

VOICES ON THE ENTRANCE MEETINGS

January 31 and February 3, 2007

Aspen High School

January 31, 2007 5:00 - 9:30 p.m. about 70 people present

February 3, 2007 10:00 a.m. - 3:00 p.m about 50 people present

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Invitation and where it was advertised	p. 2-3
Explanation of Format of Meetings	p. 4
Proposed topics from Wednesday Meeting	p. 5-6
Proposed topics from Saturday Meeting	p. 7
Issue Breakout Session Reports (what people said)	p. 8 -17
Comments collected from Comment Cards	p. 18-22

The public was invited to participate in one or two informal meeting(s) to give the City feedback on the Entrance to Aspen issue. The invitation is below. The invitation was advertised in the *Valley Journal*, *Glenwood Post Independent*, *Aspen Times*, *Aspen Daily News* and on KSPN, KSNO and KUUR as well as shorter versions on Channel 16 and 11 and KAJX. It was also posted on www.aspenpitkin.com and sent on the City's various email Newsletters.

THE ENTRANCE TO ASPEN

AFTER 37 YEARS AND 26 VOTES

The City of Aspen wants to know

WHERE SHOULD WE GO FROM HERE?

What to do about congestion at the Entrance to Aspen has been debated for nearly 40 years. Finding consensus on the issue has been difficult. In the mid-90s the community, elected officials and state and federal agencies crafted ten project objectives or criteria that any solution to the Entrance to Aspen must meet. In 1998 the Colorado Department of Transportation recommended a solution known as the Preferred Alternative* because it met those criteria. Last November, CDOT confirmed that the Preferred Alternative is still a viable solution to the Entrance to Aspen problem. Because of this confirmation, the Preferred Alternative presents a clear option and the most likely solution that could be implemented quickly.

THE CHALLENGES WE FACE:

- There is support for many diverse solutions but NONE are viable and sustainable without broad community support
- We need to know where community support lies in order to best direct our resources and move the process for solving this issue forward
- Any solution other than the Preferred Alternative will require another environmental study, costing about \$2 million and two years time
- Leaving the Entrance to Aspen as it is right now does not achieve the project objectives
- A lack of available state and federal funding means local funding options need to be considered

WE NEED TO KNOW WHAT YOU WILL SUPPORT

The City of Aspen invites you to participate in

Voices on the Entrance

January 31st 5:00 p.m. – 9:30 p.m. Aspen High School Cafeteria
February 3rd 10:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m. Aspen High School Cafeteria

No matter your viewpoint or where in the valley you live, we want you to come and participate. These meetings are an opportunity for people with all perspectives to meet, share views and actively support a solution. Your input and ideas will shape the dialogue in the months to come.

Come to one or both meetings. They are structured so YOU create the agenda, YOU choose the topics of discussion, YOU drive the meeting and its content.

RSVP to www.aspenpitkin.com and click on SIGN UP FOR VOICES ON THE ENTRANCE link. Call 920-5082 if you don't have Internet.

We kindly request that you RSVP so we can send you background reading materials and more information.

PLEASE TAKE PUBLIC TRANSIT TO THE MEETING!

* The Preferred Alternative is two general traffic lanes, light rail OR two dedicated bus lanes on a curved alignment across Marolt-Thomas property. Go to www.sh82.com for more on the ten project objectives and Preferred Alternative. Then, come to the meeting!

General Meeting Format

Participants gathered in a circle in the Aspen High School cafeteria. They were greeted by Mayor Helen Klanderud. Michael Herman (facilitator from Chicago) introduced them to the process which entailed participants coming to the center of the circle and proposing a topic they would like to discuss in small breakout sessions. Once everyone proposed their topics they assigned meeting times and a meeting space for each topic. There were three sessions each meeting day of about 45 minutes each where people gathered to discuss the topics of their choice. They wrote down notes of the most salient points of their discussion and wrote them up on poster boards. At the meetings' conclusion, each participant was given round stickers to put on the issues they cared the most about. In the notes below (p. 8) from the meetings the dots are denoted by the * sign.

