Phone, Short-Term, Long-Term, Rental Car, and Employee) but do NOT invest in any expensive structured parking at this time.
- Long Term: Collaborate with CDOT to create an ASE-designated structured parking facility at the Intercept Lot in order to accommodate Rental Car and Long-Term parking; Employee and Short-Term surface parking lots to be made available on County-owned property across Route 82 from the airport.
- Long Term: The overarching objective is to reduce the number of single-person occupancy vehicles traveling to/from ASE by making multi-passenger vehicular transit convenient and inexpensive with multiple choices for the consumer.
- Long Term: Create a primary multi-modal and BRT **mass transit corridor in between the Intercept Lot and ASE** that has subsidiary spokes between:
 - Aspen and ASE
 - Down Valley and the Intercept Lot
 - Snowmass and ASE.
- Long Term: Synchronize the new Terminal's future expansion [in both in terms of its number of gates and aircraft staging/apron area] with the phased reduction/elimination of the "foot-print" for most on-site surface parking lots in order to accommodate the expansion of the Terminal's footprint.
- Is a parking structure being considered? If so, it should be low-profile or underground. It could be landscaped to blend in from the highway or surrounding viewpoints.
- Consideration needs to be given to building an unobtrusive, ecologically friendly parking garage on the airport campus that is most likely primarily underground, easily reached from the new terminal, and large enough to accommodate future growth and act as the ground transit hub similar to the garage in Snowmass where RFTA buses and local shuttles pick up and drop

off skiers, bikers, visitors and locals on a regular schedule. Alternatively, and perhaps additionally, the large amount of real estate available at the Brush Creek Intercept Lot needs to be leveraged in partnership with CDOT, to provide airport long-term parking and rental car pick up. This could be accessed by dedicated circulating shuttles.

SIGNAGE/GUIDANCE:

- Clear delineation of where to go. It's pretty obvious when arriving where to go but departing is not currently clear unless there is a driver there with your name. Designated areas for different services will help with this.
 - Unfortunately, new airport security measures prohibit drivers from leaving their vehicles and going in the terminal. At one time High Mountain Taxi had an airport booth. We also had a web cam which allowed our dispatcher to see what was going on in the terminal and on the curb regarding passenger activity. An App available to all drivers would be extremely helpful in maximizing ground transportation efficiency.
- Many travelers arriving at ASE – or any airport – have the “deer in the headlights” look as they enter the terminal. Which way to go to collect your luggage? Which way to ground transportation? Clear, understandable signage is needed to direct people to where they want to go.
- Have a Transportation kiosk or ambassador with all transportation options (hotel shuttle, taxi, ride hailing/sharing, bus. Maybe an app that is part of a Chamber App.
 - The staff at the airport's customer service desk do a great job of directing passengers to transportation options. They could advise if any fine tuning was necessary.
- There is a need for a person or persons to offer assistance to outgoing and incoming passengers, besides airline employees. Maybe it's a Chamber of Commerce activity or maintaining an Information Desk at the airport.

GENERAL:

- Transportation should not force people to wait around.
- Timeliness, accessibility, and usefulness are three main factors. Maybe that's overly obvious, but if you have a system that is available at the times passengers want it, make it easy enough to get to and afford, and then get people in a timely fashion to their destination, you may have a success.
- Getting services closer to the terminal will help. Again, it's not that far now, but people like convenience.
- Many people say Aspen is unique and so is our airport. The airport is an airport. We should be taking the many lessons learned from other airports as a transportation hub and then tailor those to our specific needs. Also, people have certain expectations of how an airport flows, which makes it easier for them to navigate in an unfamiliar area. We shouldn't be discounting ideas brought forth from other areas.
- Aspen is unique in so many ways. That's why so many people want to visit here, as some eventually settle here. Be cautious when trying to apply what worked elsewhere to what might work here.
- Don't reinvent the wheel - it is crucial for the County's consultants to closely examine the successes and failures of ground transit networks at other similar airports, particularly in resort areas like Jackson Hole, Steamboat, Telluride, Hilton Head, Cape Cod, Carmel and at other identified airports that are physically constrained, reliant primarily on tourist traffic, close to a city or town, focused on being environmentally friendly, recently built or upgraded, etc.
- Temporary inconvenience or long-term changes to our airport could seriously damage the economy of the valley. Travelers are fickle and have many choices and if our airport becomes less convenient, they will just go somewhere else. Our tourists come here to have fun, the Aspen experience, and won't like it if the airport is inconvenient. As it is, we are already at the

mercy of weather to have the snow for skiing and for our airport to be convenient and fast in and out.

