

-----Original Message-----

From: Stacey Patch Bernot

Sent: Friday, February 15, 2013 6:53 AM

To: Jean Perry; John Foulkrod; Pam Zentmyer; John Hoffmann; Allyn Harvey; Frosty Merriott; Elizabeth Murphy

Cc: Jay Harrington; Larry Ballenger; Cathy Derby

Subject: RE: letter

Hi Jeannie-

During the Access Control Plan (ACP) process, which took over a year, we looked at every access point along Hwy 133. The Dolores intersection is one of a handful that are safety concerns for our board and the community at large. Our board discussed at length the intersection at Dolores and what feasible options were on the table in the near term and down the road.

A connection through RFTA's property to Village has been requested numerous times by our board over the years, even when the approvals went into place for that use. Each time the Town has been flat out denied by RFTA due to their concerns of safety, and ultimately not wanting more crossings of the corridor. Those denials over the years have been unfortunate because the connection through Village seems so simple. When I was newly elected this was one of my biggest contentions on Hwy 133 especially since I had a child at CCS and lived on the north end of Town, so I knew the safety issue all too well hearing and seeing many close calls. As the Town's RFTA rep, I haven't been on RFTA a year, and I too was shut down by RFTA staff when I approached them about this connection when I came onto the RFTA board.

The Town needed to look at other options for that intersection, and at a few other intersections that proved problematic. The BOT along with our consultants, CDOT, staff and the public reviewed and came up with our current ACP. We even had a joint meeting with the Garfield County Commissioners in Carbondale publicly noticed to go through the entirety of the ACP. At that meeting we discussed specifically Dolores way, not just for the safety for Satankians (your word not mine) but also for the business owners, families of CCS, neighbors in Kay PUD, customers, CRMS walkers, bikers, and Dolores Way lovers. The Village Road idea was looked at and explained why it wasn't going to work. The options in the ACP seemed to satisfy the Commissioners, and we requested that if there were issues we should discuss them jointly as the ACP serves both jurisdictions.

The preferred alternatives for Dolores Way were unsatisfactory to some people, but instead of coming in during the year long process and at our meetings to share that with our board, a special meeting on Tuesday 1/22 was held. Our board was unable to attend because of our board meeting and so a discussion covering our mutual constituencies did not occur. This meeting also occurred after our board had voted overwhelmingly to approve the ACP in order to satisfy the agreement the Town and Garfield County made with CDOT.

Since I wasn't at the 1/22 meeting I have no idea on how the ACP, and the process the Town went through was presented to the public present. Without firsthand knowledge I am not

confident that the current options for Dolores contained in the ACP were explained and discussed comprehensively. Maybe our board would have accepted the additional language, or maybe citizens concerned about the ACP would have come to the same realization our board did regarding the feasible options for Dolores. That is in part why I denied the modifications to the ACP.

I, along with my fellow board members, agreed to enter into the ACP and the process it entailed. The Town and Garfield County executed an IGA laying out the terms of the process of the ACP. Since I agreed to this process, no matter the outcome, I felt it imperative that I abide by what I agreed the Town would do. I understood after our joint meeting with Garfield County that we were moving ahead of adoption of the ACP, it wasn't until a follow up meeting at a BOCC meeting, that a Commissioner felt the ACP process needed another meeting. The Town adopted the ACP unaware that there was dissatisfaction with the current ACP by Garfield County or any users of Dolores Way. Honoring our public process is extremely important in Carbondale, and I felt that Garfield County circumvented our process and stifled transparent open dialogue on the issue of Dolores Way.

The ACP is not a perfect document, and there are citizens that don't agree with options for other intersections. That happens with process, a person can agree or disagree with the outcome.

Before our Board reopens and amends the ACP a discussion should happen so that interested parties understand the issues and feasible solutions, in addition other outside issues (like closing off the county road through CRMS) should not be lumped into the ACP. Looking over the maps included with the amended language, a few of the Village Road options caused safety concerns by our board members. Garfield County now decides if they would like to keep this language, and if so another conversation between our boards will occur, or the BOCC can adopt the document that the Town adopted back in December.

You can call me whatever names you'd like, and feel free to make assumptions on why something was or wasn't done. Just know that I don't have it out for Satank, or any user of Dolores Way, I just like my colleagues, want a safe highway where people, bikes, and automobiles can coexist. I choose not to be ignorant to problems facing our community because I educate myself on the issue comprehensively and discuss concerns with whomever would like to chat. Oh, and by community I include those who reside outside our town boundary, after all my family all lives just outside the line.

Jeannie- we're all in this together so let's work with one another. Stop by any Tuesday morning at the Village Smithy from 7-8:30 am and I'll buy you a cup of coffee or tea before you head up to work. Maybe we can chat about this and figure out a solution, or if you prefer.

Thanks,

Stacey Bernot
Mayor

Town of Carbondale
511 Colorado Avenue

Carbondale, CO 81623
970.510.1345
www.carbondalegov.org

From: Jean Perry [perrywilfley@yahoo.com]

Sent: Friday, February 15, 2013 2:52 AM

To: Stacey Patch Bernot; John Foulkrod; Pam Zentmyer; John Hoffmann; Allyn Harvey; Frosty Merriott; Elizabeth Murphy

Subject: letter

Dear Carbondale Trustees (with the exception of John Hoffmann),

I would call you all big ducklings in a small pond, but that would be an insult to ducks everywhere. The proposal by Garfield County commissioners, CDOT and residents of Satank to connect Dolores Way with the traffic light at Village Road is sane and practical, (maybe that's why you won't approve it?) especially compared to the idea of a right-turn only at Dolores and Hwy 133.

That intersection is a ticking time bomb as far as safety's concerned. With the business traffic for Ajax Bike & Sport, American National Bank Bank, NAPA, The Paint Store, etc. and all the soccer moms coming and going twice a day, someone's gonna lose more than an eye... Yet it's not a priority for Carbondale, even though all those businesses are inside the town limits. Are you sure you're not cutting off your nose to spite your Satank?

We Satankians get the message loud and clear (even those of us who "only came to town about twice a year." - Steve Earle) But this plan is sound; the land is already for sale and the light is already there. And there would be no need for traffic to cross the precious Rio Grande Trail except at the light where all the traffic on Hwy 133 currently crosses it. Plus, I don't imagine RFTA will be too happy when their brand new park 'n ride is in constant use as a u-turn for everyone trying to get to Dolores from the south, but we could ask the Carbondale representative/RFTA board member about that. She just so happens to be mother duck, i.e., the most outspoken opponent of the proposal. What a small pond it is.

Jeannie Perry
Satank