

A three-hour Stakeholder Working Group (SWG) workshop held on April 4, 2012, focused on the alternatives and options that were to be presented at the Public Open House held later that day. After reviewing the Public Open House exhibits, the 19 stakeholders broke into four groups that were facilitated by members of the study team. They were given the Topics for Discussion (in the left column below), and asked to discuss what the group liked about certain options, and what concerns they would have with them and why. The participants were asked not to choose any of the options, but to explain what was

important about what they liked and didn't like. Each group started with a different topic so that each was covered by at least one group. Some groups discussed more than one of the topics. The groups' discussions were recorded on flipcharts. The bullets (by group) are presented in the table below. The study team will use these comments and ideas to further develop and screen alternatives for the project.

| Topics for Discussion   | Group Discussion Points from Flipcharts   |  |  |         |
|---|---|--|--|---------|
|   | Group 1   | Group 2  | Group 3  | Group 4 |
| <p><b>Couplet Alignments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cooper or Grand               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Cross section an available ROW and space</li> <li>- Access requirements</li> <li>- Impacts to historic structures</li> <li>- Opportunities to enhance pedestrian environment on Grand</li> <li>- Economic impacts from traffic, parking changes, aesthetics</li> <li>- Ability to meet design standards</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Colorado               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Potential economic impacts from traffic, parking changes, aesthetics</li> <li>- Impacts to residential properties</li> <li>- Additional ROW needs</li> <li>- Impacts to businesses on 8th or 9th during construction</li> <li>- Ability to meet design standards</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do we want to "spread out the pain" or keep it on Grand?</li> <li>• Wing Street is not critical to the businesses.</li> <li>• A pedestrian friendly area at the bridge touchdown.</li> <li>• Don't prefer couplets - want to keep traffic on grand.</li> <li>• Has an effect on wayfinding.</li> <li>• How does couplet work with proposed government campus (2014)?</li> <li>• Pedestrians and bikes being able to cross the river - improvement/increase capacity, less conflicts.</li> <li>• Alternative 3 has second pedestrian crossing opportunity.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cooper would be least impactful to downtown.</li> <li>• Cooper/Colorado used to low traffic - this would change.</li> <li>• A lot of improvements required on either.</li> <li>• Cooper would impact access to new library and parking garage.</li> <li>• Businesses on Cooper would see more drive-by traffic.</li> <li>• Colorado seems better, but a lot of things are impacted (courthouse, Post Office, school).</li> <li>• Traffic signals on Colorado or Cooper (bad)</li> <li>• Aesthetic impacts on Cooper.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sensitivity to losing any parking downtown.</li> <li>• Fire station, church, library, City's parking lot - road between parking garage and library will restrict access.</li> <li>• Business on Cooper wouldn't support this.</li> <li>• Rivera or Italian Underground okay with pedestrian traffic.</li> <li>• Less noise with through traffic off Grand.</li> <li>• Underpass is a crime area - now creating a second one. Could create a space for pedestrians -plaza with lighting.</li> <li>• Northbound Grand better than northbound Cooper - less noise, more sidewalk/parking. Would remove visibility of businesses one way.</li> </ul> <p>Southbound Colorado</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Post office is there - could soften curve to avoid it.</li> <li>• S-curves in Aspen</li> <li>• S-curves Colorado to Grand.</li> <li>• Concern with elementary school traffic.</li> <li>• Philosophical differences - short term vs. long-term solution.</li> <li>• Loss of Pool visibility coming and going.</li> <li>• Downtown businesses will lose drive-by traffic.</li> <li>• Visitors Center will also lose drive-by traffic.</li> <li>• Signage could help.</li> <li>• Right turn onto Grand - creates pedestrian conflicts.</li> <li>• Need to talk to business owners between 7th and 9th.</li> </ul> <p>Information needs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Investigate traffic circulation nuances - s-curve, circling back into downtown.</li> <li>• Talk to businesses on Cooper and Grand.</li> <li>• Talk to school district about elementary school.</li> </ul> |         |

