

## Overview

Alternatives 1, 3, 4, and 6 each require tradeoffs between community values or project objectives. The Stakeholder Working Group attendees were asked to consider some of these and discuss what they liked about certain options, and what concerns they had and why. They were asked by the facilitators to focus on what was relevant to each of the four alternatives in the following areas:

- Construction impacts
- Impacts to view sheds and aesthetic opportunities
- Impacts to businesses
- Ability to accommodate bikes and pedestrians
- Length and cost of bridge
- Intersection design at Laurel
- Additional right-of-way needs
- Access to/from Hot Springs area
- Impacts to businesses and land uses
- Circulation and traffic
- Downtown circulation and traffic
- Parking changes

As the groups rotated to the four stations to discuss each alternative, they were asked:

- What is important about each topic in terms of this alternative?
- What are some of the advantages and disadvantages with this alternative?
- What are the tradeoffs?
- What information would help you understand the advantages and disadvantages about this alternative?

The feedback is summarized by alternative on the next pages.

## Alternative 1

### Construction impacts

- What is the duration of construction?
- What is the number and duration of lane closures?
- How do you accommodate ADA during construction?
- Winter conditions during construction.
- Impacts to businesses and sidewalks between 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup>.
- Construction impacts to old buildings – how invasive is construction to old buildings?
- What are the noise impacts to businesses during construction?
- The length of construction impacts businesses.
- Impact on convenience of access to downtown and businesses.
- How will pedestrians and bikes be accommodated during construction?
- Rebuild in existing space = big impact.
- How long will bridge construction disrupt traffic?
- How many lanes can stay open?
- What options exist for traffic control/movements during construction?
- Where will the staging take place?
- How long will staging take place?
- Handling traffic and pedestrian movements.
- Businesses – getting in and out of businesses during construction and beyond.

### Alternative 1 Single bridge at existing location aligned to Pine



### Impacts to view sheds and aesthetic opportunities

- Height of bridge between 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> and impacts to buildings on either side show visually the proximity to buildings (view sheds and business impacts).
- Will the view be the same except for businesses on south side?
- What will plaza area north of 8th look like?
- Can you still see the mountains?
- Alternative 1 can be the most aesthetically pleasing bridge.
- Can this alternative provide a pleasing (iconic) design?
- Single bridge potentially most attractive alternative.
- Make it attractive to look at.
- Make pedestrian access better at 6th and Pine.
- Bring pedestrian traffic over bridge at north end – not under.
- Aesthetics of bridge north of town is important to drivers on I-70.
- Views from businesses under or adjacent to bridge is important.
- What is the view from businesses between 7th and 8th?
- Alley is potential for major pedestrian corridor.
- Beautify under bridge, needs to be pleasant and inviting.

- Plaza under bridge.
- How well does this bridge “fit” with existing surrounding structures?
- How well does it fit with historic context?
- This alternative has better opportunities for an aesthetically pleasing design.
- Visual invitation to visit Glenwood?
- Don’t hang green/white signs on bridge.
- How well does the bridge allow for community functions under it (farmer’s market, place for community)?
- Open up the underside of bridge on north side

### **Impacts to businesses**

- How does bridge impact/enhance businesses below it?
- How will widening of bridge affect adjacent businesses between 7th and 8th?
- How will widening of bridge affect adjacent businesses between Pine and 6th?
- View from bridge – will the bridge hide businesses (8th and 7th) in long term?
- Will the bridge facilitate access for delivery trucks to businesses?
- Pedestrian access to businesses during construction.
- No real change to access businesses downtown (advantage).
- No advantage to improvements downtown.
- Sidewalk – public space – downtown is reduced.
- RFTA and Wing St?
- Construction would constrict traffic. This would create less potential business during construction.
- Eliminating Wing St. is a possible for businesses (works for 3, all alts).
- Nothing changes on 6th St.
- Broader redevelopment potential with other alternatives.

