

# **Transportation Votes in Aspen and Pitkin County Since 1975**

## **Organized by Year**

May 1975 City of Aspen

Shall the City endorse Pitkin County's application to the Urban Mass Transportation Authority for federal funding of the Pitkin County Light Rail System and cooperate with Pitkin County on implementation, which may include direct financing and grants of easements?

Yes: 739 (59%)

No: 517 (41%)

November 1982 City of Aspen

Shall the Council be authorized to convey ROW of 1500' X 150' across the Thomas Property for two- or four-laning of Highway 82 to 7<sup>th</sup> and Main, as the Council may determine?

Yes: 627 (41%)

No: 922 (59%)

May 1983 Pitkin County

Shall Pitkin County increase sales taxes from 2 – 3% for public transportation services and facilities for Pitkin County?

Yes: 726 (64%)

No: 405 (36%)

May 1983 Pitkin County

Shall Pitkin County issue a \$1.8 million bond for buses and a bus maintenance facility?

Yes: 714 (66%)

No: 374 (36%)

August 1986 City of Aspen

Shall Council be authorized to implement a 4-lane highway over existing open space, connecting with 7<sup>th</sup> and Main Street, if:

- CDOT compensates City for Open Space
- Area from new alignment to Cemetery Lane becomes Open Space
- Curved alignment to reduce speed into city
- Remove light at Cemetery Lane
- New light at Hwy 82/7<sup>th</sup> and Main
- Council works with CDOT to satisfy conditions through EIS

Yes: 411 (49.4%)

No: 421 (50.6%)

August 1986 City of Aspen

Shall Council be authorized to implement a 4-lane highway over existing open space and widen the S-Curves to a minimum of 4 lanes, and implement turn lanes, planted dividers,

pedestrian and bike movement and minimize private property acquisition east of the Castle Creek Bridge?

Yes: 213 (26%)

No: 603 (74%)

November 1986

City of Aspen

Shall the Council be authorized to convey ROW along Rio Grande Trail for a train and terminal, if Rio Grande Trail is relocated and ROW reverts to City if rail construction not started by January 1992?

Yes: 847 (65%)

No: 459 (45%)

February 1990

City of Aspen

Shall Council be authorized to grant ROW over City land, including open space, for 4-laning of Highway 82 on two possible alignments to facilitate construction of 4-lane entrance into Aspen; Either Option A (Direct Connection to 7<sup>th</sup>&Main) or Option B (Existing alignment)?

Yes: 1740 (68%)

No: 816 (32%)

February 1990

City of Aspen

Do you prefer Option A (Direct Connection to 7<sup>th</sup>&Main)?

Yes: 1475 (59%)

Do you prefer Option B (Existing alignment, widening S-Curves to 4 lanes)?

Yes: 1042 (41%)

November 1994

Pitkin County

**2C:** Shall Aspen City Council be authorized to convey ROW over Marolt and Thomas properties for a dedicated transitway from the City to the Airport and Snowmass Village?

Yes: 958 (49%)

No: 1011 (51%)

November 1994

Pitkin County

**2D:** If 2C is approved, shall the City be authorized to convey ROW over the Marolt and Thomas properties to realign Highway 82 if the Entrance to Aspen EIS identifies the new alignment as the preferred alternative?

Yes: 863 (45%)

No: 1065 (55%)

November 1996

City of Aspen

Shall City Council be authorized to convey ROW over Marolt and Thomas properties for a 2-lane parkway and a corridor for light rail? Only if:

- Finances and design are completed and approved by voters
- Cut and cover tunnel of at least 400'
- Section of 82 between Cemetery lane and Maroon Creek goes to open space
- Other open space acquired to make up for net loss

➤ An alignment sensitive to historical and natural resources is defined  
Yes: 1656 (59%)  
No: 1147 (41%)

August 1988 City of Aspen  
Shall the City adopt a ¼-penny sales tax for a parking garage at Rio Grande Place, and issue a \$6.5 million, 20-year bond?  
Yes: 921 (73%)  
No: 337 (27%)

November 1998 Pitkin County  
If all financing is not approved through public votes by the City of Aspen or Pitkin County before November 1999, shall Pitkin County stop spending funds on rail studies until the expansion of 82 between Basalt and Aspen is completed?  
Yes: 3063 (56%)  
No: 2380 (44%)

November 1998 City of Aspen  
Do you support the concept of a valley wide rail system linking Glenwood to Aspen?  
Yes: 1196 (52%)  
No: 1111 (48%)