Proposed Topics for Breakout Sessions

Wednesday, January 31st

(not all proposed topics made it to the discussion stage due to lack of interested participants who wanted to talk about the idea further)

- Are you interested in exploring an entrance that utilizes both the straight shot and the S-Curves rather than having to decide between the two (proposed by Bill Lipsey)
- Roundabout at Cemetery Lane, two lanes into town, two lanes out (proposed by Michael Fuller)
- Roundabout at Cemetery Lane eliminating signal (proposed by Denny Vaughn)
- Fix light timing, add Roundabouts, widen S-Curves to three lane, two inbound in a.m., 2 outbound in p.m., pedestrians under bridge (no name)
- Ski Co and ACRA market Aspen as a no auto resort as part of Eco friendly resort, push walking and bikes, keep open space open (no name)
- I can't vote in Aspen but I care about this problem. How can I contribute to a solution (proposed by Kenny Smith)
- Do we believe one car lane and one bus lane will ease congestion in any scenario (proposed by Cathy Markle)
- Opposing interests, City of Aspen voters vs. Pitkin County Voters (proposed by Tim Estin)
- Three lane Castle Creek Bridge for Buses (proposed by Cliff Weiss)
- If the time is right to vote on Buttermilk to roundabout, then the time is right to vote on the preferred alternative (proposed by Mike Maple)
- Big solutions will take time. What ideas do you have to ease traffic congestion now? (proposed by Cathy Markle)
- Improve gridlock tomorrow (proposed by Greg Paul)
- Best case scenario, no cars in downtown Aspen – work down from there and end up with less traffic (proposed by Jan Louthis)
- Service vehicles and how do we get out of cars and into buses? (proposed by Lori Weidman)
- Save Marolt Open Space (proposed by Yasmine dePagter)
- Disperse the traffic, the sewer line route (Rio Grande) (proposed by Lucy Hibberd)
- Re-open Record of Decision to consider other alternatives (proposed by Toni Kronberg)
- Buttermilk with transit hub and mountain connection (proposed by Steve Seyffert)
- Impact of bus lanes from Buttermilk to roundabout on May ballot (proposed by Denny Vaughn)

- Do we want a solution now or maybe a solution in 10-20 years (proposed by Mike Maple)
- Growth (bad) vs. Regeneration (good) use of open space (think of Glenwood Canyon) (proposed by Tim Estin)
- Land Use and Growth (proposed by Mick Ireland)
- Connect the four mountains with an aerial system (proposed by Toni Kronberg)
- Rail Option (proposed by Jon Busch)

Proposed Topics for Breakout Sessions

Saturday, February 3rd

(not all proposed topics made it to the discussion stage due to lack of interested participants who wanted to talk about the idea further)

- How much is the increased cost of construction of light rail over bus lanes? What is the comparison of costs of operating light rail over bus? (proposed by Elliot Bransom)
- Three lanes into town in the morning, three lanes out of town in the afternoon, not violate Marolt Property (proposed by Georgia Hanson)
- Other than money what would it take to have a rail-only Entrance to Aspen now? (proposed by Bert Myrin)
- Retain our Historic Open Space (no name)
- Scratch Record of Decision, two lanes only across Marolt to keep impacts at a minimum (proposed by Martha Madsen)
- Save Marolt Open Space by using existing alignment (proposed by Yasmine dePagter)
- Reduce volume of single occupancy vehicle (proposed by Bert Myrin)
- The split shot – roundabout at Cemetery lane, two lanes into town, two lanes out on S-Curves (proposed by Michael Fuller)
- Another way in and out NOT on hwy 82/Main Street (proposed by Lucy Hibberd)
- Mass Transit (proposed by Sally Sparhawk)
- We are like European town/resort, look at Europe's solutions, they have centuries of experience over U.S. (proposed by Martha Aarons)
- Relationship in US to issue of personal transportation for residents of this country (proposed by Stefan Edlis)

Pressure the integrity of the Preferred Alternative by refining the design such that the word “tunnel” is replaced with “land bridge”. Reduce the overpass distance to 100-150 feet versus 400. Reduce depth of road cut. Look at a minimal acceptable rise in the land bridge. Raise and/or slope the bridge and the highway to accommodate elevation change. Landscape profusely. *****

Issue: *Gondola System*

- Buttermilk as transit hub with visitor centers and Park and Ride ***
 - Connect Buttermilk with Highlands and Snowmass with recreation based gondolas. Gondolas not intended as primary transit system, but they will reduce traffic on Maroon, Owl, and Brush Creek valleys. **
 - System closed when necessary to respect native habitat
 - System improves quality of life for local and visitor experience
 - System is a part of overall environmental solution which emphasizes autos
 - Reduce carbon footprint
 - Park and Rides work best when located in a place people also want to go
 - System should not be promoted as “transit solution”. It is a recreational system that will reduce vehicle miles traveled.
 - Consider alternatives for Park and Ride that help stage and reduce construction traffic
 - Aspen to Buttermilk and back - whatever
-