How can we enhance multi-modal transportation options and create seamless connectivity to transit?

This is a technical question calling for professional expertise and experience in airport multi-modal ground transport facility design, financing and construction. Both regional and major hub airports, such as Burbank and O'Hare, and presumably various local commercial airports, have apparently had great success in designing, and, importantly, financing, building and operating, multimodal transportation facilities that integrate seamlessly with ground transportation systems available in their areas with the assistance of experienced professionals. With that in mind, the way forward for ASE with respect to ground transport appears to be:

- Hire an engineering consulting firm and funding consultancy with demonstrated experience and expertise in multimodal airport ground transport design, financing, construction and operation to design and assist in arranging the financing for a multimodal ground transportation facility at ASE.
- Involve ground transportation stakeholders, such as RFTA, hotel shuttle service operators, car rental companies and taxi service companies, in the design process.
- A multimodal facility located within the existing ASE landside footprint that provides access for private vehicles, commercial shuttles, RFTA and Snowmass busses and shuttles, taxis and other vehicles for hire, rental vehicles, and short and medium term parking in one centralized location at the airport, with long-term parking and excess rental vehicle inventory being located off-site with shuttle support if necessary.
- The transportation hub should have straight through covered vehicle islands like they have at DIA. A circular commercial area requires too much dangerous backing up. There will be no enthusiasm for buses unless they are specifically designed for luggage and air travelers only. Air travelers and working commuters don't mix well. Even with the air traveler specific bus the question still presents itself... will people ride it? (Remember the great automated baggage system at DIA?) Sometimes what is perceived to be the greatest innovation falls flat on its face.
- Design a larger transportation center a short walk from the terminal to comply with TSA security requirements. Taxis, hotels shuttles, Uber, lyft, etc could stage in this area. "Car-to-go or Zip-car" could have some designated parking spaces.
- A flexible design of the multimodal facility so that it could adapt to and accommodate any
 - 1) staged expansion of the new terminal planned or anticipated for its intended service life and
 - 2) reasonably anticipatable modifications or improvements to
 - a) the Entrance to Aspen
 - b) Highway 82, or
 - c) RFTA service.
- Initially: Designate specific vehicular "standing areas" for passengers utilizing Taxis, Ride Sharing, Hotel Shuttles.
 - During the Winter months when weather becomes a major factor, the "standing" time might be considerable. Occasionally inbound flights are returned to Denver or diverted to Grand Junction.
- Accommodation provided shuttles for pick up and drop off.
- Create lanes for each mode of transportation (taxi/bus/ride share).

