

To access the Agenda and Backup Materials electronically, go to www.gjcity.org



**PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA
IN-PERSON/VIRTUAL HYBRID MEETING
CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 250 N 5th STREET
TUESDAY, APRIL 25, 2023 - 5:30 PM
*Attend virtually: bit.ly/GJ-PC-4-25-23***

Call to Order - 5:30 PM

Consent Agenda

1. Minutes of Previous Meeting(s)

Regular Agenda

1. Consider a request by Smart Choice Res, LLC to zone 1.12 acres from County RSF-R (Residential Single Family Rural) to R-5 (Residential – 5 du/ac) located at 3140 E Road.
2. Consider a request by RECLA METALS L.L.P to zone 9.31 acres from County I-2 (General Industrial District) to City I-1 (Light Industrial) located at 479 30 Rd.
3. Consider a request by Foothills Housing 2 LLC and Foothills Housing 5 LLC to amend the phasing schedule of the approved Outline Development Plan for “The Community” development, now known as “Mesa Trails” on approximately 177 acres located at 2350 Highway 6 and 50 between 23 ¼ and 23 ¾ Roads, from G Road to Highway 6 and 50
4. An Ordinance adopting the Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan as an element of the 2020 One Grand Junction Comprehensive Plan, amending the Active Transportation Corridor Map found in Ordinance 4808 (Grand Junction Circulation Plan) and found in Ordinance 4971 (2020 One Grand Junction Comprehensive Plan) and Repeal and Replace Resolution 48-18 (2018 Complete Streets Policy). This item is being continued from the March 28, 2023 Planning Commission Meeting.
5. Consider a request by the City of Grand Junction to Amend Title 21 of the Grand Junction Municipal Code to regulate cannabis product manufacturing facilities by providing use-specific standards, specific location requirements, and definitions.

Other Business

Adjournment

GRAND JUNCTION PLANNING COMMISSION
March 28, 2023, 5:30 PM
MINUTES

The meeting of the Planning Commission was called to order at 5:33 p.m. by Commissioner Teske.

Those present were Planning Commissioners; Sandra Weckerly, Kimberly Herek, Shanon Secret, Ken Scissors, Keith Ehlers, and Melanie Duyvejonck.

Also present were Jamie Beard (City Attorney), Felix Landry (Planning Supervisor), Nicole Galehouse (Principal Planner), Dave Thornton (Principal Planner) and Jacob Kaplan (Planning Technician).

There was 10 members of the public in attendance, and 2 virtually.

CONSENT AGENDA

1. Approval of Minutes

Minutes of Previous Meeting(s) from March 14, 2023.

REGULAR AGENDA

1. Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan

CPA-2023-167

An Ordinance adopting the Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan as an element of the 2020 One Grand Junction Comprehensive Plan, amending the Active Transportation Corridor Map found in Ordinance 4808 (Grand Junction Circulation Plan) and found in Ordinance 4971 (2020 One Grand Junction Comprehensive Plan) and replace and sunset Resolution 48-18 (2018 Complete Streets Policy).

Staff Presentation

Dave Thornton, Principal Planner, and Carly Sieff, a consultant with Fehr and Peers, provided a presentation regarding the request. Sarah Lubin with the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee spoke in support of the plan. Ian Thomas, also with the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee, spoke in support of the plan.

Questions for staff

Commissioner Secret asked where the implementation of the plan would begin. He also asked who would be paying for the project.

Commissioner Weckerly asked where the funding of the project would come from. She also inquired about the trails proposed along North Avenue and how they would impact private properties. She noted that while the current code does contain requirements for developers to include trails and bike paths in their plans, the trails proposed in the Ped & Bike seemed to be

significantly more expensive to develop. She asked for more transparency in how funding for this project would be obtained.

Commissioner Ehlers inquired about specific language in the plan as to who would be responsible for funding this project. He noted that the plan gave examples of what developers would be responsible for, but there was no language about what aspects would be paid for through grants and government funding. He wondered why the plan should be adopted prior to determining how it would be financed. He asked how access would be addressed in the TEDS manual given that many streets would become active transportation corridors upon adoption of the plan. He asked if the plan didn't work better for a more urban setting given the higher density of vehicular roadways.

Dani Acosta listed a variety of the stakeholders who provided input on this plan.

Public Hearing

The public *comment period* was opened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, March 21, 2023, via www.GJSpeaks.org.

Rosemary Bonine expressed concerns about a bike lane being placed too close to her home.

Rod Hoover asked for more information about the plans for his property.

Diane Schwenke noted that the plan was too long and also that it required more time and planning. She also wondered why the City needed a Bicycle and Pedestrian Coordinator when there is already have a Mobility Planner.

Sarah Lubin asked Commissioner Weckerly for clarification as to her definition of "stakeholders". She argued that the plan was not "half-baked" as Diane Schwenke had put it.

Mark Austin reiterated the concerns with how this project would be funded. He expressed concerns about the proposed impact fees on developers.

Jason Nguyen brought up that the plan is designed to reduce vehicle traffic, thus reducing the need for roads that support them. He also spoke about "Captive Users" who do not and cannot drive and would benefit from adoption of this plan.

Ron Abeloe reiterated the concerns with how this project would be funded. He proposed asking the citizens to pay for it through a sales tax increase.

Ian Thomas commented that he doesn't own a car and travels exclusively by bike and foot. He expressed the importance of pedestrian and cycle infrastructure on public safety and mobility for the residents of Grand Junction.

Rebecca Scarrow said she had not read the plan but expressed concerns that adoption of the plan would dictate code revisions and that the development community would ultimately become responsible for funding the plan.

The public comment period was closed at 7:40 p.m. on March 28, 2023.

Discussion

Dave Thornton noted that the concerns for the future of Orchard Ave were part of an undertaking by the County and were not a consideration for this plan. Additionally, he noted that the Ped & Bike Coordinator position referenced in the plan was the same thing as the Mobility Planner position.

Henry Brown brought up some examples of how grant funding was already providing mobility improvements in the City. He noted that there would be challenges when implementing the plan and that compromises would need to be made to best accommodate all parties.

Felix Landry commented that while the 2020 One Grand Junction Plan called for pedestrian and cycle infrastructure but could not itself be used to acquire grant funding. He noted that if an expense is deemed necessary, it will be funded one way or another. Additionally, he noted that grant funds acquired to fund ped & bike infrastructure could often be leveraged to provide improved infrastructure for all modes of transportation.

Commissioner Scissors asked how the funding mechanisms suggested by the plan impacted the grant funding decisions. He proposed eliminating the contentious language from the policy section of Chapter 6. He also brought up that there was not an actual deadline for adoption and requested more time to solidify the plan.

Dani Acosta noted that the policy addressed the demand aspect and not just infrastructure was because many of the grants currently available were demand based.

Commissioner Ehlers asked why an economic feasibility had not been done to create an estimate of how much the project would cost prior to identifying funding methods. He asked if a continuance would be possible for this type of application.

Commissioner Weckerly proposed asking the citizens of Grand Junction if they would be willing to fund this plan. She mentioned that the trail systems would require additional development which would increase the price on developers. She stated that the item would require several more workshops before she could support it.

Commissioner Herek expressed concerns about the language in the plan and the impact of this proposal on stakeholders.

Commissioner Secrest stated that he was not opposed to the plan, he was opposed to it tonight.

Commissioner Duyvejonck noted that the stakeholders are not just the business community and the bike community and that the steering committee had done a good job with outreach. However, she noted that not all voices had been heard and that more time should be given to allow those stakeholders to address their concerns. She also asked if the future workshops could discuss the grant applications and updating the language to reflect who would be financing the plan.

Commissioner Teske asked for clarification as to which parts of the plan had the most concerns.

Motion and Vote

Commissioner Ehlers made the following motion “Mr. Chairman, on the Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan request City file number CPA-2023-167, I move that the Planning Commission continue this application so that further review and study can be done in workshops as well as asking staff to particularly look at language within the plan that would identify direct responsibility for implementation of it.”

Commissioner Duyvejonck seconded; motion passed 7-0.

2. Zoning Code Amendment

ZCA-2023-172

Consider a repeal and replace of the 2010 Title 21 Zoning and Development Code as amended.

Staff Presentation

Felix Landry, Planning Supervisor, introduced exhibits into the record and provided a presentation regarding the request.

Elizabeth Garvin and Gabby Hart, consultants with Clarion Associates, elaborated on the presentation.

Questions for staff

Commissioner Ehlers asked if there was any language in the proposed ordinance or the code that would require the City to revisit the adjacent topics. He also asked about the amendments and what specifically was being proposed this evening.

Tamra Allen stated that while the language in the ordinance concerning the adjacent topics could not be codified, the Planning Commission could amend their recommendation to City Council to include their concerns on any topics they believe should be revisited in the future.

Commissioner Secret asked if there was any language being added regarding underground utilities or if the amendment was just providing clarity.

Commissioner Scissors asked if the memo containing committee comments about undergrounding and electric vehicles was in response to the edits proposed in the “Consolidated Draft Proposed Edits” document.

Public Hearing

The public *comment period* was opened at 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, March 21, 2023, via www.GJSpeaks.org.

Rod Hoover commented that the City was moving too quickly with the plan and that there was not enough time for citizens to read and understand the issues being discussed.

Greg Tolle questioned the max height of structures for the various residential zone districts and expressed concerns about the height of future developments impacting existing properties.

Dave Zollner expressed concerns about retiring the R-1 and R-2 zone districts and the need for “transitional areas” from higher to lower density neighborhoods.

Mark Austin expressed concerns that there were many amendments to the code without adequate time for the community to review it.

Jane Quimby wondered why the amendment needed to be rushed and speculated that it was tied to the upcoming City Council election.

Ron Abeloe commented that he would like more time to review the amendments to the proposed changes.

Mike Foster mentioned that the least amount of time had been given to the Module 3, which he deemed the most important module.

Bill Wade noted that while the Development Code Committee was formed in February of 2022, the first meeting wasn't until April. He requested continuation of the item to allow more time for deliberation of the proposed code.

Diane Schwenke requested continuation of the item to allow more time for deliberation of the proposed code.

Rebecca Scarrow cautioned that the increase in costs on developers could hinder development.

The public comment period was closed at 10:07 p.m. on March 28, 2023.

Discussion

Felix Landry addressed comments and concerns about community engagement and the project timeline. Additionally, he spoke about the desire for the new code to be more flexible while still meeting the expectations of the existing properties and land uses.

Elizabeth Garvin commented that there are always reservations when adopting new code but noted that there was a “clean-up” period to address oversights in the months that follow.

Commissioner Ehlers asked if there was any public comments or feedback requesting that the item be expedited for approval.

Commissioner Scissors asked if the existing ZDCC would retain its members and continue to provide input on future maintenance of the code.

Commissioner Weckerly asked for Elizabeth's professional opinion on how long it takes to complete a code rewrite of this magnitude for a city this size. She recalled that the proposed timeline for the code rewrite was particularly short. She asked why the max height for structures in the R-12 zone district was more restrictive than in the R-8 zone district. Additionally, she asked for clarification about the max density for properties currently zoned R-O (Residential Office) since they would now be constrained to the Mixed-Use zone district requirements. Lastly, she brought up her desire to revisit the landscaping code.

Commissioner Secret echoed the concerns that the process was being rushed.

Commissioner Duyvejonck stated her agreement with the points that had been made.

Commissioner Herek stated her desire to continue this item to allow further review.

Commissioner Ehlers commented that there was no particular urgency to pass the amendment and that he would like to allow more time for review and consideration.

Tamra Allen requested a timeframe and specific sections that required further consideration should the Planning Commission recommend continuing the item.

Motion and Vote

Commissioner Ehlers made the following motion "Mr. Chairman, on the request to repeal and replace the 2010 Title 21 Zoning and Development Code of the Grand Junction Municipal Code as amended, file number ZCA-2023-172, I move that the Planning Commission recommend continuance with a directive of the staff working with the Planning Commission through workshops as well as the Code Committee to determine an appropriate timeframe and remaining issues to be resolved."

Commissioner Scissors seconded; motion passed 7-0.

3. Comprehensive Plan Amendment

CPA-2023-176

An Ordinance Amending Ordinance No. 4986 and Adopting the One Grand Junction Comprehensive Plan with Revised Zone Districts to be Consistent with the Zoning & Development Code Update.

Discussion

As this item was a companion to item two which was continued, this item was determined to be continued as well.

Motion and Vote

Commissioner Ehlers made the following motion “Mr. Chairman, on the Comprehensive Plan Amendment, City file number CPA-2023-177, I move that the Planning Commission continue this item in accordance with the continuation of agenda item number two this evening.”

Commissioner Scissors seconded; motion passed 7-0.

OTHER BUSINESS

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Scissors moved to adjourn the meeting.
The vote to adjourn was 7-0.

The meeting adjourned at 10:34 p.m.

DRAFT



Grand Junction Planning Commission

Regular Session

Item #1.

Meeting Date: April 25, 2023
Presented By: David Thornton, Principal Planner
Department: Community Development
Submitted By: David Thornton, Principal Planner

Information

SUBJECT:

Consider a request by Smart Choice Res, LLC to zone 1.12 acres from County RSF-R (Residential Single Family Rural) to R-5 (Residential – 5 du/ac) located at 3140 E Road.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the request.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The Applicant, Smart Choices Res LLC is requesting a zone of annexation to R-5 (Residential – 5 du/ac) for the Pino Annexation. The approximately 1.12 acres consists of one parcel of land located at 3140 E Road. The property is undeveloped.

The property is Annexable Development per the Persigo Agreement. The zone district of CSR is consistent with the Residential Low (2 to 5.5 du/ac) Land Use category of the Comprehensive Plan. The request for annexation will be considered separately by City Council, but concurrently with the zoning amendment request.

BACKGROUND OR DETAILED INFORMATION:

Annexation Request:

The Applicant, Smart Choices Res LLC is requesting annexation of approximately 1.12 acres consisting of one parcel of land located at 3140 E Road. There is 0.10 acres of E Road right-of-way included in the annexation. The subject property has one existing home and is planned for three additional residential units and is currently being reviewed for a subdivision plat and site plan.

The property is Annexable Development per the Persigo Agreement. The Applicant is

requesting annexation into the city limits. Annexation is being sought concurrently with the development application for site plan and subdivision. The request for zoning will be considered separately by City Council, but concurrently with the annexation request and will be heard in a future Council action.

The schedule for the annexation and zoning is as follows:

- Referral of Petition (30 Day Notice), Introduction of a Proposed Ordinance, Exercising Land Use – April 5, 2023.
- Planning Commission considers Zone of Annexation – April 25, 2023.
- Introduction of a Proposed Ordinance on Zoning by City Council – May 3, 2023.
- Acceptance of Petition and Public Hearing on Annexation and Zoning by City Council – May 17, 2023.
- Effective date of Annexation and Zoning – June 18, 2023.

Zone of Annexation Request:

The Applicant is requesting a zone district of R-5 (Residential – 5 du/ac). The property is currently zoned in the County as RSF-R (Residential Single Family Rural – one dwelling per five acres). The proposed zone district of R-5 is consistent with the Residential Low (2 to 5.5 du/ac) Land Use category of the Comprehensive Plan. The surrounding County zoning is generally RSF-R, a zone district that provides zoning for interim agricultural uses prior to urbanization that is expected by the Comprehensive Plan. Zoning will be considered in a future action by City Council and requires review and recommendation by the Planning Commission.