Issue: *Fix Gridlock Now (okay....tomorrow) ******

Comments:

- Flashing lights at Truscott and Aspen County Inn
- Law Enforcement presence at bottlenecks (Hickory House, Roundabout, and Buttermilk) *
- Congestion pricing/disincentives for parking in the core of downtown
- Criteria for Carpool permits
- Service workers – retrain to utilize TDM and leave tools at job site
- 2 lanes in; 1 out ----reverse and in combination with flashing lights *
- Stagger work hours to take impact off of rush hour **
- Roundabouts at Buttermilk and Burlingame, underpass at Truscott – no more stopping along 82!
- Realign buses along Hallam outbound – merge at Forest Service on 82
- Right turn only at Truscott and Cemetery Lane for Aspen bound during am/pm rush
- More carpool permit issue to intercept lot (Brush Creek) with easy carpool lane [pick up]
- Address entrance and exit separately

Issue: *Rail System* *****

Pros:

- Petroleum independence - large green source of electricity(?)
- Reduce car traffic
- Long term solution
- Less impacted by adverse weather
- Potential for transit hub outside of town (Buttermilk) as starting point for alternative transportation system
- Phased construction
- Environmental Impact Statement already written
- Reduces carbon footprint
- Creative solution: e.g. (not about limitation)
- Paradigm shift needed to make the rail option attractive to commuters
- People need to get over the short-term, high costs, and look at rail solution from a life cycle perspective.
- Fundamentally, the only long-term way to reduce congestion is to reduce the number of cars in the system, not increase capacity
- Hotels could have personalized cars for tourists

Cons:

- Expensive – who will pay for it
 - Long construction time
 - Proof that it will work?
 - Will people ride it? Get them out of their cars?
 - What is the incentive to ride train?
-

Issue: *Land use and transportation*

Comments:

- Gentrification – Economic Intensity of Use – residential, retail, and lodging. Job generation by high end users causes traffic generation *****
- We can't go back. No Growth Restrictions will not restore 1979 or even last year's traffic level
- Without land use recognition and mitigation of gentrification, we will exceed 4 lane highway capacity and exceed 2 lane highway and transit capacity. *
- Gentrification does provide a tax base that could be tapped for solution e.g. Use Tax on building materials 1% = \$1 million per year

- Service demand will grow even with no new units as the replacement units will be more “economically intensive”.
 - One or two FTEs per high end home is a good guess of impact
 - Pent up demand for Lodge replacement
 - Aspen is unique in that a city of this size would not ordinarily generate 23,000 vehicles per day. Again Economic intensity
 - It is rude that the people who drive the problem, the “gentry” don’t suffer the consequences of their job generation
 - Only intense growth – intensification linkage will avoid the need for a 6 lane
 - Expanding capacity will generate “indirect” traffic *****
 - A 4 lane with transit component and land use could work : offsets for traffic generation, Use tax, ????traffic impact for new project
-

Issue: *Tolls and parking*

Comments:

- Toll based on vehicle occupancy *****
 - make all parking paid or permit
 - Use revenue from toll for mass transit
 - Incorporate other ideas like additional intercept lot.
 - More employee housing appropriate to the demand of commercial and residential uses
 - Make parking paid or residential
 - Make all contractors provide secure storage for workers (to give incentive to use public transit)
 - Take a stand against pollution!
-

Issue: *4 lanes split couplet*

Comments:

- 4 lanes from original curve to airport to down valley *****
- Eliminate light at Cemetery Lane roundabout or underpass ***
- 2 lanes of one-way traffic from new roundabout into Aspen over new bridge align with W. Main Street *
- 2 lanes one way out of town on “s” curves and over existing bridge **
- New alignment (3) to avoid open space as much as possible *
- Political solution that breaks the stalemate between between straight shot and “s” curve *
- Roundabout to handle 2 lanes of traffic **
- Replace lights with round a bouts to airport **

Issue: *Preserve Open Space* *****

Comments:

- Use existing alignment, 3 lane bridge *****
 - Roundabouts where traffic lights are, eliminate traffic lights ****
 - Retro fit existing bridge ****
 - Computer model these ideas
 - Why preserve the open space?
 - History *
 - Community values **
 - Character *
 - Value trade off
 - Replicate CDOTs preferred alternative on the existing alignment
 - Can we improve traffic flow on existing alignment ***
 - Can we let the cars rot on the s curves and run a minimal bus way across Thomas and Marolt open space? **
-