- Create a layout that is directional (up-valley/down-valley).
- The transportation hub, as well as the terminal and gates, should not just be ADA compliant but should be designed, built and managed to maximize the ease of use and comfort for special needs travelers.
 - The various agencies which work with the disabled veterans during their activities here would provide a gold mine of information pertaining to these special needs.
- Instead of individual hotel shuttles coming to the airport, we would provide continuous shuttle service leaving the airport, let's say, every 15-30 mins during peak times going into town stopping at requested hotels. Then the shuttles would return to the airport to repeat the service. We'd reduce congestion, noise, emissions by reducing the number of vehicles idling at curbside (finally complying with Aspen's no idling law). Hotels would provide this airport shuttle service with guest lists and guests would be informed prior to their arrival of this service.
 - A company has been running a PUC recognized shuttle service for years at ASE without any airport oversight to require them to be an actual "shuttle." No need to re-invent the wheel here. An experimental period using what we already have is necessary.
- Any kind of shuttle should attempt to align with airline schedules.
 - High Mountain Taxi does not take reservations at the airport, although passengers frequently make that request. I don't believe in any airport in the world that passengers can reserve a 'taxi'. Limos, yes. Taxicabs, I don't think so.
- Initially: Reserve a substantial "footprint" directly in between the new Terminal and Route 82 in order to facilitate the future development of a Terminal-integrated, multi-modal transportation depot and vehicular circulation corridor that will simultaneously accommodate the convenient movement for each of BRT, Airport Circulator Buses, Taxis, and Hotel and Rental Car Shuttles.
- Long Term: Five-to-ten years post-completion of the new ASE, the County should collaborate with CDOT and RFTA in order to complete the development of the aforementioned projects, i.e.:
 - A) the Terminal-integrated, multi-modal transportation depot and vehicular circulation corridor
 - B) an ASE-designated structured parking facility at the Intercept Lot to accommodate Rental Car and Long-Term parking
 - C) the Employee and Short-Term surface parking lots on County-owned property across Route 82 from the airport.
- Initially: Create financial incentives to utilize multi-passenger vehicular transportation to/from ASE by:
 - A) substantially increasing parking lot rates to all users EXCEPT airport employees,
 - B) requiring all hotels [over 25 keys] to provide airport shuttles whose cost is factored into room rates, and
 - The larger hotels already provide this courtesy vehicle service. Some examples are; The Ritz, St. Regis, Dancing Bear, Hotel Jerome, The W, Molly Gibson/HotelAspen, The Stonebridge Inn, The Westin, The Viceroy and the Lime-lite (both Aspen and Snowmass).
 - C) developing a scheduled free Airport Circulator Bus route, accessible with a simple mobile app, to service Aspen, Snowmass, the Intercept Lot, and possibly Down Valley.
 - Most major airports already have this service -- it is called a shuttle service. Passengers sacrifice a one stop door to door service for a longer trip at a discounted price.

- Provide for taxi/shuttle marshals at curbside to assist arriving passengers to find their ride and to communicate by radio or cell phone with off-site taxi/shuttle queues and operators. Consider installation and maintenance of a web based CCT system to allow operators to monitor arrivals and to deploy needed cabs and shuttles without undue passenger curbside delay.
- Most of the larger hotels provide a courtesy shuttle vehicle with regularly scheduled rides. One hotel has a counter inside the terminal so they can properly greet their guests. A new wrinkle is the new regulation which does not allow drivers to 'meet and greet' their manifested passengers inside the terminal with a sign. This DHS (Department of Homeland Security) requirement needs to be addressed.
- The County needs to create an airport transportation "czar"/facilitator position whose role would be to work with and coordinate all of the disparate public and private entities that currently, as well as in the future, have an interest or stake in providing ground transit to and from the airport. The coordinator's job would include ensuring multiple transit modalities are represented and available to the flying public, from rental car companies to taxis to Uber to RFTA to hotel shuttles to light rail (if ever adopted in the future), etc. Finding ways for each of these modalities to coexist and operate in a way that meets community values, emissions goals, reduction of congestion and one-person vehicle trips, and other current and future airport transit goals would be central to this job's purpose. This person would also manage the curbside and terminal marshals who help travelers find the appropriate type of ground transportation from the airport to their local accommodations. Working to increase both public and private transit options for travelers is a prime goal of what the new ASE airport should be providing visitors and local users of the airport.
- Adequate weather-protected pedestrian- and handicapped-access with luggage transport support between the terminal landside entrances and exits to the various ground transport modalities at the airport, such as car rental pickup and return, shuttles, RFTA, taxis, private vehicle curbside pickup and drop-off, and private vehicle parking.
- Straight-through islands like those at DIA to address weather issues. A roof covering what is now the entire four lane arrival access would be needed to accommodate the various modes of transportation.