November 1998 Pitkin County  
Do you support the concept of a valley wide rail system linking Glenwood to Aspen?  
Yes: 2610 (49%)  
No: 2712 (51%)

November 1999 City of Aspen  
Should the City bond for \$20 million to construct a light rail system if:  
➤ The FEIS is approved  
➤ Rail goes from City to Airport as in ROD  
➤ \$36 million PitCo bond approved to extend rail to Brush Creek  
➤ The defeat of either City or County bond will result in the construction of a phased modified direct alignment as in draft EIS and ROD, starting with exclusive bus lanes and eventually to a rail system, with this bond as a local match for state and federal funds.  
Yes: 853 (45%)  
No: 1052 (55%)

November 1999 City of Aspen  
Given that the valley wide population will rise from 57,000 to 99,000 by 2020, adding 120,000 auto trips per day, and given that more than 31,000 cars use the Castle Creek Bridge on peak days, what limit on auto trips would you prefer?

Limit to today's level Yes: 710 (45%)  
No: 873 (55%)

Limit to 2% annual growth	Yes: 425 (28%) No: 1080 (72%)
Limit to 4% annual growth	Yes: 204 (14%) No: 1257 (86%)
Unlimited	Yes: 587 (38%) No: 944 (62%)

November 1999 City of Aspen

Vote yes if you agree with the following:

I am concerned that without a comprehensive valley wide transit system, Aspen will be overwhelmed with traffic. I want the City Council to work with other valley governments to develop a transit plan with design, construction and maintenance and cost estimates comparing bus-only with a bus-to-rail concept for a bonding vote no later than November 2000.

Yes: 1081 (64%)  
No: 612 (36%)

November 1999 City of Aspen

Shall City bond for \$16 million for an exclusive busway from Buttermilk to 7<sup>th</sup> and Main, if:

- It includes an expansion of Rubey Park
- It includes new transit stops along 82
- It includes an expansion of bus maintenance facility
- It includes the purchase of new alternative fuel buses
- It includes a new bus fueling center
- The bonding is approved only if Pitkin County approves spending for operational subsidy for improved services for the dedicated busway and sets aside annual revenues for an eventual upgrade to light rail
- This approval allows the City to convey ROW for the bus corridor
- Defeat of this question denies the use of a bus corridor

Yes: 805 (47%)  
No: 894 (53%)

NOTE: The total # of voters on this question was 206 or 11% fewer than for the ballot question above. There were 48 fewer Yes voters, and 158 fewer No voters.

November 1999 City of Aspen

If the City chooses to accommodate more cars instead of improving transit, where do you prefer to locate a new garage?

Wagner/Paepcke @ \$30K per space (3,000 spaces=\$90 million)    Yes: 711 (43%)  
No: 929 (57%)

Increase neighborhood parking for visitors:    Yes: 424 (26%)  
No: 1174 (74%)

Make transit work valley wide; use park n ride throughout valley; don't increase in-town parking

Yes: 1084 (66%)  
No: 553 (34%)

November 2000

Pitkin County

Establish the Regional Transit Authority, with Pitkin County contributing .7215% of existing 1.5% transportation sales tax annually?

Yes: 4529 (66%)  
No: 2300 (34%)

November 2000

Pitkin County

Shall Pitkin County bond \$10.2 million to supplement existing debt of \$8.1 million and other local, state and federal funds to:

- Realign 82 to 7<sup>th</sup> and Main, with 2 new bridges and a cut and cover tunnel
- \$7 million for Snowmass Village transit
- \$1.5 million for PitCo bus stops
- \$7.5 million for new buses, maintenance facility and affordable housing for RFTA

Yes: 4408 (64%)  
No: 2444 (36%)

May 2001

City of Aspen

Shall City Council be authorized to convey ROW over Marolt and Thomas for a 2-lane parkway and exclusive bus lanes until the community supports rail funding, if:

- It is done according to the ROD
- Cut and cover tunnel of at least 400'
- New Castle Creek Bridge
- Appropriate landscaping
- This vote shall not be construed as superseding approval by electorate in November 1996 for light rail corridor.

Yes: 913 (46%)  
No: 1056 (54%)

November 2002

City of Aspen

Which do you prefer?

S-Curves: 1405 (56%)  
Modified Direct: 1123 (44%)

November 2002

Pitkin County

Which do you prefer?

S-Curves: 3079 (51%)  
Modified Direct: 2963 (49%)