### **Ability to accommodate bikes/pedestrians**

- How well does bridge provide room for bikes?
- Get rid of Wing St. This would open up public space and make it walkable.
- North side pedestrian movements need to be improved and easier to use.
- Pedestrian traffic movements huge – must maintain short and long term.

### **Circulation and traffic**

- This alignment – people are trained to know traffic movements.

## Alternative 3

### Construction impacts

- Might be a benefit for construction phasing over Alternative 1 (need more information).
- Need details on construction impacts (e.g., number of lanes, duration).

### Length and cost of bridge

- Same advantages as Alternative 1 on south side (clearance over 7<sup>th</sup> St.)

### Intersection design at Laurel

- Regarding Laurel and 6<sup>th</sup> intersection
  - Need information on vistas/view sheds for Hot Springs (e.g., looking southwest).
  - Can you skew alignment to improve aesthetic opportunities?
  - Need information on economic impacts on north and south sides.
  - Check Grand Ave. traffic calming plan – shows roundabout at 6<sup>th</sup> and Laurel.
  - Roundabout is a good solution.
- Concerns about roundabout.
- People won't understand how to use the roundabout.
- Signalized intersection better.
- Roundabout advantage (good gateway).
- Raise vertical profile at roundabout?

### Additional right-of-way needs

- Property impact: (shed)
- Alternative 3 better than Alternative 4 since it's a direct impact – opportunity to find replacement property and/or compensate.

### Access to/from Hot Springs area

- Disadvantage: Longer vehicle trip from Hot Springs Hotel Co to downtown businesses on the south side.

### Impacts to view sheds and aesthetic opportunities

- How does curved alignment constrain or improve aesthetic and design opportunities?
- Headlights from southbound effects to south side residences (need information).

### Impacts to businesses and land uses

- Some think traffic diversion will kill 6<sup>th</sup> St.
- Economic impact information would help.

### Alternative 3 with Intersection Option A

Full bridge aligned to Exit 116/  
Laurel/6<sup>th</sup> with small  
roundabout



- Opportunities to redevelop 6<sup>th</sup> St.
- Benefits 6<sup>th</sup> businesses since it reduces traffic (easier to cross 6<sup>th</sup>, easier to pull out).

**Ability to accommodate bikes and pedestrians**

- Pedestrian issues with roundabout.
- Opportunity to improve pedestrian connection between 6<sup>th</sup> hotels west of Laurel and downtown.
- Need information on bike/pedestrian movement through roundabout.
- Need more information on wayfinding between Two Rivers Park and Canyon Trail.

## Alternative 4

### Construction impacts

- Duration of construction: the simpler, the better.
- Could allow phasing with new span.

### Length and cost of bridges

- More expensive.

### Additional right-of-way needs

- Shell would need to be total acquisition to be reasonable impact.
- All additional right-of-way needs.

### Access to/from Hot Springs area

- Pool traffic/N. River St. circulation.

### Impacts to view sheds and aesthetic opportunities

- How would the bridges look?
- How do two bridges work together?
- What do the intersections look like?
  - Height, width, curves.
- How would segment between 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> look?
  - Height, width.
- What would/could bridges look like?
- Two bridges may be harder to design aesthetically
- View concerns: 7<sup>th</sup> and Grand
  - Two bridges more disjointed
  - Rooftop dining south side
- Architectural challenges

### Impacts to businesses

- How many parking spots would be lost?
- Impacts businesses with right-of-way.
- Flower Mart – reduced traffic negative.

### Ability to accommodate bikes and pedestrians

- Doesn't improve pedestrian circulation on 6<sup>th</sup> St.
- Could provide pedestrian access to 6<sup>th</sup> West hotels – downtown.
- All traffic on Grand south of 7<sup>th</sup> impacts pedestrian environment on Grand.
- Could incorporate pedestrians/bikes in each structure.
- Put bikes on bridges
  - Could keep current pedestrian bridge
- Need to see how all modes are accommodated with connections.