The annexation area has sewer service and all other urban amenities to the property providing the ability of urban land uses on the property. It is located within Tier 2 on the Intensification and Growth Tiers Map of the Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan goal to “encourage infill and redevelopment to leverage existing infrastructure” supports the Applicant’s request of a zone of annexation of R-5 and their development application under city review to develop a multi-family 3-plex on the property supports the Comprehensive Plan’s goal of promoting more opportunities for housing choice.

In addition to the R-5 zoning requested by the petitioner, the following zone districts would also be consistent with the proposed Comprehensive Plan designation of Residential Medium (5.5 to 12 du/ac).

- a. R -4 (Residential – 5.5 to 8)
- b. CSR (Community Services and Recreation)

NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

Neighborhood Meeting:

A Neighborhood Meeting regarding the proposed Annexation and Zoning was held in-person on June 7, 2022, in accordance with Section 21.02.080 (e) of the Zoning and

Development Code. The Applicant's representative and City staff were in attendance as well as seven members of the public.

Notice was completed consistent with the provisions in Section 21.02.080 (g) of the City's Zoning and Development Code. The subject property was posted with an application sign on February 6, 2023. Mailed notice of the public hearings before Planning Commission and City Council in the form of notification cards was sent to surrounding property owners within 500 feet of the subject property on April 14, 2023. The notice of the Planning Commission public hearing was published April 18, 2023 in the Grand Junction Daily Sentinel.

Other Notification:
Public comment was offered through the GJSpeaks platform.

ANALYSIS

Zone of Annexation Analysis

The criteria for review are set forth in Section 21.02.140 (a) and includes that the City may rezone property if the proposed changes are consistent with the vision, goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan and must meet one or more of the following rezone criteria as identified:

(1) Subsequent events have invalidated the original premises and findings; and/or The property owners have petitioned for annexation into the City limits and requested zoning of R-5 which is compatible with the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map designation of Residential Low (2 to 5.5 du/ac). Since the Applicant's property is currently in the County, the annexation of the property is a subsequent event that will invalidate one of these original premises, a county zoning designation. In addition, the existing county zoning is RSF-R, a district that is rural and only allows for a density of one dwelling unit per five acres. This area is urbanizing, and the RSF-R zone is not an urban zone district. Mesa County has zoned properties within the urban growth area as RSF-R for purposes of establishing an interim zoning until the area is annexed by the city and urban development occurs supportive of the Comprehensive Plan. Therefore, staff finds this criterion has been met.

(2) The character and/or condition of the area has changed such that the amendment is consistent with the Plan; and/or
The character or condition of the area has been changing with the further development of the E Road and 31 1/2 Road area. The neighborhood has been urbanizing for nearly 50 years with the platting of the Pioneer Meadows Subdivision in 2018 with 47 lots and construction since of single-family homes on most of the lots. Prior subdivisions in the area include Willow Wood Village developing in the past 5 years, but previously to that the area saw Sundown Village Subdivision in 1993 & 1996, and K.C. Farms Subdivision in 2006 also develop. Meadowood Subdivision developed in 1975 with 38 residential lots. Most of the surrounding area has fully developed into single family

residential subdivisions. Infill development continues to occur throughout the Pear Park planning area. The RSF-R zone district of Mesa County with its density requirements of 5 acres per dwelling unit is no longer valid for this growing part of the community, therefore this criterion has been met.

(3) Public and community facilities are adequate to serve the type and scope of land use proposed; and/or

Existing public and community facilities and services are available in close proximity to and can be extended into the annexation area. These services are sufficient to serve land uses associated with the proposed R-5 zone district for this property.

Water and sewer services are available. This property is within the Clifton Water District service area. The area can be served by Xcel Energy for natural gas and electricity.

The property is currently within the Persigo 201 Sewer Service Area and the property can be served by the Clifton Sanitation District from a sewer line in the E Road right-of-way with available capacity to accommodate future development of this property.

This property is in the Clifton Fire District but upon annexation will be served by Fire Station 8 at 441 31 Road. From that location response times are within National Fire Protection Association guidelines and the station has the capacity to handle calls for service resulting from this annexation.

The property is served by Fruitvale Elementary School, Grand Mesa Middle School and Central High School. Shopping for goods and services is found less than a mile away and includes two grocery stores, pharmacies, gas stations and other services in the Clifton area. Staff has found the public and community facilities are adequate to serve the type and scope of urban land uses in the future at such time the property is further urbanized, therefore this criterion has been met.

(4) An inadequate supply of suitably designated land is available in the community, as defined by the presiding body, to accommodate the proposed land use; and/or

The subject property and surrounding area are designated on the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map as Residential Low (2 to 5.5 du/ac). The proposed zoning designation of R-5 meets the intent of achieving the minimum and desired density for the property with this request, to develop at the high end of the Residential Low land use category. For properties already annexed into the City limits in the area, to the west are zoned R-8.

For unincorporated areas of Pear Park surrounding this annexation, Mesa County has zoned the majority of the area as RSF-8. This property is zoned RSF-R, a zone district established as an interim zoning until the area is annexed by the city and urban development occurs supportive of the Comprehensive Plan.

The Land Use Map defines much of the immediate half mile area around the subject property as either Residential Medium or Residential Low and located in Tier 2 of the

Intensification and Growth Tiers Map. Staff finds that the R-5 zone district provides zoning that accommodates this parcel in a way that allows for the likely achievable density development due to the size and dimensions of the parcel. Therefore, staff finds this criterion has been met.

(5) The community or area, as defined by the presiding body, will derive benefits from the proposed amendment.

Annexation and zoning of the properties will create additional land within the City limits for city growth and it helps fill in the patchwork of unincorporated and/or urban area that is adjacent to the City limits. The annexation is also consistent with the City and County 1998 Persigo Agreement. The requested zone district provides housing within a range of density that has been defined as urban densities in the 2020 One Grand Junction Comprehensive Plan and is consistent with the needs of the community. This principle is supported and encouraged by the Comprehensive Plan and furthers the plan's goal of promoting a diverse supply of housing types that meet the needs of all ages, abilities, and incomes identified in Plan Principle 5: Strong Neighborhoods and Housing Choice, Chapter 2 of the Comprehensive Plan. Therefore, Staff finds that this criterion has been met.

Section 21.02.160 (f) of the Grand Junction Zoning and Development Code provides that the zoning of an annexation area shall be consistent with the adopted Comprehensive Plan and the criteria set forth. Though the R-4 zone district as well the CSR zoning could be considered in a Residential Low Land Use area, the R-5 zone district is consistent with the recommendations of the Plan's Land Use Map, compatible with the surrounding neighborhood and provides for housing type that has not currently been constructed in the surrounding area and can provide more housing choice in the community.

Consistency with Comprehensive Plan

Further, the zoning request is consistent with the following chapters, goals and principles of the Comprehensive Plan:

Chapter 2

Plan Principle 3: Responsible and Managed Growth

Goal: Support fiscally responsible growth and annexation policies that promote a compact pattern of growth...and encourage the efficient use of land.

Goal: Encourage infill and redevelopment to leverage existing infrastructure.

Plan Principle 5: Strong Neighborhoods and Housing Choices

Goal: Promote more opportunities for housing choices that meets the needs of people of all ages, abilities, and incomes.

Chapter 3

Intensification and Tiered Growth Plan. Subject property is located within Tier 2 – In Tier 2, the City should promote the annexation of those parcels which are surrounded

by, and or have direct adjacency to, the City limits of Grand Junction. Annexation and development of these parcels will provide development opportunities while minimizing the impact on infrastructure and City services.

Relationship to Existing Zoning. Requests to rezone properties should be considered based on the Implementing Zone Districts assigned to each Land Use Designation.

- Guide future zoning changes. Requests for zoning changes are required to implement the Comprehensive Plan.

RECOMMENDATION AND FINDINGS OF FACT

After reviewing the Pino Zone of Annexation, ANX-2022-4854 request for the property located at 3140 E Road from County RSF-R (Residential Single Family Rural) to R-5 (Residential – 5 du/ac), the following findings of facts have been made:

1. The request conforms with Section 21.02.140 of the Zoning and Development Code.
2. The request is consistent with the vision (intent), goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan.

Therefore, Staff recommends approval of the request.

SUGGESTED MOTION:

Mr. Chairman, on the Zone of Annexation request for the property located at 3140 E Road, City file number ANX-2022-484, I move that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of approval to City Council with the findings of fact as listed in the staff report.

Attachments

1. Development Application - Pino Annex
2. Annexation Schedule - Table - Pino Annexation
3. Pino Annexation Plats-Pino Annexation Plat
4. Maps
5. Site Photo
6. ORD-Zoning - Pino ANX

Development Application

We, the undersigned, being the owner's of the property adjacent to or situated in the City of Grand Junction, Mesa County, State of Colorado, as described herein do petition this:

Petition For: Annexation

Please fill in blanks below only for Zone of Annexation, Rezones, and Comprehensive Plan Amendments:

Existing Land Use Designation	Residential	Existing Zoning	RSF+R
Proposed Land Use Designation	Residential Single fam	Proposed Zoning	R-8

Property Information

Site Location:	3140 E Rd	Site Acreage:	0.94
Site Tax No(s):	2943-103-00-137	Site Zoning:	RSF-R
Project Description:	Annex Property into city limits of GJ		

Property Owner Information

Name: Smart Choice Res, LLC

Street Address: 2695 Patterson Rd
2-265

City/State/Zip: GJ, CO 81506

Business Phone #:

E-Mail: levi@smartchoiceres.com

Fax #:

Contact Person: Levi Pino

Contact Phone #: 970-692-4140

Applicant Information

Name: Levi Pino

Street Address: 2695 Patterson Rd
2-265

City/State/Zip: GJ, CO 81506

Business Phone #:

E-Mail: same

Fax #:

Contact Person: Levi Pino

Contact Phone #:

Representative Information

Name: River City Consultants

Street Address: 215 Pitkin Ave

City/State/Zip: GJ, CO 81501

Business Phone #:

E-Mail: cpatch@rcwest.com

Fax #:

Contact Person: Courtney Patch

Contact Phone #: 970-241-4722

NOTE: Legal property owner is owner of record on date of submittal.

We hereby acknowledge that we have familiarized ourselves with the rules and regulations with respect to the preparation of this submittal, that the foregoing information is true and complete to the best of our knowledge, and that we assume the responsibility to monitor the status of the application and the review comments. We recognize that we or our representative(s) must be present at all required hearings. In the event that the petitioner is not represented, the item may be dropped from the agenda and an additional fee may be charged to cover rescheduling expenses before it can again be placed on the agenda.

Signature of Person Completing the Application		Date	5/6/22
Signature of Legal Property Owner		Date	5/6/22

**PINO ANNEXATION
PETITION FOR ANNEXATION**

WE THE UNDERSIGNED do hereby petition the City Council of the City of Grand Junction, State of Colorado, to annex the following described parcels to the said City:

GENERAL LOCATION: 3140 E Road #A, Grand Junction, CO 81504
Tax ID # 2943-103-00-137

Commencing at a brass cap in a monument box, Mesa County Survey Marked No.11 being the quarter corner of Section 10 and Section 15, whence a 2" aluminum cap PLS 12291 in a monument box for the west sixteenth on the south line of said Section 10 bears North 89°50'59" West with all bearings herein relative thereto; Thence North 89°50'59" West, a distance of 368.23 feet; thence North 00°09'10" East, a distance of 30.001 feet to the Point of Beginning; Thence North 89°50'59" West, a distance of 72.00 feet; thence North 00°09'10" East, a distance of 583.81 feet; thence South 82°05'50" East, a distance of 72.66 feet; thence South 00°09'10" West, a distance of 574.01 feet to the true Point of Beginning. Said property containing 41,681 square feet or 0.96 acres more or less, County of Mesa, State of Colorado.

This foregoing description describes the parcels; the perimeter boundary description, for purposes of the Annexation Act, is shown on the attached "Perimeter Boundary Legal Description, Pino Annexation."

As grounds therefore, the petitioner respectfully state that annexation to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado is both necessary and desirable and that the said territory is eligible for annexation in that the provisions of the Municipal Annexation Act of 1965, Sections 31-12-104 and 31-12-105 CRS 1973 have been met.

This petition is accompanied by four copies of a map or plat of the said territory, showing its boundary and its relation to established city limit lines, and said map is prepared upon a material suitable for filing.

Your petitioners further state that they are the owners of more than fifty percent of the area of such territory to be annexed, exclusive of streets and alleys; that the mailing address of the signer and the date of signature are set forth hereafter opposite the name of the signer, and that the legal description of the property owned by the signer of said petition is attached hereto.

WHEREFORE, these petitioners pray that this petition be accepted and that the said annexation be approved and accepted by ordinance. These petitioners by his/her/their signature(s) acknowledge, understand and agree that if any development application concerning the property which is the subject hereof is denied, discontinued or disapproved, in whole or in part, that the annexation of the property to the City of Grand Junction shall proceed.


Smart Choice Res, LLC
NAME

2695 Patterson Rd #2-265, Grand Junction, CO 81506
ADDRESS


SIGNATURE
Levi Pino, Manager

7/5/22
DATE

(Pino Annexation Petition)



STATE OF COLORADO

SS

AFFIDAVIT

COUNTY OF MESA

Levi Pino

_____, of lawful age, being first duly sworn, upon oath, deposes and says:


That he is the circulator of the forgoing petition:

That each signature on the said petition is the signature of the person whose name it purports to be.



Subscribed and sworn to before me this 5th day of July, 2022.

Witness my hand and official seal.





Notary Public

204 8 1/2 J Rd, Fruita, CO 81521

Address

My commission expires: 9/27/2025

MESA COUNTY CERTIFICATE OF TAXES DUE

Account Number R037127
Parcel 294310300137

Certificate Number 115759
Acres 0.000
Order Number
Vendor ID Counter

Assessed To
SMART CHOICE RES LLC
2695 PATTERSON RD STE 2-265
GRAND JUNCTION, CO 81506

Legal Description	Situs Address
E 72FT OF BEG 368.25FT W OF SE COR SW4 SEC 10 1S 1E W 359.75FT N 653FT S 82DEG15' E 373FT S 581.5FT TO BEG EXCEPT RD ROW DESCRIBED AT RECPT NO 2921955 MESA CO RECD8 - 0.92 AC	3140 E RD

Year	Tax	Interest	Fees	Payments	Balance
Tax Charge					
2021	\$1,243.48	\$0.00	\$0.00	(\$1,243.48)	\$0.00
Total Tax Charge					\$0.00
Grand Total Due as of 05/12/2022					\$0.00

Tax Billed at 2021 Rates for Tax Area 15602 - 15602

Authority	Mill Levy	Amount	Values	Actual	Assessed
CLIFTON FIRE PROTECTION	11.5520000	\$194.31	RESIDENTIAL	\$58,000	\$16,820
COLORADO RIVER WATER CONSER	0.5010000	\$8.43	VACANT LOTS		
GRAND RIVER MOSQUITO CTRL	1.3210000	\$22.22	Total	\$58,000	\$16,820
GRAND VALLEY DRAINAGE DIST	1.8150000	\$30.53			
LIBRARY DISTRICT	3.0430000	\$51.18			
MESA COUNTY	11.7590000*	\$197.78			
COUNTY ROAD & BRIDGE-FULL L	0.0053000*	\$0.09			
SCHOOL DIST #51 GEN	29.7350000*	\$500.15			
SCHOOL DIST# 51 BOND	11.0280000	\$185.49			
SCHOOL DIST# 51 2017 OVERRI	3.0820000	\$51.84			
UPPER GRAND VALLEY PEST	0.0870000*	\$1.46			
Taxes Billed 2021	73.9283000	\$1,243.48			

* Credit Levy

All tax lien sale amounts are subject to change due to endorsement of current taxes by the lienholder or to advertising and distraint warrant fees. Changes may occur and the Treasurer's office will need to be contacted prior to remittance after the following dates: Personal Property and Mobile Homes, Real Property - September 1. Tax lien sale redemption amounts must be paid by cash or cashiers check.