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

Like the first question, this is a broad-brush conceptual, nontechnical question calling for a general response rather than a detailed technical analysis. With that understanding, the Focus Group does have some observations to share regarding how ASE fits into the existing surface transportation network:

- Transportation between Snowmass Village and ASE does not appear to be problematic or in need of a solution, even during peak travel periods. The Focus Group has not been made aware of any serious disfunction or need for improvement of ground transportation between the two. Accordingly, these recommendations do not address any issues unique to ground transport between the airport and Snowmass Village.
- The Entrance to Aspen and possible solutions to the daily traffic delays that can and often do occur there, especially during peak seasons, appear to remain at present intractable and highly contentious issues. Whether enlargement of capacity along this route, and if capacity were to be enlarged at the entrance, how, where and for what mix of private and public traffic, remain the subjects of strongly held divergent views and vigorous debate. The Focus Group believes

that the County's ASE Vision process would be best served by staying out of that debate and by the County's designing, funding, building and operating a multimodal ground transportation facility that has the flexibility to accommodate and interface with whatever off-airport ground transportation systems presently exist or may reasonably be anticipated to exist in the future.

- Design flexibly for the future: e.g. we don't have to have a light rail out of the gate, but the new design should include the space to add a light rail in the future without necessitating another redesign.
- Leverage as many existing modes of transportation as possible for new uses rather than creating bespoke new modes just for the airport.
- The airport should act as one of the hubs of our regional transportation network. It currently just acts as a stop. People should be able to reliably use a bus, train, shuttle or ride hail from here.
- The dedicated Hwy 82 transit corridor/right of way and easements need to be preserved and maintained to accommodate future use, particularly for light rail or some other local transit mode that we may not yet know of today. This is a way to "future-proof" airport ground transport to a time when technology and funding catch up to a point that innovative and ground-breaking methods can be seriously considered for implementation.
- The Aspen Airport does not fit into any broader transportation network.
- This is a great opportunity to use this transportation facility for the overall benefit of a valley wide system. Planning for the future would include using any increased capacity to accommodate traffic and transit loads. The airport is well positioned to be an upper valley hub serving commuters in Aspen, Snowmass and the length of the valley.

Additional Comments

- Pitkin County should not try to limit airline service solely to regional aircraft due to the future regional pilot shortage. SkyWest Inc. president and CEO Chip Childs recently warned the US Congress of a “growing pilot shortage” that could become significantly more pronounced over the next three years, leading to the grounding of large numbers of aircraft in US regional airlines’ fleets. <http://m.atwonline.com/government-affairs/skywest-ceo-warns-pilot-shortage-could-lead-big-service-cuts>
- Here is a short video sent to Pitkin County Commissioners two years ago with a vision for transportation at the airport. <https://vimeo.com/235917768> As a side note, I tried not having a car for 8 years and commuted to Denver several times a month renting vehicles from the airport. Eventually, it became cheaper to own a car than deal with the hassle and cost of renting cars. Occasionally, cars wouldn't be available during busy times, or the cost became exorbitant during holiday periods (understandable) and taking the Bustang to Denver required too many connections and too much time. The city's carpool program doesn't exist from what I experienced, and Car To Go is antiquated and more costly than renting a car. The city's arrangement with Enterprise to offer a flat or discounted rate was only based on availability, which meant it didn't help at the times I needed it. In the end, my experiment to not own or need a car in Aspen failed, but I see the airport as an excellent opportunity to have a mobility hub that hosts many different transportation services that effectively make it possible to not need a personal vehicle in Aspen.
- In terms of the visitor experience, I can't imagine a better way to set the tone for what our community values are and how unique the valley is than by having a variety of convenient and environmentally friendly mobility options when people arrive. It can be a positive experience if planned well and utilizing some vision.
- During an airport tour earlier this month, two separate airline employees came up to us and shared (emotionally) the poor condition of employee services. Only one bathroom for the employees to use and that there is not a rest/break room area for the employees. Currently the one bathroom is inadequate to clean up after being shot in the face/body with waste that sometimes come off the planes (yuck). Currently, the rest/break area is out in the open with baggage screening without a sink to wash off your dishes - you have to go to the one bathroom to wash off your dishes/cups, etc. The employees shared that often times during the peaks seasons due to flight delays their initial eight-hour shifts will last 12-14 hours.
- DIA has a separate (though temporary) area for friends and family greeting new arrivals at the airport. The new ASE design should consider this type of space in order to get it away from the baggage area, as it is now, and to create a comfortable, welcoming spot to meet and greet. Some of the most emotional moments happen in places like this.
- Build a new terminal with a professional specialist terminal architect and design team. Include the basic multi modal fundamentals that are needed to facilitate a mass transit system as described in Eduard Oliemans First Mile – Last Mile local regional and state wide design concepts.
- When figuring out how all this works, don't leave out the requirements of those over at the FBO.
- Although the Focus Group scope is primarily concerned with ground transportation modalities for commercial aviation customers, the FBO clients' transport needs cannot be overlooked or forgotten. It makes no sense to resolve ground transit congestion, modalities, flow, accessibility, etc., for some users and not for all. Both types of fliers contribute to the challenges that transit to/ from the airport faces, and both types need to get to their ultimate accommodation.

