

## **Urban Trails Committee Minutes**

**February 10, 2021** (virtual meeting)

Present: Shana Wade (Chair), David Lehmann, Ross Mittelman, Diana L. Rooney (Vice Chair), Orin Zyvan, Lance Gloss (Senior Planner), Trent Prall (Public Works Director), Alisha Wenger, Vara Kusal (Executive Director, Horizon Drive BID)

### **CALL TO ORDER**

Shana called the meeting to order at 5:31 pm.

### **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

No announcements were made.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

*No minutes were available or approved.*

### **ACTION ITEMS**

Lance introduced a non-agendized item: a letter of support for a grant request to be made by the Horizon Drive Business Improvement District.

#### **Consider a Letter of Support for Horizon Drive Parklet Project**

The UTC welcome Vara Kusal, Executive Director of the Horizon Drive Business Improvement District (BID).

Vara gave a presentation with a set of slides showing the proposed location of a series of parklets along Horizon Drive. She explained that the BID would apply to the CDOT Revitalizing Main Streets grant program, which could provide up to \$50,000 for the installation of parklets. She showed an example of a bicycle repair station that would be included, and indicated that bike parking would also be part of the parklet design.

Several committee members gave questions and comments related to the design, location, intent, and anticipated use of the parklets. Vara responded and general discussion of the proposal ensued.

The committee was generally supportive of the idea of providing outdoor public space in the area, especially given the number of long-term residents of some of the motels/lodges and the number of folks living in RVs in the district.

There was some question as to the exact placement of the facility near the interchange. Vara indicated that this was perhaps the only location available, as only the ROW was suitable for the grant, so parking lots were not permissible locations for the grant; and, some good candidate areas were outside of the BID boundary. The group also discussed use of the facility post-COVID.

Lance asked if the UTC was interested in writing a letter of support.

Diana moved to endorse the proposal and write a letter of recommendation. Steve seconded the motion. The UTC unanimously supported the proposal.

Diana and Lance committed to working with Vara to draft the letter.

## **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

### **Introduce UTC Infrastructure Priorities List**

Lance described the use and background of the UTC Infrastructure Priorities List. At Trent's prompting, Lance reviewed the packet items: the final list, and a snapshot of last year's process. This includes the criteria-based ranking system.

Previously, the UTC had also used tiers, but these had gone away in 2019. The committee discussed whether or not the final numerical score based on the ranking should be amended in the meeting afterward or should be required to remain as ranked by the criteria-based scoring.

Shana asked that the list be updated with funding and completion details. Lance said the updates would be made.

Lance also covered process for nominating and ranking projects.

Orin suggested that the ranking be conducted from one to five to avoid ties.

Steve asked about discussing the projects in small groups outside of a meeting. It was determined that groups of two could meet or discuss.

David rekindled the discussion on adjusting rankings in a follow-up meeting, and noted that it was not the only thing UTC needs to invest time in.

Diana asked how the list was used.

Trent pointed out that grant proposals, the Capital Improvements Plan, and other Public Works decisions were influenced and supported by the rankings and list. He gave several examples.

David underscored that other kinds of improvements and projects interact with those on the list, and that the emphasis does not need to be on just this list or the ranked order.

Lance noted that the list informs long-range planning activities in the Community Development Department.

Andy noted that the list informs the RTPO's 5-year transportation plan cycle.

Lance re-summarized the ranking process and asked committee members to stick to the schedule on the list.

Andy suggested that reviewing of the survey results might be a good way to add items to the ranked list.

Trent committed to providing some extra commentary to the list about status of projects.

Ross asked for cost estimates, but Trent replied that the amount of effort needed to provide a good cost estimate and the complication of separating a total project from the multimodal components of it would make that challenging.

After further discussion of details, the committee committed to completing their homework on this project.

## **Safe Routes to School**

Lance provided background on the use of CDBG funds to provide better multimodal connections to schools, similar to formal “Safe Routes to School” programs in other communities. He asked that the UTC look for new projects that could be proposed that would parallel the examples that were shared in the packet and in the UTC’s Google Drive.

Trent asked that Lance provide a map of the boundaries of the CDBG eligibility areas.

Andy committed to forwarding resources about Safe Routes planning to the UTC.

Trent suggested that UTC members use the “School Walk Routes” layer on the City’s GIS Transportation Map.

Trent reviewed the items from last year’s list that are moving forward.

## **Annual Report**

Lance gave a brief review of the report and attachments, and thanked David for supplying the new picture.

David said it was a good report and thanked Lance for working on it.

Diana asked for a tweak to the spelling of her name.

## **UPDATES**

### **4<sup>th</sup>/5<sup>th</sup> One-way/Two-way**

Trent noted that the study of converting 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> streets to two-ways was kicking off, and that Diana would be involved as a UTC rep. Public meetings would occur in the coming months.

### **Asphalt Trail Maintenance**

Trent indicated that he had funding to do some asphalt upgrades as listed by UTC in the 2020 priorities list, and asked for direction from UTC on which one to start with.

### **Mobility Hub**

Andy said that there was a quick and strong push to explore a Mobility Hub in Grand Junction, with anticipation of a grant application in April. This could involve a Survey. Andy described this as taking many different forms, with an emphasis on centralizing and linking transportation modes to provide for more seamless transitions between them.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

*No public comment voiced.*

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Steve made a motion to adjourn. David seconded the motion. Shana adjourned the meeting at 7:00pm.