Special taxing districts and the boundaries of such districts may be on file with the board of County Commissioners, the County Clerk, or the County Assessor.

This certificate does not include land or improvements assessed under a separate account number, personal property taxes, transfer tax or misc. tax collected on behalf of other entities, special or local improvement district assessments or mobile homes, unless specifically mentioned.

I, the undersigned, do hereby certify that the entire amount of taxes due upon the above described parcels of real property and all outstanding sales for unpaid taxes as shown by the records in my office from which the same may still be redeemed with the amount required for redemption are as noted herein. In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and seal.

MESA COUNTY CERTIFICATE OF TAXES DUE

MESA COUNTY TREASURER, SHEILA REINER




Mesa County Treasurer
PO Box 20000
544 Rood Ave
Grand Junction CO 81502-5027



IMPROVEMENT SURVEY PLAT

Mesa County Parcel Number 2943-103-00-137
Southeast 1/4 of the Southwest 1/4 of Section 10,
Township 1 South, Range 1 East, Ute Meridian, Mesa County, Colorado

2" ALUMINUM CAP ON #5 REBAR IN MONUMENT BOX
N1/16 S10 PE/PLS 12291
(WEST 1/16TH SEC. 10 SEC. 15)



BASIS OF BEARINGS STATEMENT: Bearings are based on grid north of the Mesa County Local Coordinate System, locally determined by GPS observations on the brass cap Mesa County survey marker at the South one-quarter corner of Section 10, and the aluminum cap at the West one-sixteenth corner on the South line of Section 10. The measured bearing of this line is N89°50'54"W.



LEGEND	
	2" ALUMINUM CAP ON #5 REBAR PLS 18480 - RIVER CITY CONSULTANTS
	1.5" ALUMINUM CAP IN CONCRETE LAND DESIGN
	ALIQUOT MONUMENT AS NOTED
	SET 1.5" ALUMINUM CAP ON #5 REBAR PLS 38274
	SEWER CLEANOUT
	AREA INLET
	IRRIGATION MANHOLE
	GAS METER
	WATER METER
	ELECTRIC METER
	ELECTRIC PULL BOX
	EASEMENT LINE
	PARCEL LINE
	ROW LINE
	ALIQUOT LINE
	EDGE OF ASPHALT
	EDGE OF GRAVEL
	EDGE OF CONCRETE
	STRUCTURE
	OVERHEAD TELEPHONE LINE
	UNDERGROUND TELEPHONE
	GAS LINE
	WATER LINE
	UNDERGROUND ELECTRIC LINE
	OVERHEAD ELECTRIC LINE
	STORM LINE
	WOOD FENCE
	CHAIN LINK/IRON FENCE
	FENCE
	MAIL BOX

SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS USED ON THIS PLAT	
E:	EAST
N:	NORTH
NO:	NUMBER
PLS:	PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYOR
MCSM:	MESA COUNTY SURVEY MARKER
MPE:	MULTI-PURPOSE EASEMENT
PLS:	PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYOR
REC:	RECEPTION
ROW:	RIGHT OF WAY
S:	SOUTH
T:	TOWNSHIP
UM:	UTE MERIDIAN
W:	WEST

Lineal Units of Measurement are U.S. Survey Foot.

MCLCS ZONE "GVA"
TRANSVERSE MERCATOR PROJECTION
POINT OF ORIGIN (SOUTH) AND CENTRAL MERIDIAN:
LATITUDE: 39°10'22.72746"N
LONGITUDE: 108°32'01.43552"W
NORTHING: 50,000FT
EASTING: 100,000FT
SCALE FACTOR: 1.000218181798
PROJECT/SCALE FACTOR HEIGHT: 4644FT(NAVD88)

This survey plat does not constitute a title search by the undersigned surveyor or River City Consultants, Inc. and no certification as to title or ownership of any parcels shown hereon is made by either. All information regarding ownership, rights-of-way easements of record, adjoiners, and other documents that may affect the quality of title to this property is from a title commitment prepared by Land Title Guarantee Company, GJR65042134, dated June 01, 2020. Other documents may exist which would affect this property.

PROPERTY DESCRIPTION (as surveyed):
Commencing at a brass cap in a monument box, Mesa County Survey Marked NO.11 being the quarter corner of Section 10 and Section 15, whence a 2" aluminum cap PLS 12291 in a monument box for the west sixteenth on the south line of said Section 10 bears North 89°50'54" West with all bearings herein relative thereto;
Thence North 89°50'54" West, a distance of 368.23 feet;
thence North 00°04'10" East, a distance of 30.00 feet to the Point of Beginning;
Thence North 89°50'54" West, a distance of 72.00 feet;
thence North 00°04'10" East, a distance of 583.81 feet;
thence South 82°05'50" East, a distance of 72.66 feet;
thence South 00°04'10" West, a distance of 574.01 feet to the Point of Beginning. Said property containing 41.681 square feet or 0.96 acres more or less.

This plat is a graphical representation of the professional opinion of the undersigned surveyor of the location of the property as described in the title documents referenced. The bearings of the boundary lines on the drawing represent the title description rotated to grid north of the Mesa County Local Coordinate System (MCLCS) noted above. The geometric integrity of the lines has been preserved except where they yield to record monuments and/or senior or controlling lines.

SURVEYOR'S STATEMENT
I, Alec K Thomas, a registered Professional Land Surveyor in the State of Colorado, do hereby state: the Improvement Survey represented hereon was performed by me or under my responsible charge; it is based upon my knowledge, information and belief; it is in accordance with applicable standards of practice. This statement is not a guaranty, either expressed or implied.

Alec K Thomas,
Colorado PLS 38274



LAND SURVEY DEPOSITS
Mesa County Surveyor's Office
Date _____
Deposit Number _____



IMPROVEMENT SURVEY PLAT
Mesa County Parcel Number 2943-103-00-137
Southeast 1/4 of the Southwest 1/4 of Section 10,
Township 1 South, Range 1 East, Ute Meridian,
Mesa County, Colorado

Sheet 1 of 1	Date: 01/08/2022	Job No. 2034-001
Surveyed: TPJ	Drawn: AKT	Checked: BDM
Drawing name: S:\PROJECTS\2024 - Land Pro\03 - 340 E Road\Drawings\2943-103-00-137.dwg		



**Neighborhood Meeting Notes
Pine Grove Annexation & Subdivision
3140 E Rd. Grand Junction, CO 81504**

**SUMMARY OF VIRTUAL NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING
TUESDAY June 7, 2022 @ 5:30PM, VIA ZOOM**

A virtual neighborhood meeting for the above-referenced annexation & subdivision was held Tuesday June 7, 2022, via zoom, at 5:30pm. The initial letter that was sent to neighbors notifying them of the meeting was sent to property owners within 500 feet of the subject property. The letter was sent on May 19th, 2022, per the mailing list received from the City of Grand Junction. There were 7 attendees including Courtney Patch, Project Coordinator, and Jarrod Whelan, Project Engineer, with River City Consultants, Levi & Alisha Pino, the Developer, and Jace Hochwalt, Senior Planner with the City of Grand Junction. There were 3 neighbors in attendance via zoom or over the phone.

The meeting included a brief presentation and question/answer session. Information about the proposed annexation and subdivision were presented. The zoning and density were discussed, as well as the right-of-way to be built on Bevill Ave. between the residences. The parent parcel is located within the Urban Development Boundary and the Persigo 201 District which require annexation into the city limits to subdivide further. The parent parcel is to be subdivided into a total of four lots. The existing house and out-buildings on the north side of Bevill Ave. will remain as one parcel. The south side of Bevill Ave. will have three townhome lots constructed with attached single-family residences. A Site Plan and maps depicting the current, platted configuration, and zoning were shown to the attendees and copies are attached to this summary.

Jarrod introduced himself and explained that the development is a unique situation. He explained that the shared driveway leads to a gravel drive where a garage will be located. This building cannot be converted to a dwelling unit. The stormwater will be collected in the southeast corner of the parcel and will be conveyed to an existing storm sewer manhole in E Rd.

Lance explained that the parcel must be annexed into the city limits before the subdivision can be finalized. Annexation will be a public hearing process and will go in front of the Planning Commission for a recommendation and then to the City Council for final approval. The subdivision portion is an administrative review process but requires this neighborhood meeting.

The neighbors in attendance had questions on the following items:

-Access point from Bevill Ave, will this continue all the way to 31 ½ Rd?

-Jarrod explained that the road will be extended across the parcel for this development. The number of homes with the additional 4 homes is under the maximum number (100 lots) of lots for one access location. The parcel to the east will also be required to have Bevill Ave to be extended to 31 ½ Rd when it is developed.

-Detention pond fees paid for the subdivision to the west?

-The stormwater is going to be collected in the southeast corner of the parcel and then conveyed to a manhole that is existing in the local storm drain system. This development will not use or be connected to the subdivision's storm water system on the west.

-Bevill Ave is not extending through the parcel on the east, what is the purpose of stubbing the road out at the parcel to the east?

-Jace explained that the connection is required for whenever the parcel at 3142 E Rd develops the connection can be made all the way across to 31 ½ Rd. This is a requirement for connectivity by the city of Grand Junction.

*Neighbor is not happy about this future connectivity.

-Style of the homes?

-Levi explained that the homes will not be stucco or vinyl siding. They are going to have different colors and accents and appear as very high-end homes. The two units on both ends are approximately 1,700 square feet, and the one in the middle is approximately 1,238 square feet.

- Will the homes be low-income homes?

-Levi explained that the two on the ends will be owner occupied, and the middle one will be a rental.

-Are the homes going to be single story?

-Levi explained that the two on the ends will be ranch styles and the middle unit will be a two-story to add dimension to the building and allow additional square footage. Once the three townhomes are constructed the density will be maxed out.

-When will construction begin?


-Levi explained that we are submitting as soon as possible, and after the review period and approval is obtained construction will begin. They hope to have all construction finalized by the end of this year.

-Jace explained that the annexation will take approximately 4 months to complete, but the subdivision can run simultaneously with the annexation. The review process is approximately 4 months start to finish once a submittal is made. Jace also mentioned that another notice will be sent to the neighboring parcels once applications have been submitted and the neighbors will be given another opportunity to speak on the subject at the public hearings.

-Will the new lots be added on the HOA to the west?



-No, we will have our own HOA for the shared driveway and landscape buffer, which will be taken care of separately.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 6:00 pm.




Plus one more caller who cut out early.

Location Map



Printed: 6/7/2022
1 inch equals 94 feet
Scale: 1:1,128






City of Grand Junction Zoning
(go to www.gjcity.org for G.J zoning info)

City of Grand Junction Zoning
(go to www.gjcity.org for G.J zoning info)


Current Zoning: RSF-R

Print Packet Page 27 of 27



The Geographic Information System (GIS) and its components are designed as a source of reference for assessing location, for planning and for modeling. GIS is not blended or does not replace legal description information in the chain of title and other information contained in official government records such as the County Clerk and Recorder office or the courts. In addition, the representations of location in the GIS cannot be substituted for actual legal surveys. The information contained herein is believed accurate and suitable for the intended uses, and subject to the limitations set forth above. Mesa County makes no warranty as to the accuracy or suitability of any information contained herein. Users assume all risk and responsibility for any and all damages, including consequential damages, which may flow from the user's use of this information.

City of GJ Comprehensive Plan Map




Printed: 6/7/2022
1 inch equals 94 feet
Scale: 1:1,128

Description:
Residential Low (2 -5.5 DU/Acre)



IMPROVEMENT SURVEY PLAT

Mesa County Parcel Number 2943-103-00-137
 Southeast 1/4 of the Southwest 1/4 of Section 10,
 Township 1 South, Range 1 East, Ute Meridian, Mesa County, Colorado



2" ALUMINUM CAP ON #5 REBAR IN MONUMENT BOX
 N1/16 S10 PE/PLS 12241
 (NEST 1/16TH SEC. 10 SEC. 15)

BRASS CAP IN MONUMENT BOX
 MESA COUNTY SURVEY MARKER
 NO.11
 1/4 S10 S15



BASIS OF BEARINGS

The bearings hereon are grid bearings of the Mesa County Local Coordinate System, GVA, as defined at http://emop.mesacounty.us/gps_survey/GVAZONE.htm, determined by GPS observation of the south line of the SE1/4 SE1/4 NW1/4 of Section 16, T.1S., R.1E., Ute Meridian, the Center 1/4 corner of said Section 16, being a 3.25" aluminum cap on a pipe marked "LS 37904 MCSM" whence the Center-West 1/16 Corner of said Section 16, being a 3" brass cap marked "LS 37904 MCSM", bears South $84^{\circ}54'32''$ West, as shown hereon.

PROPERTY DESCRIPTION (as surveyed):

Thence North $84^{\circ}50'54''$ West, a distance of 72.00 feet;
 thence North $00^{\circ}04'10''$ East, a distance of 583.81 feet;
 thence South $82^{\circ}05'50''$ East, a distance of 72.66 feet;
 thence South $00^{\circ}04'10''$ West, a distance of 574.01 feet to the true POINT OF BEGINNING, Said 1 containing 41681 square feet or 0.96 acres more or less.

This survey plat does not constitute a title search by the undersigned surveyor or River City Consultants, Inc. and no certification as to title or ownership of any parcels shown hereon is made by either. All recorded and apparent rights-of-way and easements shown hereon were researched by the professional land surveyor, other documents may exist which would affect this property.

This plat is a graphical representation of the professional opinion of the undersigned surveyor of the location of the property as described in the title documents referenced. The bearings of the boundary lines on the drawing represent the title description rotated to grid north of the Mesa County Local Coordinate System (MCLCS) noted above. The geometric integrity of the lines has been preserved except where they yield to record monuments and/or senior or controlling lines.

SURVEYOR'S STATEMENT

I, Alec K Thomas, a registered Professional Land Surveyor in the State of Colorado, do hereby state: the Improvement Survey represented hereon was performed by me or under my responsible charge; it is based upon my knowledge, information and belief; it is in accordance with applicable standards of practice. This statement is not a guaranty, either expressed or implied.

Alec K Thomas,
 Colorado PLS 38274



215 Pitkin Avenue, Unit 201
 Grand Junction, CO 81501
 Phone: 970.241.4722
 www.rccwest.com
 Date: 01/08/2021
 Job No. 2010-001
 Surveyed: TPJ
 Drawn: BDM
 Checked: AKT
 Drawing name: S:\PROJECTS\2024 - Levi Proj\001 - 340 E Road\Drawings\2943-103-00-137.dwg

Lineal Units of Measurement are U.S. Survey Foot.

MCLCS ZONE "GVA"
 TRANSVERSE MERCATOR PROJECTION
 POINT OF ORIGIN (SNO) AND CENTRAL MERIDIAN:
 LATITUDE: 3410622.72746N
 LONGITUDE: 10893201.43552W
 NORTHING: 50,000FT
 EASTING: 100,000FT
 SCALE FACTOR: 1.00021817198
 PROJECT/SCALE FACTOR HEIGHT: 4644FT(NAVD88)


NOTICE: According to Colorado law you must commence any legal action based upon any defect in this survey within three years after you first discover such defect. In no event may any action based upon any defect in this survey be commenced more than ten years from the date of the certification shown hereon.