Keeping this in mind, it is incumbent on the BOCC to create a competitive market for the current FBO operator by finding a way and place to add a second FBO operator. The current monopoly is creating unintended negative consequences ranging from outrageous fuel prices to an unwillingness and disincentive to reduce emissions, noise and other community values-type operation methods at the FBO.

- Move the FBO to the other side or the West side to park all the private aircraft making room for parking and new terminal. Use the old one while you're building the new terminal north.
- The airport runway problem could be solved by keeping it as is where is. Just move the taxi to the East so that there is no wing overlap. Lot cheaper too. You can use the taxi way you have while you construct the new one. This idea limits where you can put the new terminal. Moving Highway 82 would be cheaper than building a new runway.
- Redirect Highway 82 around to the west side using Owl Creek Road then move the terminal where 82 was making room to move the taxiway east. This would slow traffic into Aspen as well spreading the congestion out before the roundabouts.
- The only way to handle to control emissions is with fewer flights, less traffic. Or a shuttle system flying out of Rifle. Spread the emissions to other areas.
- Build a new terminal to include the Eduard Oliemans First Mile to Last Mile concepts.
- I had an opportunity to visit Eduard Olieman's office and see his vision for a transit hub. Unfortunately, the site for this hub is where the new city offices are being built.
- Every one of the 124 members of the ASE Advisory Committee should have a Vote. One Man/Woman = 1 vote on the final recommendations to the PCC.
- Mike Kaplan, Bill Tomcich and all the employees of the Aspen Skiing Company should be called out with a conflict of interest and be required to recuse themselves.
- Inform Jon Peacock this is not a competition between Eagle/Vail, Rifle, Grand Junction.
- Move the TSA and The PC Airport Administration on offices to the AABC.
- 100% All Electric Airport...on the ground and in the air.
- Have Pitkin County own and operate the FBO.
- Cut the number of gates in half at the FBO and the ASE Terminal.
- DO NOT EXPAND the runway in any way.
- Do Not strengthen, widen, lengthen the runway air side improvements until the next new generation all Electric planes are in service.
- Install a new GPS landing system.
- Authorize new air approaches and take-off patterns.
- Require the PCBCC to appoint an airport Board of Directors/Advisory Board that reports directly to the BOCC like other budget driven divisions of the county with recommendation powers to the BOCC. The PC Manager is unprepared and inexperienced in being in charge of the airport. This is out of the job description and expertise of the PC Manager. The Airport Manager will report directly to the Airport Board. The petty political power play of the Airport and County Manager needs to be dissolved ASAP so they can't play ball with the FAA, Consultants and Corporate Greedheads for their own personal gains.