Issue: *Preferred Alternative* *****
 Why Not?
 (Use of Marolt open space)

Comments:

- Open Space transfer
 - 2 -1 open space replace *
 - Some of PA open space purchased with transit funds
 - Open space will not be completely affected *
 - Land bridge allows x-c ski network enhancement ****
 - Gridlock to Jerome or use of open space?
-

Issue: *Solution: Feasible and Currently Achievable* *****

Comments:

- roundabout and/or underpass at Cemetery Lane *****
- 3 or 4 lanes on existing dedicated HOV and buses reversible
- Preserve open space! *****
- Preserve small town entrance ****
- Take out stop lights all the way to airport *****

- Widen existing Castle Creek bridge ***
- Less costly so we can accomplish sooner *
- Preserve history *****

Issue: *Use low cost traffic management actions to improve incrementally traffic conditions from “F” to a “C” level = 25% improvement **

Incremental improvements:

- Metro wide parking permit with car registration 5%
- Synchronized highway 82 lights during commute time 5%
- Reduce school drop off traffic using parking drop off permit 5% **
- More bicycle friendly streets i.e. Hopkins 2% *
- Use “kiss and ride” area to allow school Highlands traffic by pass round a bout 3% **
- Reactivate FREE park and ride at intercept lot 3%
- Stagger work hours 2%

Issue: *Other than Money, What would it take to have a Rail only entrance to Aspen now?*

Comments:

- Work with CDOT to design a rail only bridge across Castle Creek along preferred alternative alignment. In lieu of a car bridge *
- Why did intercept lot work at X-games (76,000 people and no choice to drive plus it was efficient! City could do same) and why did intercept lot fail with airport intercept lot *
- Use time savings as an incentive to ride train **
- Time disincentive for using a car to get into Aspen via leaving only 1 lane for cars forever *
- Build using existing plans, a light rail terminal at Brush Creek *****
- 5000 Free bicycles with snow tires in town for people arriving via train
- Increase N.E. U.’s zip car use for those arriving on train
- Focus on incentives for trains

Issue: *Potential to*

- *4 lanes on existing 82 with s curves in place*
- *Castle Creek bridge = 4 lanes. ***

Comments:

Expand on both sides equal amount

- Design so the “extra lane” doesn’t require huge “taking” on Villas side. Is this possible?

- 3 lanes in for am (one for bus)
- 3 lanes out for pm (one for bus) *
 - Questions – what is exactly possible and what takings required. Need definite information, not speculation. **
 - What can happen now?
- Underpass at Truscott
- Roundabout at Cemetery Lane
- 3 lane 82 in one direction am/pm

Issue: *How Do We Stop Local Government from being Obstructionist and actually consider options presented by the public which differ from government's "preferred option".*

Comments:

- Put all the alternative options on a ballot, use direct democracy. Reopen the Record of Decision.
- \$2 million and 2 years. Fine! **

Issue: *Save Marolt Open Space by using existing alignment.....******

Comments:

- 3 lane Castle Creek bridge (2 cars and one bus lane) *****
- Roundabout at Cemetery Lane light instead of light *****
- TDRS
- Auto disincentives – example school traffic – kids should take the bus *
- Bus lane from Buttermilk to roundabout *****
- Grade separated intersection at Truscott ****

Issue: *Reduce Volume of Single Occupancy Vehicles ******

Comments:

- Bus shoulder lane
- Roundabout to Castle Creek bridge
- Slugging – bus stop hitching
- Outbound HOV parking refund
- Increase mass transit frequency to intercept lot *
- Increase all parking fees to fund fee mass transit to Brush Creek lot – x games
- Make mass transit quicker and easier and less money per rider than driving a single occupancy vehicle

- Be a model – first in the USA
 - Dedicated right of way for mass transit
 - Carrots and sticks to encourage mass transit use
 - Restrict cars in residential zones and fund free buss to Brush Creek lot. X games
-

Issue: *Sharing Open Space to Solve Transportation Issue*

Comments:

- Entrance to Aspen starts at Airport (congestion)
 - Stay on S-Curve alignment *
 - Soften s-curves/ no sidewalks
 - Reversible 3 lane on Castle Creek bridge
 - Preserve bus stops
 - Will impact on property owners along route
 - Roundabout to airport/eliminate lights
 - Don't spread impacts to two locations/character
 - Use Marolt to create more inviting entry:
 - All modes?
 - Transit only?
 - Light rail only?
 - Cut and cover or tunnel only?
 - No net loss of open space **
 - Mass transit doesn't work thru S-curves
 - Tunnel too expensive/do more realistic alternatives
 - Extend exclusive bus lanes to airport/smarter lights
 - Are we just moving congestion to new location? Mill/Main
 - Safety issue of emergency access/congestion
 - We should decide the solution, not the State *
 - Potential funding source: metro use tax
 - Buy right-a-way from state
 - Use Rio Grande for transportation corridor?
 - Huge public amenity as trail corridor
 - Preserve open space even if it slows traffic *
 - Under what conditions is sharing open space acceptable? *
 - All modes or only to accommodate transit?
-

Issue: *Funding the Preferred Alternative (including rail)*

Comments:

- Funding summit ***
- Congestion pricing using new technology (pricing based on place and time)

- Metro wide parking permit system from ABC to downtown ***

Issue: *Immediate Low Cost Traffic Management Action*

Comments:

- Synchronized lights
- Town wide from ABC/Highlands/School metro parking permit system

Issue: *European communities like Aspen who have dealt with traffic issues*

Comments:

- Look to Europe. Aspen resembles European towns and resorts, all of which have centuries of experience with traffic control (over us)
- The preferred alternative invites more traffic, faster, into Aspen. It only relocates the bottleneck farther into the heart of town. No Euro town with historical character has a highway dead ending directly into town.
- Europe uses: circles (roundabouts), fees, especially during peak hours, or total restrictions (London), parking outside with public transportation into town.
- To keep our European style uniqueness:
 - keep the s-curves (if public transit is inevitable, use preferred alternative only for light rail)
 - widen them to 3 lanes, especially Castle Creek bridge
 - Add circle at Cemetery Lane
 - Small steps over a draconian (massive) one involving irreversible damage to Aspen's historical character and green space
- Intercept lot with only rail (no cars/bus) across Marolt into Aspen
- As in Europe, to disincentivise some cars, institute a congestion charge to non-residents and those without medallions (to get in) and fine those who don't call in their registration numbers and pay for the day.
- Slugging – pick up passengers along the way, flexible spontaneous car pooling
- Disney world system of getting people around
- Technology of bus and light rail is changing
- X-games approach – park outside. Many buses often higher frequency
- Buses are wireless. Stations have coffee (INK!) franchise at stations or train

No dots were on this page

Issue: *Mass Transit (bus, other)*

Comments:

- Reduce cars
- Keep local oriented buses all year round
- Car shares at affordable housing
- Permit system for cars – money goes to reduce bus fares
- Require local officials to ride the bus 50% of the time
- Fund cheaper fares and more frequent buses and/or targeted tax for local buses

No dots on this page

Issue: *Another Route – in addition to the highway 82 – into/out of town*

Comments:

- Main Street route
 - 4 lane traffic into Main Street is NOT preferred and is very detrimental to “small town character”
- Need to offer an alternative route to relieve Main Street

Solution:

- Build 2 lane road over Sewer line on Rio Grande right of way from Post office/Puppy Smith to Cemetery lane
- Cost effective – 2 lanes, river crossings at grade. No need for tunnels or expansion bridges
- Utilize the public right of way that already exists

No dots on this page

Issue: *The Split Shot Compromise ******

Comments:

- Roundabout at Cemetery lane ***
 - 2 lane in, one way along creek to align with W. Main
 - New 2 lane bridge over creek *
 - 2 lane one way out on existing “s” curve **
 - No traffic light at 7th and Main **
 - Can accommodate bus lane each way
 - Can be light rail alignment **
-

Participants were handed cards to write any additional comments on; their comments are listed below.

Top Three Issues	Additional Information Needed for Decision	What I didn't get to say in breakouts
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Preferred Alternative will worsen problem by putting more vehicles - faster - into the same space 2. Destroying green space and losing character 		<p>The WORST case scenario would be executing the PA without guaranteed light rail. It would entail all the frequently voiced negatives (irreversibly), would dump more traffic into Aspen, faster, and solve nothing while ruining green spaces, etc. The key swing voters on the PA are the pro-rail people!</p>
		<p>The PA does not solve the problem. Aspen needs to be a model city: limit car access, frequent, efficient bus or light rail, extensive parking out of town.</p> <p>Allow right turn to Highlands coming up valley without going into the circle - cut through bus area.</p> <p>Thorough investigation of 3 lanes on existing Castle Creek bridge.</p>
		<p>This was a great opportunity to learn and contribute to a very complicated, emotional and cultural issue. "A Train" was barely discussed - why?</p>
		<p>Do Something - no more cars idling. Preferred Alternative.</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reduction in number of low-occupancy vehicles. 2. Congestion caused by 		<p>We have tried voluntary efforts to encourage people to leave their cars and use transit</p>