IMPROVEMENT SURVEY PLAT

Mesa County Parcel Number 2943-103-00-137
 Southeast 1/4 of the Southwest 1/4 of Section 10,
 Township 1 South, Range 1 East, Ute Meridian,
 Mesa County, Colorado

Sheet 1 of 1	Date: 01/08/2021	Job No. 2010-001
Surveyed: TPJ	Drawn: BDM	Checked: AKT

Drawing name: S:\PROJECTS\2024 - Levi Proj\001 - 340 E Road\Drawings\2943-103-00-137.dwg



ZONING SUMMARY

Zoning: R-8
 Min Lot Size: 3,000 SF
 Min Lot Width: 40 FT
 Min Lot Frontage: 20 FT
 Min Setbacks
 Front: 20 FT
 Rear: 15 FT
 Side: 5 FT
 Max Height (Building): 40 FT
 Max Height (Stories): N/A
 Max Lot Coverage: 60%
 Max Building Size: N/A

UTILITY PROVIDERS

Water: CliftonWater District
 Sewer: Clifton Sanitation District
 Electric: Xcel Energy
 Gas: Gas
 Telephone: CenturyLink
 Cable: Charter Spectrum
 Irrigation: Grand Valley Irrigation Canal

SITE BREAKDOWN

Lots (4)	0.807 ac	74.26%
Tract A (Shared Drive/Utility)	0.077 ac	4.83%
Right of Way (Dedicated)	0.073 ac	16.52%
Total	0.957 ac	100.00%

ACCEPTANCE BLOCK
 The City of Grand Junction hereby certifies general compliance with the City's Development Standards, subject to these plans being sealed, signed, and dated by the Professional of Record. Review by the City does not constitute approval of the plan design. The City neither accepts nor assumes any liability for errors or omissions. Errors in the design or calculations remain the responsibility of the Professional of Record. Construction must commence within one year from the date of plan signature.

City Planner _____ Date _____
 City Development Engineer _____ Date _____

811
 UNCC
 Know what's below. Call before you dig.
 800.922.1987
 www.uncc.org
 CALL 2 BUSINESS DAYS IN ADVANCE BEFORE YOU DIG, GRADE, OR EXCAVATE FOR THE MARKING OF UNDERGROUND MEMBER UTILITIES.

Project Benchmark
 TBD

NORTHING: —
 EASTING: —
 ELEVATION: —
 DATUM SOURCE: MCLCS Zone "GVA" (NAVD 88)

SCALE (FEET)

HORIZONTAL: 0 20 40

VERTICAL: N/A

CONTOUR INTERVAL: N/A FT

PROJECT PHASE: Preliminary/Review DATE ISSUED: _____

NO.	DATE	REVISION	BY

S:\PROJECTS\2034_Levi_Pine\001_3140_E_Road\Design\DWG\05-Sheet\2034-001_Site_Plan.dwg [Site Plan] 6/7/2022 5:20:23 PM

RIVER CITY CONSULTANTS
 215 Pitkin Avenue, Unit 201
 Grand Junction, CO 81501
 www.rcwest.com
 Phone: 970.241.4722
 Fax: 970.241.8841

PRELIMINARY

DRAWN BY: _____ PROJECT: 2034-001
 CHECKED BY: _____
 ORIGINAL SHEET SIZE: 22 x 34

SMART CHOICE RES LLC

Pine Grove
 Site Plan

Pine Grove Annexation & Zoning
3140 E Rd, Grand Junction, CO 81504
Parcel No. 2943-103-00-137

General Project Report

June 28, 2022

Prepared for:

Levi Pino

Smart Choice RES, LLC

2695 Patterson Rd STE 2-265

Grand Junction, CO 81506

Prepared by:



215 Pitkin, Grand Junction, CO 81501

Grand Junction, CO 81506

Phone: (970) 241-4722

Fax: (970) 241-8841

A. Project Description

1) Location: The project is located at 3140 E Road (Parcel No. 2943-103-00-137).

2) Acreage: The subject parcel contains approximately 0.96 Acres. The portion to be annexed consists of all 0.96 acres.

3) Proposed Use: This submittal is for the Annexation into the City of Grand Junction limits and requests a zoning of the parcel to R-5. The future land use is Residential Low (2-5.5 DU/Acre). The proposed R-5 zoning (3-5.5 DU/Acre) meets the intent of the 2020 Comprehensive Plan with regards to density and use. A separate submittal will be made with regards to the subdivision of the parcel.

B. Public Benefit

The proposed Annexation and Zoning will provide low density, single family residential lots needed to keep up with growth and demand for housing.

C. Neighborhood Meeting

A neighborhood meeting was held virtually via a zoom meeting on June 7, 2022. A summary of the meeting is included with this submittal.

D. Project Compliance, Compatibility, and Impact

1) Adopted plans and/or policies:

The proposed Annexation and Zoning, in conjunction with the 2020 Comprehensive Plan, will comply with the adopted codes, plans and requirements for the property. The R-5 zoning is an appropriate district for the Residential Low category of the Comprehensive Plan.

2) Land use in the surrounding area:

The uses contained within the surrounding area are a mix of large lot residential and agricultural uses, as well as low density residential.

3) Site access and traffic patterns:

Not applicable for this submittal.

4) Availability of utilities, including proximity of fire hydrants:

The subject parcel is served by the following:

Clifton Water
City of Grand Junction Sewer
Grand Valley Irrigation Company

Xcel Energy
City of Grand Junction Fire – Station 2
Spectrum/Charter
CenturyLink/Lumen

A Fire Flow Form will be obtained at the Preliminary/Final submittal stage.

5) Special or unusual demands on utilities:

There will be no unusual demand on utilities as a result of the Rezone.

6) Effects on public facilities:

The Annexation and Zoning will have no adverse effect on public facilities.

7) Hours of operation:

Typical of residential development.

8) Number of employees:

Not applicable.

9) Signage:

Not applicable.

10) Site Soils Geology:

Not applicable.

11) Impact of project on site geology and geological hazards:

None are anticipated.

E. Must address the review criteria contained in the Zoning and Development Code for the type of application being submitted

Section 21.02.070 (6) of the Zoning and Development Code:

General Approval Criteria. No permit may be approved unless all of the following criteria are satisfied:

(i) Compliance with the Comprehensive Plan and any applicable adopted plan.

The Annexation and Zoning request is in compliance with the recently adopted 2020 Comprehensive Plan.

(ii) Compliance with this zoning and development code.

The Annexation and Zoning request is in compliance with the zoning and development code.

(iii) Conditions of any prior approvals.

There are no conditions of prior approvals.

(iv) Public facilities and utilities shall be available concurrent with the development.

All public facilities and utilities will be available concurrent with the rezoning and subsequent development of this property.

(v) Received all applicable local, State and federal permits.

All applicable permits will be obtained for this project.

Section 21.02.140 Code amendment and rezoning:

(a) **Approval Criteria.** In order to maintain internal consistency between this code and the zoning maps, map amendments must only occur if:

(1) Subsequent events have invalidated the original premises and findings; and/or

The proposed Annexation and Zoning request to the R-5 zone district will bring the parcel into compliance with the newly adopted 2020 Comprehensive Plan. The parcel's location within the 201 boundary dictates that the project must annex and establish zoning in the City limits in order to develop.

(2) The character and/or condition of the area has changed such that the amendment is consistent with the Plan; and/or

The annexation and zoning would allow the continuation of low density, affordable, quality housing in this much desired area of Grand Junction and is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

(3) Public and community facilities are adequate to serve the type and scope of land use proposed; and/or

Public and community facilities are existing and adequate and will support low density residential and industrial developments and are not affected as a result of the Annexation and Zoning request.

(4) An inadequate supply of suitably designated land is available in the community, as defined by the presiding body, to accommodate the proposed land use; and/or

This parcel of land is adequately serviced by utilities and roadways. There is an inadequate supply of low-density development parcels in this area, that haven't already been developed, to meet demand.

(5) The community or area, as defined by the presiding body, will derive benefits from the proposed amendment.

The area will benefit with the development of low-density residential development with the extension of services.

F. Development Schedule

Not applicable for this submittal.

3140 E Rd Property Description (as surveyed):

A parcel of land situated in Southeast 1/4 of the Southwest 1/4 of Section 10, Township 1 South, Range 1 East, Ute Meridian, City of Grand Junction, County of Mesa, State of Colorado, said parcel being more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at a brass cap in a monument box, Mesa County Survey Marked NO.11 being the quarter corner of Section 10 and Section 15, whence a 2" aluminum cap PLS 12291 in a monument box for the west sixteenth on the south line of said Section 10 bears North 89°50'59" West with all bearings herein relative thereto;

Thence North 89°50'59" West, a distance of 368.23 feet;
thence North 00°09'10" East, a distance of 30.00 feet
to the Point of Beginning;

Thence North 89°50'59" West, a distance of 72.00 feet;
thence North 00°09'10" East, a distance of 583.81 feet;
thence South 82°05'50" East, a distance of 72.66 feet;
thence South 00°09'10" West, a distance of 574.01 feet to the Point of Beginning. Said parcel containing 41,681 square feet or 0.96 acres more or less.

OWNERSHIP STATEMENT - CORPORATION OR LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY

Print Form

(a) Smart Choice Res, LLC ("Entity") is the owner of the following property:

(b) 3140 E Rd. Grand Junction, CO 81504

A copy of the deed(s) evidencing the owner's interest in the property is attached. Any documents conveying any interest in the property to someone else by the owner are also attached.

I am the (c) Manager for the Entity. I have the legal authority to bind the Entity regarding obligations and this property. I have attached the most recent recorded Statement of Authority of the Entity.

My legal authority to bind the Entity both financially and concerning this property is unlimited.

My legal authority to bind the Entity financially and/or concerning this property is limited as follows:

[Empty box for limited authority details]

The Entity is the sole owner of the property.

The Entity owns the property with other(s). The other owners of the property are:

[Empty box for other owners]

On behalf of Entity, I have reviewed the application for the (d) Annexation + Subdivision

I have the following knowledge or evidence of a possible boundary conflict affecting the property:

(e) None

I understand the continuing duty of the Entity to inform the City planner of any changes regarding my authority to bind the Entity and/or regarding ownership, easement, right-of-way, encroachment, lienholder and any other interest in the land.


I swear under penalty of perjury that the information in this Ownership Statement is true, complete and correct.

Signature of Entity representative: [Signature]

Printed name of person signing: Levi Pino

State of Colorado)

County of Mesa) ss.



Subscribed and sworn to before me on this 6th day of May, 20 22

by Levi Pino

Witness my hand and seal.

My Notary Commission expires on 9-27-2025

[Signature]
Notary Public Signature



State Documentary Fee
Date: June 01, 2020
\$11.00

Special Warranty Deed
(Pursuant to C.R.S. 38-30-113(1)(b))

Grantor(s), **LAVINA R. BEVERIDGE**, whose street address is **PO BOX 1406, Eagle, CO 81631**, City or Town of **Eagle**, County of **Eagle** and State of **Colorado**, for the consideration of **(\$110,000.00) ***One Hundred Ten Thousand and 00/100***** dollars, in hand paid, hereby sell(s) and convey(s) to **SMART CHOICE RES, LLC, A COLORADO LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY**, whose street address is **2695 PATTERSON RD STE 2-265, Grand Junction, CO 81506**, City or Town of **Grand Junction**, County of **Mesa** and State of **Colorado**, the following real property in the County of **Mesa** and State of **Colorado**, to wit:

**THE EAST 72 FEET OF THE FOLLOWING DESCRIBED TRACT, TO-WIT:
BEGINNING AT A POINT 368.25 FEET WEST OF THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF THE SW¼ OF SECTION 10, TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 1 EAST OF THE UTE MERIDIAN;
THENCE WEST 359.75 FEET;
THENCE NORTH 653 FEET;
THENCE SOUTH 82°15' EAST 373 FEET;
THENCE SOUTH 581.5 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING;
EXCEPT ROAD RIGHT OF WAY FOR E ROAD;
EXCEPTING THEREFROM THE SOUTH 30 FEET THEREOF, AS CONVEYED TO MESA COUNTY, COLORADO IN QUIT CLAIM DEED RECORDED APRIL 27, 2020 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 2921955,**

COUNTY OF MESA, STATE OF COLORADO.

also known by street and number as: **3140 E ROAD, GRAND JUNCTION, CO 81504**

with all its appurtenances and warrant(s) the title to the same against all persons claiming under me(us), subject to Statutory Exceptions.

Signed this day of **June 01, 2020**.

LAVINA R. BEVERIDGE

State of **Colorado**)
)ss.
County of **MESA**)

May 28

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me on this day of ~~June 1st~~, 2020 by **LAVINA R. BEVERIDGE**

Witness my hand and official seal

My Commission expires: 5-28-2024
Notary Public

MELINDA DOW
NOTARY PUBLIC
STATE OF COLORADO
NOTARY ID 20044018726
My Commission Expires: **May 28, 2024**

When recorded return to: **SMART CHOICE RES, LLC, A COLORADO LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY**
2695 PATTERSON RD STE 2-265, Grand Junction, CO 81506



WHEN RECORDED **SMART CHOICE RES, LLC**
RETURN TO: **2695 PATTERSON ROAD, SUITE #2-265**
GRAND JUNCTION, CO 81506



STATEMENT OF AUTHORITY
(§38-30-172, C.R.S.)

1. This Statement of Authority relates to an entity¹ named
SMART CHOICE RES, LLC, A NEVADA LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY
2. The type of entity is a:

<input type="checkbox"/> Corporation	<input type="checkbox"/> Registered Limited Liability Partnership
<input type="checkbox"/> Nonprofit Corporation	<input type="checkbox"/> Registered Limited Liability Limited Partnership
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Limited Liability Company	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited Partnership Association
<input type="checkbox"/> General Partnership	<input type="checkbox"/> Government or Governmental Subdivision or Agency
<input type="checkbox"/> Limited Partnership	<input type="checkbox"/> Trust
<input type="checkbox"/>	
3. The entity is formed under the laws of **Nevada**
4. The mailing address for the entity is **2695 PATTERSON ROAD, SUITE #2-265, GRAND JUNCTION, CO 81506**
5. The name position of each person authorized to execute instruments conveying, encumbering or otherwise affecting title to real property on behalf of the entity is **LEVI PINO, AS MANAGING MEMBER OR ALISHA PINO, AS MANAGING MEMBER OR IVY BEVILLE, AS MANAGING MEMBER OR RAYMOND BEVILLE, AS MANAGING MEMBER**
6. The authority of the foregoing person(s) to bind the entity: is² not limited is limited as follows:
7. Other matters concerning the manner in which the entity deals with interests in real property:
8. This Statement of Authority is executed on behalf of the entity pursuant to the provisions of §38-30-172, C.R.S.³
9. This Statement of Authority amends and supersedes in all respects any and all prior dated Statements of Authority executed on behalf of the entity.

(Signature and Notary Acknowledgement on Second Page)

¹This form should not be used unless the entity is capable of holding title to real property.
²The absence of any limitation shall be prima facie evidence that no such limitation exists.
³The statement of authority must be recorded to obtain the benefits of the statute.