### Alternative 4

Two bridges, aligned to Laurel and Pine with a single connection to Grand Ave.



### **Circulation and traffic**

- Worst of all of them
  - 6<sup>th</sup> traffic and ops.
  - two bridges
  - I-70 ramps
  - Wider over 7<sup>th</sup>
- Could accommodate alternate route in emergency.
- Consider roundabout options with this alternative.
- Operation of off ramp signing.
- Reduces traffic on 6<sup>th</sup>, less congestion in a.m.
- Doesn't remove traffic from 6<sup>th</sup> enough to create pedestrian environment – “Bisquit to small”
- Laurel intersection changes don't really provide benefits – doesn't remove SH 82 traffic from 6<sup>th</sup> and Laurel.
- Can another intersection configuration be used at Laurel?
- Do it well on existing or on new alignment – splitting not preferable.
- What are real impacts of splitting traffic?
- Why does Aspen hate the S curves?
- Same issues on south side as Alternative 1.
- Accommodating large vehicles at off ramp.
- Grades on southbound approach.
- Traffic noise from new bridge in north Glenwood
  - Model noise

## Alternative 6

### Construction impacts

- While bridge is closed – downtown events (other alts).
- Construction in downtown area hurts businesses – shorter time better.
- Longer time to construct.
- Pedestrians in construction zone at 6<sup>th</sup> and Pine.

### Length and cost of bridges

- Costs to do two bridges.

### Downtown circulation and traffic

- Creates a lot of problems, but doesn't solve anything as a trade off.
- Circulation problems downtown – especially county building.
- Eliminates impetus to take SH 82 traffic off of Grand.
- Positive - system redundancy.
- Supports 8<sup>th</sup> St. project.
- Need straight connection with 8<sup>th</sup> to maintain circulation.
- Concerned about interrupting neighborhoods on Colorado and Cooper.
- Cars could cut through on Colorado – south.
- Would people keep going into residential areas?
- Still putting traffic on streets that don't have it now.
- Spreads traffic disease onto other streets...S curves.
- Moving traffic to another street – not good.
- Also increases traffic on Cooper – good/bad?
- Post office S curve – must take out bank.
- S curves - Aspen
- S curves are a bad idea.
- Creates S curve – Aspen getting rid of.
- Parking at Post Office – worse.
- Taking parking away from Post Office.
- Eliminates parking in front of Post Office.
- Why not combine Grand Ave. with Exit 116?
- Adding a Wing St. – negative impact for pedestrians and businesses.
- More stress on 7<sup>th</sup>.
- Existing mall area moved – not good
- Opportunity to remove Suicide Island.
- Doesn't improve 6<sup>th</sup>/Pine intersection.
- Doesn't help 6<sup>th</sup> St.

### Alternative 6

#### Couplet using Grand Ave. and Colorado Ave.



### **Impacts to view sheds and aesthetic opportunities**

- Aesthetics work if complementary but not as well as one bridge.
- Aesthetics not as good with the two bridges.
- Aesthetics under bridge not possible.

### **Impacts to businesses**

- May be worse for businesses between 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup>.
- Not many walk-in businesses on Colorado.
- “Farming” interest in businesses by keeping traffic on Grand.
- Wider bridge, faster cars – not good for businesses downtown.
- Doesn’t help redevelopment
- Businesses on 900 block of Colorado don’t like this alternative.
- Keeping 6<sup>th</sup> and Pine intersection - no gain of a redevelopment area.
- Area will stay the same.
- Northbound traffic – two lanes a positive for redoing downtown.
- Lessons learned – downtowns want traffic going both directions through town.

### **Parking changes**

- Could there be a parking lane on bridge?

### **Ability to accommodate bikes and pedestrians**

- 2<sup>nd</sup> Wing St. – closed – children.
- Compared to other three - can think about bike lane
- Highways in urban area - not pedestrian friendly.
- More intersections to get across.
- People unfamiliar with streets - confusing.