| Topics for Discussion  | Group Discussion Points from Flipcharts |   |         |   |
|--|---|---|---------|---|
|  | Group 1                                 | Group 2   | Group 3 | Group 4   |
| <p><b>One Bridge or Couplet</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential to enhance downtown Glenwood</li> <li>• Additional ROW needs</li> <li>• Construction cost</li> <li>• Construction impacts and ability to construct off-line</li> <li>• Impacts to residential properties</li> </ul>   |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Single bridge is best- couplets bypass Grand Avenue - couplets harm businesses.</li> <li>• Two blocks of downtown would make great business areas.</li> <li>• Couplets create disturbance to new improvements (Post Office, parking garage, library).</li> <li>• Would couplets have a “splitting effect” to downtown?</li> <li>• Potential disruption to properties on Colorado and Cooper.</li> <li>• Is it more important for businesses to be seen or for easier access to businesses?</li> <li>• Couplets require difficult intersections to get back on Grand.</li> <li>• Couplets require more construction (2 of everything) = more cost.</li> <li>• Rehab alternative seems to be overlooked; need a more open discussion of this alternative.</li> <li>• Look at function first, then cost.</li> </ul> |         |   |
| <p><b>Bike/Ped</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ability to accommodate bikes and peds on Grand Avenue bridge</li> <li>• Ability to accommodate bikes and peds on more than one bridge (couplet)</li> <li>• Bike and ped access to bridge(s) – ramp, at-grade, elevator</li> <li>• Opportunities to increase sidewalk widths</li> <li>• Continuity with bike network</li> </ul> |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Put a rest stop (point of interest) in between the long walk between north side and south side.</li> <li>• Couplets would help people cross Grand Avenue.</li> </ul>   |         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Three trails meet in downtown.</li> <li>• Like the separate structure for pedestrians.</li> <li>• Need to retain connection from Pool and hotels to downtown/Grand.</li> <li>• View from bridge for pedestrians/bikes.</li> <li>• Connect bikes on bridge to south side facilities.</li> <li>• Couplet offers opportunity to provide two bike/pedestrian crossings.</li> <li>• Connection on south should be as direct as possible. If it doesn't meet ADA, consider elevator.</li> <li>• Rather have good bike access on south even if it removes Wing St. and left turns at 8th.</li> <li>• On-street bikes and shared-use paths - minimum 10 feet.</li> <li>• If structure is 8 feet and at east/west alleys between 7th and 8th, could accommodate bikes to connect to bridge(s).</li> <li>• Bike routes - Cooper and Colorado. Couplets would need to accommodate network.</li> <li>• Like pedestrian focus for Grand.</li> <li>• Bring bike/pedestrian facility to Cooper.</li> <li>• Providing bike/pedestrian access across Grand Avenue at the alley would enhance bike/pedestrian connectivity.</li> </ul> |

| Topics for Discussion  | Group Discussion Points from Flipcharts  |   |   |         |
|--|--|---|---|---------|
|  | Group 1  | Group 2   | Group 3   | Group 4 |
| <p><b>North Side Landing</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction impacts and ability to construct off-line</li> <li>• Length and cost of bridge</li> <li>• Intersection design – signals, roundabout, reconfiguration</li> <li>• Additional right-of-way needs</li> <li>• Connectivity and ability to accommodate higher volumes</li> <li>• Access to/from Hot Springs area</li> <li>• Impacts to view sheds</li> <li>• Impacts to businesses</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction impacts - do we want our town "to look like that".</li> <li>• Entry opportunities.</li> <li>• Redevelopment opportunities - Laurel has redevelopment opportunities.</li> <li>• Currently hard to park off of 6th.</li> <li>• Allow freeway traffic to clear the area.</li> <li>• Reduce congestion on 6th.</li> <li>• Under the bridge environment.</li> <li>• Be attractive to pedestrian traffic to improve their experience.</li> <li>• Concerns with use of a roundabout.</li> <li>• Alternative C looks too "Big City"; pedestrian impacts.</li> <li>• Alternative A better since it keeps thru traffic out of intersection.</li> <li>• Concerns with long signals holding thru traffic.</li> <li>• People going to the Pool. They will get there.</li> <li>• Laurel alternatives clean up 6th/Pine pedestrians.</li> <li>• Improve pedestrian access to local business.</li> <li>• Alternatives 2 and 3 "force" redevelopment.</li> <li>• Alternative 3 improved view from Pool.</li> <li>• Intersection Alternative C – worst on view shed.</li> <li>• View shed is independent as long as bridge is an "attractive" bridge.</li> <li>• Headlight impacts – Pine is preferred.</li> <li>• All alternatives have minimal impact to Pool parking.</li> <li>• What is scale of roundabout? Too large – too urban.</li> <li>• Current bridge gives both directions a view of the Pool.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 6th St. provides character to entrance to Glenwood Springs. People are used to this (return visitors) benefit to this. Sioux Villa character.</li> <li>• Bypassing local businesses on 6th St. is a negative.</li> <li>• Bypassing 6th St. is an opportunity to enhance 6th St.</li> <li>• Curves on couplets make the streets wider where pedestrians need to cross.</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction impacts – reduced impacts preferred, but should not limit long-term objectives.</li> <li>• Couplet offers construction options and provides opportunities for enhanced bike/pedestrian connections on the north.</li> <li>• If new west couplet built with wide bike/pedestrian, could be used to accommodate two-way traffic during east bridge construction.</li> <li>• Simplify movements on north side to accommodate bike and pedestrian crossings of project</li> <li>• Concern with business impacts.</li> <li>• Grand northbound couplet better for business.</li> <li>• Couplet concerns more critical on south than north.</li> <li>• Bike network to serve connection from Two Rivers to Glenwood Canyon trail. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Connections to hotels, Pool, and trails.</li> <li>- Connect Two Rivers to Vapor Caves.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |         |
| <p><b>Parking</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parking on Colorado, Grand and Cooper</li> <li>• Parking on 8th and 9th</li> </ul>  |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need quick access to pick up/drop off things.</li> <li>• If you are shopping, parking can be further away.</li> <li>• What's more important – parking or sidewalks? Parking: don't decrease it, maybe enhance it.</li> <li>• Need more businesses downtown.</li> <li>• Separate pedestrian bridge is better than sidewalk on bridge.</li> <li>• Parking is an important consideration for restaurant selection.</li> </ul> |   |         |