Executed this 5th day of April 2019


LEVI PINO, AS MANAGING MEMBER

State of COLORADO)
)ss
County of MESA)

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me on this 5th day of April 2019
by Name Ack LEVI PINO, AS MANAGING MEMBER OF SMART CHOICE RES, LLC, A NEVADA LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY

Witness my hand and official seal.
My Commission expires 11-15-21


Notary Public

JULIANNA MCNEILL
NOTARY PUBLIC
STATE OF COLORADO
NOTARY ID #19934017213
My Commission Expires November 15, 2021
County of Mesa

PINO ANNEXATION SCHEDULE




April 5, 2023	Referral of Petition (30 Day Notice), Exercising Land Use, 1st Reading of Annexation Ordinance
April 25, 2023	Planning Commission considers Zone of Annexation
May 3, 2023	Introduction of Ordinance on Zoning by City Council
May 17, 2023	Public Hearing on Annexation and Zoning by City Council
June 18, 2023	Effective date of Annexation and Zoning

ANNEXATION SUMMARY

File Number:	ANX-2022-484	
Location:	3140 E Road	
Tax ID Numbers:	2943-103-00-137	
# of Parcels:	1	
Existing Population:	2	
# of Parcels (owner occupied):	0	
# of Dwelling Units:	1	
Acres land annexed:	1.12	
Developable Acres Remaining:	0.7	
Right-of-way in Annexation:	0.10 acres (E Road)	
Previous County Zoning:	RSF-R	
Proposed City Zoning:	R-5	
Current Land Use:	Vacant and Residential	
Comprehensive Plan Land Use:	Residential Low	
Values:	Assessed:	\$16,820
	Actual:	\$58,000
Address Ranges:	3140 E Road	
Special Districts:	Water:	Clifton Water & Ute Water Conservancy District
	Sewer:	City of Grand Junction
	Fire:	Clifton Fire Protection District
	Irrigation/Drainage:	Grand Valley Irrigation Company
	School:	District 51
	Pest:	Grand River Mosquito District & Upper Grand Valley Pest
	Other:	Colorado River Water Conservancy

PINO ANNEXATION

Located in the SE1/4 SW1/4, SECTION 10 AND NE1/4 NW1/4, SECTION 15,
TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 1 EAST,
UTE MERIDIAN, COUNTY OF MESA, STATE OF COLORADO



LEGAL DESCRIPTION

A parcel of land being a part of the Southeast Quarter of the Southwest Quarter (SE1/4 SW1/4) of Section 10 and the Northeast Quarter of the Northwest Quarter (NE1/4 NW1/4) of Section 15, Township 1 South, Range 1 East, Ute Meridian, Mesa County, Colorado more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at the South Quarter Corner of said Section 10 whence the West Sixteenth Corner of said Section 10/Section 15 bears N89°51'00\"/>

AREAS OF ANNEXATION		LEGEND	
ANNEXATION PERIMETER	1504.55 FT.	ANNEXATION BOUNDARY	
CONTIGUOUS PERIMETER	643.81 FT.	ANNEXATION AREA	
AREA IN SQUARE FEET	48954 FT ²	EXISTING CITY LIMITS	
AREA IN ACRES	1.12		
AREA WITHIN R.O.W.	4320 FT ²		
	0.10 ACRES		
AREA WITHIN DEEDED R.O.W.	4320 FT ²		
	0.10 ACRES		

SURVEY ABBREVIATIONS		SQ. FT.	SQUARE FEET
P.O.C.	POINT OF COMMENCEMENT	Δ=	CENTRAL ANGLE
P.O.B.	POINT OF BEGINNING	RAD.	RADIUS
R.O.W.	RIGHT OF WAY	ARC	ARC LENGTH
SEC.	SECTION	CHD.	CHORD LENGTH
TWP.	TOWNSHIP	CHB.	CHORD BEARING
RGE.	RANGE	BLK.	BLOCK
U.M.	UTE MERIDIAN	P.B.	PLAT BOOK
NO.	NUMBER	BK.	BOOK
REC.	RECEPTION	PG.	PAGE
		HOR. DIST.	HORIZONTAL DISTANCE

ORDINANCE NO. PRELIMINARY	EFFECTIVE DATE PRELIMINARY
-------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

NOTE:
THE DESCRIPTION(S) CONTAINED HEREIN HAVE BEEN DERIVED FROM SUBDIVISION PLAT, DEED DESCRIPTIONS & DEPOSIT SURVEYS AS THEY APPEAR IN THE OFFICE OF THE MESA COUNTY CLERK & RECORDER. THIS PLAT OF ANNEXATION DOES NOT CONSTITUTE A LEGAL BOUNDARY SURVEY, AND IS NOT INTENDED TO BE USED AS A MEANS OF ESTABLISHING OR VERIFYING PROPERTY BOUNDARY LINES.


PRELIMINARY

RENEE BETH PARENT _____ DATE _____
STATE OF COLORADO - P.L.S. NO. 38266
FOR THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION
333 WEST AVENUE - BLDG. C
GRAND JUNCTION, CO. 81501

THIS IS NOT A BOUNDARY SURVEY

NOTICE:
ACCORDING TO COLORADO LAW ANY LEGAL ACTION BASED UPON ANY DEFECT FOUND IN THIS SURVEY MUST COMMENCE WITHIN THREE (3) YEARS AFTER THE DISCOVERY OF SUCH DEFECT. IN NO EVENT MAY ANY ACTION BASED UPON ANY DEFECT FOUND IN THIS SURVEY BE COMMENCED MORE THAN TEN (10) YEARS FROM THE DATE OF THE CERTIFICATION SHOWN HEREON.


DRAWN BY: MJH DATE: 2/14/2023
DESIGNED BY: RBP DATE: 2/14/2023
CHECKED BY: RBP DATE: 2/15/2023



**PUBLIC WORKS
ENGINEERING DIVISION**

PINO ANNEXATION
LOCATED IN THE SE1/4 SW1/4, SECTION 10 AND THE NE1/4 NW1/4, SECTION 15,
TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 1 EAST,
UTE MERIDIAN, COUNTY OF MESA, STATE OF COLORADO

PINO ANNEXATION



G:\GIS\ADMINISTRATION\ANNEXATION\ANNEXATION.aprx



0 0.05 0.1 Miles

 Annexation

 City Limits


PINO ANNEXATION



0 0.05 0.1 Miles

 Annexation  City Limits

PINO ANNEXATION - LAND USE




G:\BIG ADMINISTRATION\ANNEXATION\ANNEXATION.aprx



0 0.05 0.1 Miles

 Annexation Boundary

PINO ANNEXATION - ZONING



0 0.05 0.1 Miles




Annexation

City Zoning
Packet Page 45

County Zoning

Date Created: 3/9/2023





Pino Annexation – 3140 E Road
– Looking north



CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO

ORDINANCE NO. _____

**AN ORDINANCE ZONING PINO ANNEXATION
TO R-5 (RESIDENTIAL – 5 DWELLING UNITS PER ACRE) ZONE DISTRICT
LOCATED ON PROPERTY AT 3140 E ROAD**

Recitals:

The property owner has petitioned to annex their 1.12 acres into the City limits. The annexation is referred to as the “Pino Annexation.”

After public notice and public hearing as required by the Grand Junction Zoning & Development Code, the Grand Junction Planning Commission recommended zoning the Pino Annexation consisting of 1.12 acres from County RSF-R (Residential Single Family Rural) to R-5 (Residential – 5 dwellings per acre) finding that both the R-5 zone district conforms with the designation of Residential Low as shown on the Land Use Map of the Comprehensive Plan and conforms with its designated zone with the Comprehensive Plan’s goals and policies and is generally compatible with land uses located in the surrounding area.

After public notice and public hearing, the Grand Junction City Council finds that the R-5 (Residential – 5 dwellings per acre) zone district, is in conformance with at least one of the stated criteria of Section 21.02.140 of the Grand Junction Zoning & Development Code for the parcel as designated.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION THAT:

ZONING FOR THE PINO ANNEXATION

The following parcel in the City of Grand Junction, County of Mesa, State of Colorado is hereby zoned R-5 (Residential – 5 dwellings per acre) as follows:

Perimeter Boundary Legal Description

A parcel of land being a part of the Southeast Quarter of the Southwest Quarter (SE1/4 SW1/4) of Section 10 and the Northeast Quarter of the Northwest Quarter (NE1/4 NW1/4) of Section 15, Township 1 South, Range 1 East, Ute Meridian, Mesa County, Colorado more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at the South Quarter Corner of said Section 10 whence the West Sixteenth Corner of said Section 10/Section 15 bears N89°51'00"W a distance of 1,308.14 feet using the Mesa County Local Coordinate System with all other bearings contained herein being relative

thereto; thence N89°51'00"W a distance of 368.25 feet along the South line of said Southeast Quarter of the Southwest Quarter of said Section 10 to the Point of Beginning; thence S00°09'09"W a distance of 30.00 feet to a point on the north boundary line of Sundown Village Number 2 Replat as described in Reception Number 1746497; thence along said North Boundary line N89°51'00W a distance of 72.00 feet to the Southeast Corner of the PELLUM ANNEXATION, ORDINANCE NO. 3613; thence along the Eastern Boundary line of said Annexation N00°09'09"E a distance of 30.00 feet to a point on the North line of the Northeast Quarter of the Northwest Corner of said Section 15, thence continuing along said Eastern Annexation line N00°09'09"E a distance a distance of 30.00 feet to the Southwest Corner of a parcel of land as described in Reception Number 3049398, thence continuing along said Eastern Annexation line N00°09'09"E a distance of 583.81 feet to the Northeast Corner of said Annexation; thence the following four (4) courses 1) N00°09'09"E a distance of 41.04 feet to the centerline of the Grand Valley Canal, 2) S82°05'51E along the centerline of said canal a distance of 72.66 feet, 3) along the Eastern Boundary line of said parcel of land as described in Reception Number 3049398 S00°09'09"W a distance of 615.05 feet to the Southeast Corner of said Parcel, 4) S00°09'09"W a distance of 30.00 feet to the Point of Beginning.

Said Parcel of land CONTAINING 48,954 Square Feet or 1.12 Acres, more or less.

INTRODUCED on first reading this ____ day of _____, 2023 and ordered published in pamphlet form.

ADOPTED on second reading this ____ day of _____, 2023 and ordered published in pamphlet form.

Anna M. Stout
President of the Council

ATTEST:

Amy Phillips
City Clerk



Grand Junction Planning Commission

Regular Session

Item #2.

Meeting Date: April 25, 2023
Presented By: Daniella Acosta, Senior Planner
Department: Community Development
Submitted By: Daniella Acosta, Senior Planner

Information

SUBJECT:

Consider a request by RECLA METALS L.L.L.P to zone 9.31 acres from County I-2 (General Industrial District) to City I-1 (Light Industrial) located at 479 30 Rd.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the request.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The Applicant, RECLA METALS L.L.L.P, is requesting a zone of annexation to I-1 (Light Industrial) for the Recla Metals Annexation. The 9.31-acre property consists of one parcel of land located at 479 30 Rd. The property currently contains a single-family residence and will be seeking redevelopment.

The property is Annexable Development per the Persigo Agreement. The zone district of I-1 is consistent with the Industrial Land Use category of the Comprehensive Plan. The request for annexation will be considered separately by the City Council, but concurrently with the zoning amendment request.

BACKGROUND OR DETAILED INFORMATION:

Annexation Request:

The Applicant, Recla Metals L.L.L.P. is requesting annexation of 9.31 acres consisting of one parcel of land located at 479 30 Rd. There is road right-of-way included in the annexation. There currently exists a single-family residence on the property. The Applicant intends to redevelop the property further, constructing a steel service center that recycles metals into architectural building materials for wholesale.

The property is Annexable Development per the Persigo Agreement. The Applicant is requesting annexation into the city limits. Annexation is being sought in anticipation of

constructing a steel service center facility development. The request for zoning will be considered separately by City Council, but concurrently with the annexation request and will be heard in a future Council action.

The schedule for the annexation and zoning is as follows:

- Referral for Petition (30 Day Notice), Introduction of a Proposed Ordinance, Exercising Land Use – April 19, 2023.
- Planning Commission considers Zone of Annexation – April 25, 2023.
- Introduction of a Proposed Ordinance on Zoning by City Council – May 3, 2023.
- Acceptance of Petition and Public Hearing on Annexation and Zoning by City Council – June 7, 2023.
- Effective date of Annexation and Zoning – July 9, 2023.

Zone of Annexation Request

The Applicant is requesting a zone district of I-1 (Light Industrial). The property is currently zoned in the County as I-2 (General Industrial District). The proposed zone district of I-1 is consistent with the Industrial Land Use category of the 2020 Comprehensive Plan. The surrounding properties include a mixture of City zoned properties, such as I-1, C-2 (General Commercial), B-1 (Neighborhood Business), R-8 (Residential 8 du/ac), and R-5 (Residential 5 du/ac), as well as properties in the County zoned primarily I-2 and RSF-4 (Residential Single – 4 District) and RSF-R (Residential Single Family – Rural District) .

The City I-1 and County I-2 properties are primarily located directly to the west, north and south of the subject parcel. The majority of the residentially zoned City and County properties are located indirectly to the south and to the east, separated by Gunnison Avenue and 30 Road, respectively. The former is a Minor Collector, and the latter is a Minor Arterial. The County I-2 (General Industrial District) is primarily intended to accommodate areas of heavy and concentrated fabrication, manufacturing and industrial uses. Zoning will be considered in a future action by City Council and requires review and recommendation by the Planning Commission. The property is currently adjacent to the existing city limits. The property owner has signed a petition for annexation.

The annexation area has sewer service and all other urban amenities to the property accommodating future industrial manufacturing and wholesale development. It is located within Tier 1 on the Intensification and Growth Tier Maps outlined in the Comprehensive Plan. Additionally, the subject property is located within the Pear Park Neighborhood Plan.

In addition to I-1 zoning requested by the petitioner, the following zone districts would also be consistent with the proposed Comprehensive Plan land use designation of Industrial:

- a. General Commercial (C-2)
- b. Industrial/Office Park (I-O)
- c. General Industrial (I-2)

NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

A Neighborhood Meeting regarding the proposed rezone request was held on October 24, 2022 at 2990 Teller Road inside the Harvest View Alliance Church, in accordance with Section 21.02.080 (e) of the Zoning and Development Code. The Applicant, the Applicant's representative, City Staff and approximately ten neighbors were in attendance.

Notice was completed consistent with the provisions in Section 21.02.080 (g) of the Zoning and Development Code. The subject property was posted with an application sign on November 10, 2022. Mailed notice of the public hearings before Planning Commission and City Council in the form of notification cards was sent to surrounding property owners within 500 feet of the subject property, as well as neighborhood associations within 1000 feet, on April 13, 2023. The notice of this public hearing was published on April 16, 2023 in the Grand Junction Daily Sentinel.

ANALYSIS

Zone of Annexation Analysis

The criteria for review are set forth in Section 21.02.140(a) and includes that the City may rezone property if the proposed changes are consistent with the vision, goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan and must meet one or more of the following rezone criteria as identified:

(1) Subsequent events have invalidated the original premises and findings; and/or

The property owner has petitioned for annexation into the City limits and requested zoning of I-1, which is compatible with the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map designation of Industrial. Since the Applicant's property is currently in the County, the annexation of the property may be viewed as a subsequent event that would invalidate one of these original premises, a county zoning designation. However, annexation into the City is not a subsequent event. Furthermore, Staff has found this to not be enough justification as the land use designation for this property between the 2010 Comprehensive Plan and the 2020 Grand Junction has not changed substantially. The 2010 Comprehensive Plan designated the property as Commercial Industrial and the 2020 Comprehensive Plan designated the property's land use as Industrial. Therefore, this criterion has not been met.