APPENDIX A: Previous Studies

COMPILED FOCUS GROUPS BULLET POINTS THAT ALSO LISTS THE STUDY RECOMMENDATIONS FROM PREVIOUS YEARS

(Overall Combined, Outside Studies Observations)

- Free-flowing traffic is not a reasonable expectation unless congestion reduction measures are sufficient to reduce current traffic and mitigate future induced traffic.
- The U.S. is undergoing a transition away from a car-centric culture. Millennials are buying fewer cars than previous generations, and parking demand is expected to drop.
- Regional and local land use decisions profoundly affect mobility challenges and traffic congestion.
- Specific elements of the integrated mobility system will affect different people and different geographies in varying ways. We should consider carefully which user group is affected by each element of the system and plan accordingly.
- The primary advantage of LRT is that it reduces the number of buses in Aspen to the greatest degree.
- The number of intercepted buses (458 bus trips per day) would be replaced with 144 two-car train trips per day.
- The BRT alternative has lower capital and O&M costs than LRT and would reduce travel time via the construction of the Marolt easement crossing and dedicated bus lanes from Brush Creek to Buttermilk.
- If capital improvements include the construction across the Marolt easement preferred alignment, it would improve traffic operations, travel times, and safety. This alignment is already cleared by the ROD... Voters have already approved the LRT alternative. This arrangement also preserves the opportunity to convert the dedicated bus lanes for future LRT.
- A grassroots advocacy organization for an integrated mobility system is essential.
- The integrated mobility system adopted should leverage existing approvals and plans (e.g., the Entrance to Aspen Record of Decision, Aspen Area Community Plan, etc.).

Combined Summary Recommendations from Past Studies

Sources:

2017 Upper Valley Mobility Report by Community Forum Task Force on Transportation and Mobility, Aspen Institute Community Program

2017 Upper Valley Mobility Study proposed by Parsons

2014 Surface Transportation Best Practices Study, Aspen/Pitkin County Airport, Felsburg Holt & Ullevig

2013 The West of Maroon Creek Master Plan, Pitkin County, Adopted October 8, 2013

2012 Aspen Area Community Plan, City of Aspen and Pitkin County

On Airport Site:

- Have greeters/passenger assistants promote transit/shuttles when asked about getting to Aspen and/or Snowmass Village – **ACRA provides this service for the airport.**

- Reroute the “Parking and Transportation” link on the airport website homepage to the ground transportation page rather than the parking page, order modes with alternative modes first and parking/rental cars last, and display all transit information on ground transportation page rather than forcing users to click another page. – **The airport's new website will incorporate this (due to be complete 1st quarter 2020).**
- Explore the feasibility of installing bike lockers – **The TSA prevents the usage of lockers in close proximity due to security concerns.**
- Provide free baggage trolleys that can be used between the transit stops and the terminal (dependent on facility upgrades)
- Consider heated sidewalks between the terminal and the airport bus stops as a short-term improvement.
- Ensure that the walkway from terminal to bus stations on SH 82 is enclosed and temperature controlled for the longest distance possible and is conveniently connected to the baggage claim in addition to the ticketing area.
- Work with RFTA to install real-time bus information within the terminal, which could include estimated walk time to the bus stations, bus route and time display, and large map digital display with real-time bus locations and estimated arrival times.
- Consider integration of transit stops (including accommodations for possible fixed-guideway transit access) into the terminal in terminal redevelopment plans.
- Improve bike connection from the grade-separated transit tunnel to the terminal.
- 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.
- Reserve room on the Airport property for future commuter parking needs to support the mass transit system.
- Work with rental car companies on ways to tailor the rental car inventory to take advantage of new technologies that reduce emissions and increase fuel economy.
- Work with lodges and hotels in the Aspen/Snowmass Area on measures to improve shuttle service to reduce reliance on rental cars.
- Improve signage and information to direct users from terminal to public transit services.

Recommendations In Proximity To The Airport Site:

- The community should seek public/private partnerships to help implement mobility decisions.
- We should improve mobility incrementally and continuously.
- The package of mobility experiments now being planned by the City of Aspen should be used by Aspen, Pitkin County and Snowmass Village to help demonstrate and explore elements of this integrated mobility system.
- We should engage innovators and entrepreneurs from all sectors to help create the mobility system we envision.