<p>service vehicles.</p>		<p>long enough. We have to intercept all low-occupancy vehicles coming into town at Brush Creek, Airport or Buttermilk. Also we need a program to deal with service vehicles (size and times that they can come into town). I think Vail regulates service vehicles. Worth checking. Prevent commuters from blocking roundabout in the afternoon - sign left lane (downvalley) for Maroon/Castle Creek only - just as the right up valley lane is signed and ENFORCE.</p>
		<p>Nada. Great job done by the organizers of this event. 'Cept: license BRT operations to Ink!/Starbucks. Let 'em sell coffee and continental breakfast and evening snacks on the ride (some of us DID say this.)</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Congestion pricing 2. Preserve Aspen's character 3. Preserve open space 		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No 4-lane across open space 		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Where 2. How 3. When 	<p>Consensus</p>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Politics 2. Politics 3. Politics 	<p>Too much already</p>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Give more incentive to mass transit and continue to make driving harder 2. Look at alternatives that we have not given much press - not quite right yet. 3. Train for airport has 		

reached its day!		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We need better options for mass transit in Aspen. 2. We should be limiting cars in rather than making it easier for them which is why we need better mass transit. 3. More people involved from down valley. Aspen is dependent on down valley workers. 		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Decide on an alignment. 2. Make mass transit more convenient and affordable. 3. Finding funding mechanisms. 		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Preferred Alternative is not preferred by many - take fresh look. 2. Think about people who cannot take mass transit due to work. 3. Look at cost and be efficient (??) with plan. 		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop consensus to increase <u>both</u> auto capacity and mass transit. 2. Investigate designs for surface transportation accessing Main St. at 7th that are different from current idea. 3. Provide 2 lanes out, 2 lanes in at all times with expanded transit. 		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Exit from Aspen should be looked at as a separate issue from 		

<p>entrance.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Two lanes of continued traffic without stopping for any reason (signals, etc.) 3. Enforce existing HOV lane or abandon it. 		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No more "S" curves 2. Two lanes in, two lanes out. 		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Finish Hwy. 82's entrance to Aspen with roundabouts, park & rides, rapid transit and 4 lanes (2 bus). 2. consider gondola links 3. action items now 		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Only possible improvements to traffic flow need 4lanes of pavement through Marolt, however they are designated. 2. We already decided to allow Aspen to grow to the degree that has our current traffic needs and if we don't stop demand we must accommodate the results. 3. I know of no viable attractive mass transit alternative to many automotive needs so offer more buses, but plan for more cars. 		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Getting from Buttermilk to the roundabout in the AM - it has gotten ridiculous. 		<p>We need 4 lanes and a straight shot - opened to traffic (not 2 lanes for buses only).</p>
		<p>We must consider negative impacts on air quality and parking of increasing highway</p>

		lanes. Light rail offers long-term, efficient, environmentally sensitive solution.
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reduce cars 2. Protect open spaces and environment 3. Use rail! 		<p>Moving traffic from cars to public transportation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Each of us can look at how we use our cars and make the choices we make. ➤ There <u>are</u> creative solutions for driving less. Solutions do not have to be about limitations. When we get out of our cars more, we increase our interaction with neighbors and community.
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Destroying open space 2. Land use is the root cause of all transportation trouble - we need to control growth. 3. Mass transit needs to be more attractive (faster and cheaper) for the riders. 		<p>The <u>next</u> and hopefully <u>last</u> ballot question should be worded clearly and offer 3 choices:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. do nothing 2. use existing S curves plus 2 more lanes 3. 4 lanes over Marolt <p>And let the <u>whole valley</u> vote.</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We treat people arriving like 2nd class citizens, including myself - it makes Aspen seem arrogant and pisses off the workers. 2. Gridlock at roundabout caused by law breakers and soccer moms. 3. Whole valley votes. 	<p>I need to be shown that a 4-lane and bus solution cannot happen with S curve route.</p>	<p>There is a solution on the existing alignment that has not been fully examined. Potential to find a way to have 2 lane plus bus in one direction AM (total 4 lanes required - 1 down valley, 3 up valley). Reverse in the afternoon. Roundabout at Cemetery Lane. Have to add on to Castle Creek Bridge.</p>