(2) The character and/or condition of the area has changed such that the amendment is consistent with the Plan; and/or

The character of the parcels west of 30 Road are largely industrial with heavy commercial, whereas the character of the parcels east of 30 Road are predominantly

single-family residential, with the exception of the recently approved and constructed Dollar General on the corner of 30 Road and E Road. In the last five years, the area west of 30 Road has only seen one substantial development application aside from this zone of annexation request, which was the minor site plan approval for a telecommunications facility (SPN-2021-173). The majority of the development applications within the past five years west of 30 Road have consisted of planning clearances for interior remodels of existing industrial facilities and a church, and sign permits. The current land uses west of 30 Rd, where the subject parcel is also located, are a mix of heavy manufacturing, heavy commercial and light commercial, with the exception of the Harvest View Alliance Church. The already existing industrial nature of the immediate area, it is premature to conclude that the area west of 30 Road has changed dramatically enough in character to warrant a rezone. As such, staff finds this criterion has not been met.

(3) Public and community facilities are adequate to serve the type and scope of land use proposed; and/or

Existing public and community facilities and services are available in close proximity to and can be extended into the annexation area. These services are sufficient to serve land uses associated with the proposed I-1 zone district for this property. Water and sewer services are available.

This property is within the Ute Water District service area and there is an 18" C900 water line that runs in the right-of-way (30 Road), which runs adjacent to the property. The property is within the Persigo 201 Service Sewer Area and there is a 10-inch PVC sewer line in the 30 Road right-of-way with available capacity to accommodate future industrial development of this property. Staff has found the public and community facilities are adequate to serve the type and scope of urban land uses in the future at such time the property is further urbanized, and existing public facilities can accommodate the industrial/wholesale commercial operation of a steel recycling center in the near term. Therefore, this criterion has been met.

(4) An inadequate supply of suitably designated land is available in the community, as defined by the presiding body, to accommodate the proposed land use; and/or

There are approximately ten neighboring parcels within City limits that are zoned I-1 and one neighboring parcel within City limits that is zoned C-2. Both I-1 and C-2 implement the Land Use Designation of Industrial. Therefore, staff has determined that there is not a deficit of zone districts that can implement this land use. This criterion has not been met.

(5) The community or area, as defined by the presiding body, will derive benefits from the proposed amendment.

Annexation and zoning of the properties will create additional land within the City limits for city growth and it helps fill in the patchwork of unincorporated and/or urban area that

is adjacent to the City limits. The annexation is also consistent with the City and County 1998 Persigo Agreement. The requested zone district will provide an opportunity for industrial businesses consistent with the Comprehensive Plan to meet the needs of the growing community. This principle is supported and encouraged by the Comprehensive Plan and furthers the plan's goal of fostering a vibrant, diverse, and resilient economy identified in Plan Principle 2: Resilient and Diverse Economy, found in Chapter 2 of the 2020 One Grand Junction Comprehensive Plan. Therefore, Staff finds that this criterion has been met.

Compliance with the Comprehensive Plan

The rezone criteria provide that the City must also find the request consistent with the vision, goals, and policies of the Comprehensive Plan. Staff has found the request to be consistent with the following goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan:

Plan Principle 2.1.a. – Economic Diversity: Support the further diversification of the economy that is prepared to anticipate, innovate, and proactively respond to cyclical economic fluctuations and evolution.

Plan Principle 2.1.g. – Sales and Use Tax Revenue: Emphasize the retention and recruitment of retailers or development projects that have a positive impact on sales tax generation, specifically focused on increasing retail sales inflow and reducing retail sales leakage.

Plan Principle 3.1.b. – Intensification And Tiered Growth: Support the efficient use of existing public facilities and services by directing development to locations where it can meet and maintain the level of service targets as described in Chapter 3, Servicing Growth. Prioritize development in Tier 1: Urban Infill areas.

Relationship to Existing Zoning. Requests to rezone properties should be considered based on the Implementing Zone Districts assigned to each Land Use Designation. Guide future zoning changes. Requests for zoning changes are required to implement the Comprehensive Plan.

Additionally, the 2020 Comprehensive Plan elaborates area-specific policies for areas with an Industrial land use designation. In particular, the Comprehensive Plan recommends the continued promotion of reinvestment and new development within the designated Industrial Areas, of which this particular parcel is within. Furthermore, the Comprehensive plan calls for the preservation of established industrial areas, particularly those that are situated along rail access as this parcel is. A zone of annexation to I-1 would achieve this objective by preserving industrial areas and promoting manufacturing uses in those key areas.

RECOMMENDATION AND FINDINGS OF FACT

After reviewing the Recla Metals Zone of Annexation request, ANX-2022-818, for the property located at 479 30 Road, the following findings of fact have been made:

1. The request conforms with Section 21.02.140 of the Zoning and Development Code.
2. The request is consistent with the vision (intent), goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan.

Therefore, Staff recommends approval of the request.

SUGGESTED MOTION:

Mr. Chairman, on the Zone of Annexation for the property located at 479 30 Rd, City file number ANX-2022-818, I move that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of approval to City Council with the findings of fact as listed in the staff report.

Attachments

1. Exhibit 1. Development Application
2. Exhibit 2. Annexation Schedule and Summary Table
3. Exhibit 3. Recla Metals Annexation Plat-Annexation Plat
4. Exhibit 4. Recla Metals Annex Legal Description
5. Exhibit 5. Site Maps and Streetview
6. Exhibit 6. Neighborhood Meeting Notes
7. Exhibit 7. Recla Annexation Ordinance

Development Application

We, the undersigned, being the owner's of the property adjacent to or situated in the City of Grand Junction, Mesa County, State of Colorado, as described herein do petition this:

Petition For:

Please fill in blanks below only for Zone of Annexation, Rezones, and Comprehensive Plan Amendments:

Existing Land Use Designation <input type="text" value="Industrial"/>	Existing Zoning <input type="text" value="I-2 Mesa County"/>
Proposed Land Use Designation <input type="text" value="Industrial"/>	Proposed Zoning <input type="text" value="I-1"/>

Property Information

Site Location: <input type="text" value="479 30 Road"/>	Site Acreage: <input type="text" value="9.10 acres"/>
Site Tax No(s): <input type="text" value="2943-171-00-079"/>	Site Zoning: <input type="text" value="I-2"/>
Project Description: <input type="text" value="Annex this parcel to bring it into the city of Grand Junction"/>	

Property Owner Information

Name:

Street Address:

City/State/Zip:

Business Phone #:

E-Mail:

Fax #:

Contact Person:

Contact Phone #:

Applicant Information

Name:

Street Address:

City/State/Zip:

Business Phone #:

E-Mail:

Fax #:

Contact Person:

Contact Phone #:

Representative Information

Name:

Street Address:

City/State/Zip:

Business Phone #:

E-Mail:

Fax #:

Contact Person:

Contact Phone #:

NOTE: Legal property owner is owner of record on date of submittal.

We hereby acknowledge that we have familiarized ourselves with the rules and regulations with respect to the preparation of this submittal, that the foregoing information is true and complete to the best of our knowledge, and that we assume the responsibility to monitor the status of the application and the review comments. We recognize that we or our representative(s) must be present at all required hearings. In the event that the petitioner is not represented, the item may be dropped from the agenda and an additional fee may be charged to cover rescheduling expenses before it can again be placed on the agenda.

Signature of Person Completing the Application

Date

Signature of Legal Property Owner

Date

**RECLA METALS ANNEXATION
PETITION FOR ANNEXATION**

WE THE UNDERSIGNED do hereby petition the City Council of the City of Grand Junction, State of Colorado, to annex the following described parcels to the said City:

GENERAL LOCATION: 479 30 Road, Grand Junction, CO 81507
Tax ID # 2943-171-00-079

**THE S½ S½ NE¼ NE¼ OF SECTION 17, TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 1 EAST OF THE UTE MERIDIAN;
EXCEPT COMMENCING AT THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF SAID TRACT;
THENCE NORTH 100 FEET;
THENCE WEST 300 FEET;
THENCE SOUTH 100 FEET;
THENCE EAST 300 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING;
ALSO EXCEPTING THEREFROM THAT PORTION THEREOF CONVEYED TO MESA COUNTY IN
WARRANTY DEED RECORDED FEBRUARY 7, 2002 IN BOOK 3017 AT PAGE 974 UNDER RECEPTION NO.
2039629,
COUNTY OF MESA, STATE OF COLORADO**

This foregoing description describes the parcel; the perimeter boundary description, for purposes of the Annexation Act, is shown on the attached "Perimeter Boundary Legal Description, Recla Metals Annexation."

As grounds therefore, the petitioner respectfully state that annexation to the City of Grand Junction, Colorado is both necessary and desirable and that the said territory is eligible for annexation in that the provisions of the Municipal Annexation Act of 1965, Sections 31-12-104 and 31-12-105 CRS 1973 have been met.

This petition is accompanied by four copies of a map or plat of the said territory, showing its boundary and its relation to established city limit lines, and said map is prepared upon a material suitable for filing.

Your petitioners further state that they are the owners of more than fifty percent of the area of such territory to be annexed, exclusive of streets and alleys; that the mailing address of the signer and the date of signature are set forth hereafter opposite the name of the signer, and that the legal description of the property owned by the signer of said petition is attached hereto.

WHEREFORE, these petitioners pray that this petition be accepted and that the said annexation be approved and accepted by ordinance. These petitioners by his/her/their signature(s) acknowledge, understand and agree that if any development application concerning the property which is the subject hereof is denied, discontinued or disapproved, in whole or in part, that the annexation of the property to the City of Grand Junction shall proceed.

By: Garry Fulks

479 30 Road Grand Junction, CO 81504
ADDRESS

SIGNATURE

DATE

OWNERSHIP STATEMENT - CORPORATION OR LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY

(a) RECLA METALS LLLP ("Entity") is the owner of the following property:

(b) 479 30 RD GRAND JUNCTION, CO 81504

A copy of the deed(s) evidencing the owner's interest in the property is attached. Any documents conveying any interest in the property to someone else by the owner are also attached.

I am the (c) Managing Member for the Entity. I have the legal authority to bind the Entity regarding obligations and this property. I have attached the most recent recorded Statement of Authority of the Entity.

- My legal authority to bind the Entity both financially and concerning this property is unlimited.
My legal authority to bind the Entity financially and/or concerning this property is limited as follows:

GREG FULKS

- The Entity is the sole owner of the property.
The Entity owns the property with other(s). The other owners of the property are:

[Empty box for other owners]

On behalf of Entity, I have reviewed the application for the (d) Annexation & Zoning

I have the following knowledge or evidence of a possible boundary conflict affecting the property:

(e) None

I understand the continuing duty of the Entity to inform the City planner of any changes regarding my authority to bind the Entity and/or regarding ownership, easement, right-of-way/encroachment, lienholder and any other interest in the land.

I swear under penalty of perjury that the information in this Ownership Statement is true, complete and correct.

Signature of Entity representative: [Handwritten Signature]

Printed name of person signing: Greg Fulks

State of Colorado)


County of Mesa) ss.

Subscribed and sworn to before me on this 23 day of August, 2022

by Greg Fulks

Witness my hand and seal.

My Notary Commission expires on 9/16/2024



[Handwritten Signature]
Notary Public Signature

**Project Report
Recla Metals LLLP
479 30 Road
Grand Junction, CO 81504
October 24, 2022**

For the proposed Annexation & Zoning



479 30 Rd – Metals Service Center

Prepared by ~ Colorado Land Advisor, Ltd.

Project Report

This report is for the exclusive use of Recla Metals LLLP and/or Garry Fulks, Greg Fulks, their successors, and assigns.

© 2022

Prepared by:

Jeffery Fleming, CNUa, QLIDI

Colorado Land Advisor, Ltd.

300 Main Street | Suite 302

Grand Junction, CO. 81501

970.812.3288

LandAdvisor@ColoradoLandAdvisor.com

As urban planners much experience and research has gone into compiling data for this report. Information was collected from various sources and every attempt has been made to acknowledge the contributing sources. Any errors of omission are unintentional and should be brought to the attention of the author as soon as possible.

Contents

Page

- 4 Introduction and Summary
- 5 Site Analysis
- 6 Zoning
- 7 Existing Land Use & Future Land Use
- 8 Surrounding Land Use
- 9 Proposed Land Use
- 10 Opportunity & Enterprise Zone
- 11 FEMA Floodplain Map
- 12 Transportation & Emergency Services
- 13 Utility Services
- 14 Soils and Geology
- 15 Development Schedule
- 16 Evaluation of the Request – Annexation & Rezone

Introduction and Summary

This General Project Report, documents, and accompanying drawings, is intended to provide an overview of the property and proposed development utilizing the Grand Junction's Planning process. The process is intended to gather initial input from review agencies prior to Annexation and Zoning.

The site selected for Recla Metals consists of a single parcel of land that is 9.10 acres. The site is located at 479 30 Rd in Mesa County, Colorado. The parcel of land currently has a house on it. The Mesa County Assessor has given the property the following parcel number: 2943-171-00-079.

This request is for the Annexation and Zoning of the lot. The existing house will be moved leaving just land.

This request is for annexation into the City of Grand Junction coupled with a zoning designation. This zoning request is for a zoning designation of I-1. The Future Land Use of the site is designated as Industrial, which would support an I-1 (light industrial) zone district. Access to the lot would remain where it is until a future date when an application for a Major Site Plan development is approved.

No construction is being proposed with this application. Any construction would be proposed in a future development application. All utilities: water, gas, sewer, electric, etc. are adjacent, or on-site.

There are no known site conditions which would be impacted by this request. The site has no wetlands, no surface waters, no unusual topography. It is within the Persigo Agreement Boundary.

The ultimate plan is to construct a 10,000 sq. ft. steel building to house the office administration and small retail office, along with staff restrooms along with some metals processing and inside storage. Much of the acreage would be devoted to a storage and processing yard for the metals service center.

Site Analysis

The purpose of this section is to identify the physical and technical characteristics of the property selected for the metal service center in relationship to the surrounding area. This section also evaluates potential site development assets and constraints.

The site under consideration is one parcel of land that is rectangular in shape. The parcel is partially developed land. Ground cover ranges between non-existent on the formerly cultivated areas, to native landscaping typically found in a high desert setting. Around the existing house the land is fully landscaped.

The site consists of one parcel of land that totals 9.10 acres. Located in Mesa County, Colorado. The longitude and latitude of the approximate center of the property is: Latitude = 39.0741471 Longitude = -108.4990842.

The topography of the site consists of low slopes around 0%-2%.

Location Map:



Zoning


Grand Junction has identified the property as IND on the Future Land Use Map.

I-1: Light Industrial.

- (1) Purpose. To provide for areas of light fabrication, manufacturing and industrial uses which are compatible with existing adjacent land uses, access to transportation and the availability of public services and facilities. I-1 zones with conflicts between other uses can be minimized with orderly transitions of zones and buffers between uses. This site will use landscape and fences for buffering to adjacent parcels.
- (2) Street Design. Effective and efficient street design and access shall be considerations in the determination of project/district intensity. This site will not change any street configuration.
- (3) Performance Standards.
 - (i) Retail Sale Area. Areas devoted to retail sales shall not exceed 10 percent of the gross floor area of the principal structure, and 5,000 square feet on any lot or parcel.