Appendix B: Minority Report

- Sue Binkley Tatem (submitted individual Focus Group Minority Report)
- Tim Mooney (submitted individual Focus Group Minority Report)

Appendix B.1: Sue Binkley Tatem Minority Report – ASE Vision Focus Group – November 5, 2019

AN OPPOSING POINT OF VIEW Sue Binkley Tatem, Ph.D.

I am a retired biology professor, now a local artist in Aspen, living at the Gant for over two decades. I came here for the skiing and ice skating and walk around town. Now I am 75 and no longer so active and use wheelchairs in large airports so I have some ADA experience. I see our guests in the hot tub every day. I painted aerial views. **We already do airports better.** Seventy years of frequent flying, often alone with a pet, since I was five (Oshkosh to Cincinnati by way of Chicago). Around the world with National Geographic, Hawaii and the Caribbean, Spain, Italy, England, Japan, Galapagos.

******Aspen has the BEST AIRPORT with the FASTEST IN AND OUT of the world. I volunteered to try to save THE BEST of this BEST AIRPORT.**

We had a sticker vote on the types of transportation. No surprise to me hotel vans had 19 votes, taxis had 6, mass transit had only 1. The baggage area is adjacent to the pickup by the taxis and the hotel vans. No airport in the world has so short a distance from baggage to transport. So the transport is SEAMLESS. Passenger to baggage, baggage goes with the passenger to transport, about a fifty foot walk. Taxi or hotel van to destination or hotel. Hotel bellhop service to room. The hotel vans have space for the luggage, the taxis can carry it on their roofs. The luggage stays with the traveler. Are we the patsies? Money leads to Gulfstream? Crown?

In the committee discussions most participants don't want closed jetways from the planes to the terminal. They love stepping out the airplane door into Aspen's fresh crisp air, it is the first refreshing moment of the ASPEN EXPERIENCE.

The terminal is ONE FLOOR. This eliminates the need for stairs, escalators, and elevators. Babies in strollers and wheel chair users can roll without interruption through from ticketing through security to gates on departures, and from gates to baggage to vans and taxis on arrivals.

I never used the restaurant or bought anything from the gift shop, these could be reduced to a small unmanned kiosk. WATER, BAGS OF PRETZELS, COOKIES, POSTCARDS, AND SKI AREA pins all **FREE**. No big SCREEN ADVERTISING.

- NO JETWAYS
- FREE BLING No shopping or dining, space for the employee break room. No nickel and diming.
- BAGGAGE NEXT TO TRANSPORT AS IT IS NOW Free luggage carts.
- Expand the current terminal waiting area capacity by extending the building over the landscaping with glass enclosed porches. No overnight parking. Small only car rentals. One story terminal.
- Runway and terminal changes? What would be the schedule for disruption of travels? No RAFTA, our luxury guests hate being forced to use it to go to Bells.
- Pilot shortage? We're rich, we can buy our own pilots.

Appendix B.2: Tim Mooney Minority Report – ASE Vision Focus Group – November 6, 2019

Hi Everybody,

Thanks for your generous efforts and positive response!

Please consider Pausing the Vision Advisory Committee Train and All air side expansion so that we can get and further gather and understand all the data involved in such complicated / multi player / multi business voices / angles and multi Unintended Growth and Safety consequences.

Clearly, There is NO rush to start the expansion of the accidental and non-reversible consequences of expanding the runway to facilitate Bigger Airplanes with longer wing spans of 95 ft. both Commercial and Private.

The CJ 700 can & will be the work horse of the Aspen Commercial Air Fleet thru 2039.

The FAA is not pressuring ASE to Standardize.

The Growth implications of bigger planes with more people will further crush the caring capacities of Aspen , Snowmass, Basalt ,Glenwood Springs and State HWY # 82.

The stabilizing enplanement growth .8%, the noise level and pollution level reduction 'Principals' ,chosen during the Vision Committee meetings, for the Sardy Field will never be a reality and will never be codified with teeth to enforce these limits...according to Jon Peacock much to the dismay of John Bennett.