A reproduction of part of the City's Future Land Use Map follows:

Future Land Use Map



Existing Land Use and Future Land Use

(continued)

(ii) **Vibration, Smoke, Odor, Noise, Glare, Wastes, Fire Hazards and Hazardous Materials.** No person shall occupy, maintain or allow any use in an I-1 district without continuously meeting the following minimum standards regarding vibration, smoke, odor, noise, glare, wastes, fire hazards and hazardous materials. Conditional use permits for uses in this district may establish higher standards and conditions.

(A) **Vibration.** Except during construction or as authorized by the City, an activity or operation which causes any perceptible vibration of the earth to an ordinary person on any other lot or parcel shall not be permitted.

(B) **Noise.** The owner and occupant shall regulate uses and activities on the property so that sound never exceeds 65 decibels at any point on the property line.

(C) **Glare.** Lights, spotlights, high temperature processes or otherwise, whether direct or reflected, shall not be visible from any lot, parcel or right-of-way.

(D) **Solid and Liquid Waste.** All solid waste, debris and garbage shall be contained within a closed and screened dumpster, refuse bin and/or trash compactor. Incineration of trash or garbage is prohibited. No sewage or liquid wastes shall be discharged or spilled on the property.

(E) **Hazardous Materials.** Information and materials to be used or located on the site, whether on a full-time or part-time basis, that are required by the SARA Title III Community Right to Know shall be provided at the time of any City review, including site plan. Information regarding the activity or at the time of any change of use or expansion, even for existing uses, shall be provided to the Director.

(iii) **Outdoor Storage and Display.** Portable display of retail merchandise may be permitted as provided in GJMC 21.04.040(h).

(A) **Outdoor storage and displays shall not be allowed in the front yard setback;**

(B) **Screening shall be maintained in the frontage adjacent to arterial and collector streets and along that portion of the frontage on local streets which adjoin any zone except I-1 or I-2;**

(C) **Unless required to buffer from an adjoining district, screening along all other property lines is not required; and**

(D) **Screening of dumpsters is not required.**

Surrounding Land Use

The surrounding land uses in the vicinity of the subject property are considered to be “low to moderate” intensity. Surrounding Land Uses in the immediate vicinity of the subject property are depicted on the accompanying Surrounding Land Use Map that shows the configuration of the various properties in relationship to the subject site. The following chart describes the various land uses that adjoin the property:

NORTHWEST

residential

NORTH

residential

NORTHEAST

mix of uses including
commercial &
residential

WEST

vacant, some
residential parcels

SITE

EAST

commercial

SOUTHWEST

low density
residential

SOUTH

industrial

SOUTHEAST

low density
residential parcels

Proposed Land Use

INTRODUCTION – This Annexation application is intended to gather input from public review agencies before a public hearing by the city planning commission and city council. The reader is encouraged to review all of the plans and related documents prior to examination of this section. Information gained as a result of this review process will be utilized in determining approval of the annexation and subsequent zoning designation.


SITE DEVELOPMENT – Preparation of the Site Development Plan is currently in the concept phase and likely to change as it is further developed. It's final detail will be shaped by the site conditions and intended uses described in this narrative statement. The map depicts the relationship of the building sites to the property boundary, roadway access and adjacent properties.

Industrial Land Use Summary:


USE	AREA	% TOTAL
Parking		10%
Landscaping		10%
Building	10,000sf	2.5%
Total	398,574sf	

Future lot development standards will include paving landscaping, stormwater controls and a building. The developer will maintain ownership, control, and will ensure an aesthetically pleasing and orderly development.

Opportunity & Enterprise Zone Maps




According to the opportunityzones.hud.gov/resources/map up until June 28, 2023 eligible capital gains recognized in 2022 can be invested in this site.



The Recla Metals property is eligible for Enterprise Zone investment benefits. The subject property is located in the Mesa County Enterprise Zone. Mesa County is encouraging growth and the creation of jobs in this area. They have instituted certain tax policies to encourage redevelopment in the area, including this parcel.

FEMA Floodplain Map

The FEMA FIRM Map below shows the property is not in or near any identified flood plain, or flood zone.



Transportation and Emergency Services

Developing the site is supported by existing transportation systems as well as emergency services. Access to the site is easily granted via 30 Rd. 30 Road is a 3 lane roadway with bike lanes and sidewalks. It is in good condition.



The Grand Valley Transit operates buses along 30 Road from 4:45 am to 8:35 pm. A bus stop is within 1 block of the site at 30 Road and Gunnison Avenue.

Emergency services are available from the City of Grand Junction Police Department; the Uniform Patrol section was comprised of sworn officers, non-sworn police service technicians, sergeants and lieutenants. Collateral duties such as the Canine Program, SWAT, the Bike Office Program, and Forensic Investigations fall under the Uniform Patrol section. In all the Grand Junction Police Department has approximately 200 full time law enforcement employees.

The property is located in the Grand Junction Fire Department Service area as established by the City of Grand Junction Fire Department. Firefighters can respond to emergencies from Fire Station No. 2 located at 441 31 Rd, which is approximately a half mile away from the project site.

The Grand Junction Fire Department currently employs approximately 181 full time employees and is one of the largest paid fire departments between Denver and Salt Lake City.

Utility Services

DOMESTIC WATER – All potable water for the site is serviced by Ute Water. There is capacity in their system along 30 Rd as evidenced by a recent Fire Flow Form.

SANITARY SEWER – Sanitary Sewer for the property is provided by the Persigo Plat operated by the City of Grand Junction.

NATURAL GAS – XCEL Energy currently provides service to the site.

DRY UTILITIES – XCEL Electric along with Spectrum Cable and tele-communication lines are available along the side (East) of the property in the 30 Road MPE and will be extended into the parcel from existing lines. Lines will be underground on-site.

IRRIGATION WATER – Grand Valley Irrigation District currently services the property and will be utilized to provide irrigation water.

DRAINAGE – Historic drainage patterns will continue. The area of the proposed building is currently hard-packed driveway and landscape areas. Runoff will be directed to a new stormwater pond to be located at the property's southwest corner.

CELLULAR COVERAGE – All major cellular communications companies operate in the area. Verizon, T-Mobile and AT&T all have a very good 4G signal on the property. An AT&T/Verizon cell tower is located on an adjoining parcel.

Tower Owner: SBA

Tower Owner ID : CO10468-A

Tower Name: E-Babe

Structure Type : Monopole

Location: 2982 Gunnison Ave

ATT: Colocate - 116 ft

VERIZON: 1

Height: 99'

Location : GJ Urban

Soils and Geology

No man-made or natural geologic hazards are known to exist on the subject property. The US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, has identified the following soils on the site. (The complete USDA narrative is available from Colorado Land Advisor)

Map Unit Legend

Map Unit Symbol	Map Unit Name	Acres in AOI	Percent of AOI
Bc	Sagers silty clay loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes	9.3	89.6%
BcS	Sagers silty clay loam, saline, 0 to 2 percent slopes	1.1	10.4%
Totals for Area of Interest		10.3	100.0%



Development Schedule and Evaluation of The Request

DEVELOPMENT SCHEDULE – It is anticipated that site development will begin immediately upon the City of Grand Junction’s approval. It is expected that development of the site will occur in a single phase.

FINANCIAL - The development of the subject property would create a net positive financial impact to the City of Grand Junction and Mesa County as a response to the existing, and future growth demands in the Grand Valley area as projected in the Comprehensive Plan.

Any activity similar to the proposed development, no matter where it is located, will most likely create some impact to the surrounding community economically and physically. The nature of the proposal and how it is handled and controlled can determine whether the impacts are positive or negative. By a logical evaluation of all aspects of the existing and proposed development, steps can be taken which insure that the ultimate affects by the proposal are beneficial to the community.

By utilizing the Annexation and Rezone process, any negative impacts created by the proposal can be minimized. In addition to this application further review is anticipated in a Conditional Use Permit Application followed by a Major site Plan Review Application.

Evaluation of the request is accomplished by using criteria contained within Land Use and Development Code for approval of an Annexation.

Evaluation Of The Request

21.02.160 Annexation.

- (a) **Purpose.** *In accordance with State statutes, land may be annexed or de-annexed from the City as deemed appropriate by the City Council.*
- (b) **Applicability.** *Any lands to be added to or deleted from the corporate limits of the City shall comply with this section.*
- (c) **Approval Criteria.** *The application shall meet all applicable statutory and City administrative requirements. A complete copy of these requirements is available from the Public Works and Planning Department.*
- (d) **Decision-Maker.**
 - (1) *The Director shall make recommendations to City Council.*
 - (2) *City Council shall approve, conditionally approve or disapprove all applications for annexation or contraction of the municipal limits.*
- (e) **Application and Review Procedures.** *Application requirements and processing procedures shall comply with those described in applicable State statutes. A summary of these procedures is available from the Public Works and Planning Department.*
- (f) **Zoning of Annexed Properties.** *Land annexed to the City shall be zoned in accordance with GJMC 21.02.140 to a district that is consistent with the adopted Comprehensive Plan and the criteria set forth. Generally, future development should be at a density equal to or greater than the allowed density of the applicable County zoning district.*

RESPONSES -

This Application represents a formal request in writing and does give consent to Annexation and Zoning. All owners do consent to this Application. No part of the subject property's boundary is disputed. No right-of-way will be changed through this annexation.

This Application is intended to meet multiple Goals of the Comprehensive Plan as well as the requirements within the Zoning and Development Code which relate to this zone of annexation application.

There is adequate capacity in all systems to support this application. Streets, transportation, utility services, city and county services all have additional capacity.

The density/intensity of the proposed project will be in conformance with the Future Land Use and Comprehensive Plan designations for the parcel.

We respectfully request your approval of this Annexation and Rezone Application.

Evaluation Of The Request

21.02.160 Annexation (continued)

(C) *Correct a scrivener or clerical error such as lot numbers, acreage, street names and identification of adjacent recorded plats.*

N/A

(3) *Additional Approval Criteria. The Director will approve a Annexation and Zoning if the applicant demonstrates that:*

(I) *Any changes to existing easements or right-of-way have been completed in accordance with this code or otherwise allowed by law (additional easements or right-of-way may be dedicated);*

N/A

(ii) *The right-of-way shown on the Grand Valley Circulation Plan is not changed; and*


It has been considered and it will not be affected by this Annexation and Zoning

(iii) *If a new lot is being created, no portion of the property may have been the subject of a previous Annexation and Zoning creating a new lot within the preceding 10 years or a minor exemption subdivision (see subsection (o) of this section).*

Previously considered at the General Meeting and supported by City Planner and Development Engineer.

IMPROVEMENT SURVEY

SITUATED IN THE NE¼ NE¼ SECTION 17
TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 1 EAST OF THE UTE MERIDIAN
COUNTY OF MESA, STATE OF COLORADO




LEGEND:

○	FOUND SURVEY MARKER AS DESCRIBED
○	FOUND CORNER AS DESCRIBED
○	SET No. 5 REBAR WITH 2 INCH ALUMINUM CAP PLS 37904
○	SET MAGNETIC NAIL WITH 1-1/2 INCH BRASS DISC PLS 37904
○	FOUND No. 5 REBAR WITH CAP
○	EXISTING UTILITY POLE
○	EXISTING SIGN
○	EXISTING UTILITY PEDESTAL
○	EXISTING LIGHT POLE
○	EXISTING SANITARY SEWER MANHOLE
○	EXISTING FIRE HYDRANT
○	EXISTING GAS METER
○	EXISTING WATER METER
○	EXISTING OVERHEAD UTILITY LINE
○	EXISTING FENCE LINE
— OH — OH —	OH
— x —	x

ABBREVIATIONS:

N	NORTH	SQ	SQUARE
S	SOUTH	FT	FEET
E	EAST	AVE.	AVENUE
W	WEST	ST.	STREET
T	TOWNSHIP	CT.	COURT
R	RANGE	LN.	LANE
MCSM	MESA COUNTY SURVEY MARKER	DR.	DRIVE
ROW	RIGHT OF WAY	U.S.	UNITED STATES
SIMS	SURVEY INFORMATION MANAGEMENT SYSTEM	L.C.E.	LIMITED COMMON ELEMENT
PLS	PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYOR	P.O.C.	POINT OF COMMENCEMENT
No.	NUMBER	P.O.B.	POINT OF BEGINNING
GPS	GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM		
ID	IDENTIFICATION		



NOTES

- OWNERSHIP, RECORDED RIGHTS-OF-WAY, AND EASEMENT INFORMATION WAS DONE USING A CURRENT TITLE POLICY PROVIDED BY LAND TITLE GUARANTEE COMPANY, ORDER NUMBER: GJC65051561.
- BEARINGS ARE BASED ON THE WEST LINE OF NE¼ NE¼ SECTION 17, TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 1 EAST OF THE UTE MERIDIAN. THE VALUE USED N0°03'54"W, WAS CALCULATED USING THE MESA COUNTY LOCAL COORDINATE SYSTEM. SURVEY MARKERS WERE FOUND AT THE NORTH AND SOUTH ENDS OF SAID LINE AS SHOWN HEREON.
- ACCORDING TO COLORADO LAW YOU MUST COMMENCE ANY LEGAL ACTION BASED UPON ANY DEFECT IN THIS SURVEY WITHIN THREE YEARS AFTER YOU FIRST DISCOVERED SUCH DEFECT. IN NO EVENT MAY ANY ACTION BASED UPON ANY DEFECT IN THIS SURVEY BE COMMENCED MORE THAN TEN YEARS FROM THE DATE OF THE CERTIFICATION SHOWN HEREON.
- THIS IMPROVEMENT SURVEY IS BASED ON THE DEED AS RECORDED AT RECEPTION NUMBER 2644070, OF THE MESA COUNTY RECORDS.
- THE EAST SIXTEENTH CORNER ON THE NORTH LINE OF SAID SECTION 17 HAD BEEN DESTROYED DURING ROAD CONSTRUCTION AT THE TIME OF THIS SURVEY. HOWEVER, GPS OBSERVATIONS WERE TAKEN ON JANUARY 24, 2022 FOR SAID CORNER. SAID CORNER IS SCHEDULED TO BE REPLACE AT COMPLETION OF CONSTRUCTION.
- THE 6' DRAINAGE EASEMENT TO MESA COUNTY WAS GRANTED AT RECEPTION NUMBER 2036640 (EXHIBIT B) ALONG WITH THE RIGHT OF WAY (EXHIBIT A). THE LEGAL DESCRIPTION FOR THE RIGHT OF WAY WAS AMENDED DUE TO AN ERRONEOUS LEGAL DESCRIPTION AT RECEPTION NUMBER 2039556. THE ORIGINAL AGREEMENT STILL IS IN EFFECT.

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

THE S½ S½ NE¼ NE¼ OF SECTION 17, TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 1 EAST OF THE UTE MERIDIAN; EXCEPT COMMENCING AT THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF SAID TRACT; THENCE NORTH 100 FEET; THENCE WEST 300 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 100 FEET; THENCE EAST 300 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING; ALSO EXCEPTING THEREFROM THAT PORTION THEREOF CONVEYED TO MESA COUNTY IN WARRANTY DEED RECORDED FEBRUARY 7, 2002 IN BOOK 3017 AT PAGE 974 UNDER RECEPTION NO. 2039629, COUNTY OF MESA, STATE OF COLORADO. SAID PARCEL CONTAINS 9.11 ACRES.