The incremental expansionist degradation of the local lifestyle, in a Historic Ski Town at 8,000 Ft in a box canyon surrounded by granite clouds that are the highest ridgeline of the Rocky Mt's. western slope, will be a simple corporate power push if the airport is expanded to a design 3 Group allowing all aircraft in that category.

Less Local Characters, More flights, bigger planes, more tourists, more hotel rooms, more restaurants, more parking, more pollution, more corporate power, more repetition of the same.

Let's lock in the next generation green electric planes with our airline service providers before we become a standard Class 3 design airfield.

Let's keep the 95 Ft wing span limitation so we can control our safety and Growth as a community.

Our operation of the greenest local recreational airport in the world not necessarily the biggest regional runway assures a profitable sustainable air operations for Pitkin County.

The resort is setting records for skier visits and return on investments now.

The economy in the Roaring Fork Valley is strong.

There are \$2.5 Billion in Real Estate transactions annually because of the Beauty of the mountains and the small town characters.

Why kill the Goose that is laying the Golden Eggs.

The Character of the community will further be erased if the Industrial Tourism Model of Expansionism of the Ski Co's Ikon Pass business plan infects the accessibility of the Roaring Fork Valley.

Please pause the Vision Advisory committee and Airport Expansion Deal that is on the table to allow the City of Aspen and our Elected Officials to have a vote and a voice in the future growth impacts that are going to change their responsibilities to their citizen with the expansion of the runway and bigger 737 style airplanes and many thousands of additional sightseers coming here thru the airport.

Please consider allowing each of the 120+ citizen volunteer to vote on the recommendations to the PCC.

1 person 1 vote.

We have paid our dues to participate in the \$1.5M committee meetings.

We deserve the dignity of being heard individually with a Yes or No vote.

It is insulting to all who worked so hard in committee to give a voting voice to only a select group of 25+/- who will have the power to erase or fortify the votes of about 7 volunteer citizens with just their thumbs up or down.

Please stop the Jon Peacock bullying and steering of the expansion wind shear to arrive at his and the hired consultants on his team conclusions that we should spend \$450 M to \$500 M on making the Aspen/Pitkin County Airport the winner in a competition with Eagle / Vail, Rifle and Grand Junction instead of designing a cooperative transportation system of links to connect and enhance all Statewide & especially Western Slope towns transit facilities.

Please stop the process so professional consultants can debate all sides plus other ideas and designs that focus on ground transportation solutions to access Aspen, Snowmass, the Roaring Fork Valley and the entire state.

Please have all committee recommendations be viewed thru the Character Committee lens and approval via an in favor or not in favor vote.

Please pause the committee process and planned expansions to have EIS studies, like the FAA did on the Airport property, or an Environmental Assessment analysis done on the towns of Aspen, Snowmass, Basalt and Glenwood Springs.

The county should pay for the data to inform the local municipalities of the positive and negative impacts that will be ahead if the Aspen/PC airport is expanded.

Please consider raising funds to pay for airport safety improvements and a new terminal and new tower leaving the runway the same width / turning dimensions without FAA money.

The city and the county joint owners together they could be striving at the airport for enhanced safety, governing growth and regulating the operations costs to benefit the community.

Please pause and consider appointing an ASE Advisory Board of Directors, of City and County volunteers, with air business experts to be in charge/manage ASE instead of a county manager with zero air service experience and expertise who has his own political agenda.

Please pause the process to eliminate obvious conflict of interest characters like Mike Kaplan, John Sarpa, Charles Cunniff, etc. and all who were paid by a business, company or special interest group while sitting on a committee.

Please codify regulations at the FBO to prohibit charter flights.

Please reconfigure the FBO so to limit expansion of take offs and landings, added services for bigger planes and increased Fractional Jet type parking.

Please take the time to assess methods of profitizing the FBO thru City and County control.

Please give the time community to take a deep breath and realize that the airport expansion train is rolling thru town for reasons of corporate greed not community need.

Thanks so much for all you do.

I appreciate you all.

I hope to speak with you soon,

Sincerely, Tim