SURVEYOR'S CERTIFICATION:

I, Patrick W. Click, a registered Professional Land Surveyor in the State of Colorado, do hereby certify that this Plat represents a field survey completed by me and / or under my direct supervision. Both conform to the standards of practice, statutes and laws of the State of Colorado to the best of my knowledge and belief. This statement is not a guaranty or warranty, either expressed or implied.



COLORADO REGISTERED LAND SURVEYOR PLS #37904

LAND SURVEY DEPOSIT
MESA COUNTY SURVEYORS OFFICE
DATE _____
DEPOSIT No. _____

IMPROVEMENT SURVEY		
479 30 ROAD		
SITUATED IN THE NE¼ NE¼ SECTION 17 TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 1 EAST OF THE UTE MERIDIAN COUNTY OF MESA, STATE OF COLORADO		
JOB # 2022-088	FIELD WORK: KM	DRAWN BY: JW
DATE: 4/29/22	DRAWING NAME: 479 30 ROAD	CHECKED BY: PC
POLARIS SURVEYING		
PATRICK W. CLICK P.L.S.		
3194 MESA AVE. #B GRAND JUNCTION, CO 81504 PHONE (970)434-7038		

TWO PONIES ANNEXATION SCHEDULE


April 19, 2023	Referral of Petition, Intro Proposed Ordinance, Exercise Land Use
April 25, 2023	Planning Commission Considers Zone of Annexation
May 3, 2023	City Council Intro Proposed Zoning Ordinance
June 7, 2023	City Council Accept Petition/Annex and Zoning Public Hearing
July 9, 2023	Effective date of Annexation and Zoning

ANNEXATION SUMMARY




File Number		ANX-2022-818	
Location		479 30 Rd	
Tax ID Number(s)		2943-171-00-079	
Number of Parcel(s)		1	
Existing Population		2	
No. of Parcels Owner Occupied		1	
Number of Dwelling Units		1	
Acres Land Annexed		9.10	
Developable Acres Remaining		9.10	
Right-of-way in Annexation		none	
Previous County Zoning		I-2	
Proposed City Zoning		I-1	
Surrounding Zoning:	North:	C-2	
	South:	I-2	
	East:	RSF-4	
	West:	I-1	
Current Land Use		Single-family residential/agricultural	
Proposed Land Use		Single-family residential and Commercial	
Surrounding Land Use:	North:	residential	
	South:	industrial	
	East:	commercial	
	West:	Vacant, some residential parcels	
Comprehensive Plan Designation:		Commercial/Industrial	
Zoning within Comprehensive Plan Designation:		Yes:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X No: <input type="checkbox"/>
Values:	Assessed	\$14,370	
	Actual		
Address Ranges			
Special Districts:	Water	Ute	
	Sewer	Persigo	
	Fire	Grand Junction	
	Irrigation/Drainage	GVIC/GVDD	
	School	School District 51	
	Pest	Grand River Mosquito Control District	

RECLA METALS ANNEXATION

Located in the NE1/4 NE1/4, SECTION 17, TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 1 EAST, UTE MERIDIAN, COUNTY OF MESA, STATE OF COLORADO



SITE LOCATION MAP SCALE: 1" = 800'



LEGAL DESCRIPTION

A parcel of land being Reception Number 3029585 and a portion of the Right of Way parcel described in Reception Number 2039629 located in the Northeast Quarter of the Northeast Quarter (NE1/4 NE1/4) of Section 17, Township 1 South, Range 1 East, Ute Meridian, Mesa County, Colorado more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at the Northeast Corner of said Section 17, whence the North Sixteenth Corner of said Section 17 bears S00°00'43"E 1,318.08 feet using the Mesa County Local Coordinate System with all other bearings contained herein being relative thereto; thence along the East line of the Northeast of the Northeast Quarter of said Section 17, S00°00'43"E a distance of 988.30 feet to a point on the Western boundary line of the FRUITVALE ANNEXATION NO. 2, ORDINANCE NO. 3098; thence, N89°59'57"W a distance of 1.00 feet to a point on the Western boundary line of the FRUITVALE ANNEXATION NO. 1, ORDINANCE NO. 3097, being the Point of Beginning; thence along said boundary line S00°00'43"E a distance of 229.78 feet; thence the following two (2) courses, 1) S89°59'54"W a distance of 298.39 feet, 2) S00°02'27"E a distance of 100.00 feet to a point on the North Sixteenth line of said Section 17; thence along said North Sixteenth line S89°59'54"W a distance of 1022.06 feet to the Northeast Sixteenth Corner of said Section 17, said point also being a point on the CALFRAC ANNEXATION, ORDINANCE NO. 4010 boundary line; thence along the East Sixteenth line N00°05'27"W a distance of 329.83 feet; thence, S89°59'57"E a distance of 1320.85 feet to the Point of Beginning.

Said Parcel of land CONTAINING 405,716 Square Feet or 9.314 Acres, more or less.

AREAS OF ANNEXATION		LEGEND	
ANNEXATION PERIMETER	3,300.91 FT.	ANNEXATION BOUNDARY	
CONTIGUOUS PERIMETER	2,431.78 FT.	ANNEXATION AREA	
AREA IN SQUARE FEET	405,716 FT ²	EXISTING CITY LIMITS	
AREA IN ACRES	9.314		
AREA WITHIN R.O.W.	8,862.00 FT ²		
	0.203 ACRES		
AREA WITHIN DEEDED R.O.W.	8,862.00 FT ²		
	0.203 ACRES		

SURVEY ABBREVIATIONS		SQ. FT.	SQUARE FEET
P.O.C.	POINT OF COMMENCEMENT	Δ=	CENTRAL ANGLE
P.O.B.	POINT OF BEGINNING	RAD.	RADIUS
R.O.W.	RIGHT OF WAY	ARC	ARC LENGTH
SEC.	SECTION	CHD.	CHORD LENGTH
TWP.	TOWNSHIP	CHB.	CHORD BEARING
RGE.	RANGE	BLK.	BLOCK
U.M.	UTE MERIDIAN	P.B.	PLAT BOOK
NO.	NUMBER	BK.	BOOK
REC.	RECEPTION	PG.	PAGE
		HOR. DIST.	HORIZONTAL DISTANCE

ORDINANCE NO.	EFFECTIVE DATE
PRELIMINARY	PRELIMINARY


NOTE: THE DESCRIPTION(S) CONTAINED HEREIN HAVE BEEN DERIVED FROM SUBDIVISION PLAT, DEED DESCRIPTIONS & DEPOSIT SURVEYS AS THEY APPEAR IN THE OFFICE OF THE MESA COUNTY CLERK & RECORDER. THIS PLAT OF ANNEXATION DOES NOT CONSTITUTE A LEGAL BOUNDARY SURVEY, AND IS NOT INTENDED TO BE USED AS A MEANS OF ESTABLISHING OR VERIFYING PROPERTY BOUNDARY LINES.

PRELIMINARY
 RENEE BETH PARENT DATE _____
 STATE OF COLORADO - P.L.S. NO. 38266
 FOR THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION
 333 WEST AVENUE - BLDG. C
 GRAND JUNCTION, CO. 81501

THIS IS NOT A BOUNDARY SURVEY

NOTICE: ACCORDING TO COLORADO LAW ANY LEGAL ACTION BASED UPON ANY DEFECT FOUND IN THIS SURVEY MUST COMMENCE WITHIN THREE (3) YEARS AFTER THE DISCOVERY OF SUCH DEFECT. IN NO EVENT MAY ANY ACTION BASED UPON ANY DEFECT FOUND IN THIS SURVEY BE COMMENCED MORE THAN TEN (10) YEARS FROM THE DATE OF THE CERTIFICATION SHOWN HEREON.

DRAWN BY: MJH DATE: 12/21/2022
 DESIGNED BY: RBP DATE: 12/21/2022
 CHECKED BY: RBP DATE: 12/21/2022



PUBLIC WORKS
ENGINEERING DIVISION

RECLA METALS ANNEXATION
 Located in the NE1/4 NE1/4, SECTION 17,
 TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 1 EAST,
 UTE MERIDIAN, COUNTY OF MESA, STATE OF COLORADO


Legal Description

A parcel of land being Reception Number 3029585 and a portion of the Right of Way parcel described in Reception Number 2039629 located in the Northeast Quarter of the Northeast Quarter (NE1/4 NE1/4) of Section 17, Township 1 South, Range 1 East, Ute Meridian, Mesa County, Colorado more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at the Northeast Corner of said Section 17, whence the North Sixteenth Corner of said Section 17 bears $S00^{\circ}00'43''E$ 1,318.08 feet using the Mesa County Local Coordinate System with all other bearings contained herein being relative thereto; thence along the East line of the Northeast of the Northeast Quarter of said Section 17, $S00^{\circ}00'43''E$ a distance of 988.30 feet to a point on the Western boundary line of the *FRUITVALE ANNEXATION NO. 2, ORDINANCE NO. 3098*; thence, $N89^{\circ}59'57''W$ a distance of 1.00 feet to a point on the Western boundary line of *FRUITVALE ANNEXATION NO. 1, ORDINANCE NO. 3097*, being the the Point of Beginning; thence along said boundary line $S00^{\circ}00'43''E$ a distance of 229.78 feet; thence the following two (2) courses, 1) $S89^{\circ}59'54''W$ a distance of 298.39 feet, 2) $S00^{\circ}02'27''E$ a distance of 100.00 feet to a point on the North Sixteenth line of said Section 17; thence along said North Sixteenth line $S89^{\circ}59'54''W$ a distance of 1022.06 feet to the Northeast Sixteenth Corner of said Section 17, said point also being a point on the *CALFRAC ANNEXATION, ORDINANCE NO. 4010* boundary line; thence along the East Sixteenth line $N00^{\circ}05'27''W$ a distance of 329.83 feet; thence, $S89^{\circ}59'57''E$ a distance of 1320.85 feet to the Point of Beginning.

Said Parcel of land CONTAINING 405,716 Square Feet or 9.314 Acres, more or less.

Recla Metals Annexation - Aerial Map




479 30 Road - Subject Property



Printed: 4/5/2023
1 inch equals 376 feet
Scale: 1:4,514





Recla Metals Annexation



Printed: 4/5/2023
1 inch equals 376 feet
Scale: 1:4,514





Recla Metals Annexation - Land Use



Printed: 4/5/2023
1 inch equals 376 feet
Scale: 1:4,514



Recla Metals Annexation - Zoning



Printed: 4/5/2023
1 inch equals 376 feet
Scale: 1:4,514



Street View – Looking northwest from 30 Road

Neighborhood Meeting Notes for **Recla Metals Annexation**

A Neighborhood Meeting was held on October 24th, 2022 at 5:30 PM at 2990 Teller Rd inside the Harvest View Alliance Church.

Approximately 14 people were in attendance at the meeting. 13 people signed in on the sign-in sheet provided.

Mr. Fleming started the meeting by introducing himself from Colorado Land Advisor and Dani Acosta from the City of Grand Junction. Dani advised her role in the process and let the crowd know how they could give feedback/voice concerns online.

Mr. Fleming began speaking about the company Recla Metals, what they do, and the location of the site as well as how it would be laid out and that the task we are now working on now is getting it zoned and annexed from Mesa County into the City of Grand Junction.

One couple wanted to know how this industrial business would affect the value of their home. Mr. Fleming advised he is an urban planner, not an engineer, and what he studies is how communities are developed and built and what it means to those that move into new developments, and what happens to those who live around them. Anytime you have new developments the value of the homes around it will go up.

One man asked what the parcel was currently zoned as and Mr. Fleming advised Industrial. The man did not agree because he stated there was alfalfa growing. Mr. Fleming explained the difference between zoning and use.

There was concern from several members of the crowd that traffic was going to be a big issue stating that this business would bring too much traffic. Dani jumped in to remind people that the City has several regulations that have to be met when we submit these projects and if they deem a traffic study necessary then they would require one.

Another person questioned how far back the building for Recla Metals will be from the road. Mr. Fleming responded that at a minimum it would be 90 ft. Would there be a requirement for privacy fencing? Yes, there will be required privacy fencing as well as landscaping around the development. There was also a

little concern about how 'nice' this property was going to look. It was explained again that we will have a landscape architect that will be creating an area at the front with shrubs and trees with a driveway and privacy fence. It will all be new so it will look nice. Dani again added that we (Colorado Land Advisor) have a lot of papers and plans to submit to the City that all have to be approved and one of the conditions is the City has more strict landscaping standards and it has to meet code. They want it to look aesthetically pleasing.

Largely the site will remain undeveloped for the near future. There will be landscaping, and then a parking area, a small building or two, and a scale, and then the two driveways there will be combined to make one larger more accessible driveway. One last question was how big is the building going to be and Mr. Fleming stated it was probably going to be approximately 10,000 SF.

The meeting wrapped up around 6:45 pm.

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO

ORDINANCE NO.

**AN ORDINANCE ANNEXING TERRITORY TO THE
CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO
RECLA METALS ANNEXATION**

**LOCATED ON PROPERTIES AT 479 30 RD
APPROXIMATELY 9.31 ACRES**

Recitals:

The property owner has petitioned to annex its 9.31 acres into the City limits. The annexation is referred to as the "Recla Metals Annexation."

After public notice and public hearing as required by the Grand Junction Zoning & Development Code, the Grand Junction Planning Commission recommended zoning the Recla Metals Annexation consisting of 9.31 acres from County I-2 (General Industrial District) to I-1 (Light Industrial) finding that both the I-1 zone district conforms with the designation of Industrial as shown on the Land Use Map of the Comprehensive Plan and conforms with its designated zone with the Comprehensive Plan's goals and policies and is generally compatible with land uses located in the surrounding area.

After public notice and public hearing, the Grand Junction City Council finds that the I-1 (Light Industrial) zone district, is in conformance with at least one of the stated criteria of Section 21.02.140 of the Grand Junction Zoning & Development Code for the parcel as designated.

**BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION
THAT:**

ZONING FOR THE RELCA METALS ANNEXATION

RECLA METALS ANNEXATION

EXHIBIT A

A parcel of land being Reception Number 3029585 and a portion of the Right of Way parcel described in Reception Number 2039629 located in the Northeast Quarter of the Northeast Quarter (NE1/4 NE1/4) of Section 17, Township 1 South, Range 1 East, Ute Meridian, Mesa County, Colorado more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at the Northeast Corner of said Section 17, whence the North Sixteenth Corner of said Section 17 bears S00°00'43"E 1,318.08 feet using the Mesa County Local Coordinate System with all other bearings contained herein being relative thereto; thence along the East line of the Northeast of the Northeast Quarter of said Section 17, S00°00'43"E a distance of 988.30 feet to a point on the Western boundary line of the FRUITVALE ANNEXATION NO. 2, ORDINANCE NO. 3098; thence, N89°59'57"W a distance of 1.00 feet to a point on the Western boundary line of FRUITVALE

ANNEXATION NO. 1, ORDINANCE NO. 3097, being the the Point of Beginning; thence along said boundary line S00°00'43"E a distance of 229.78 feet; thence the following two (2) courses, 1) S89°59'54"W a distance of 298.39 feet, 2) S00°02'27"E a distance of 100.00 feet to a point on the North Sixteenth line of said Section 17; thence along said North Sixteenth line S89°59'54"W a distance of 1022.06 feet to the Northeast Sixteenth Corner of said Section 17, said point also being a point on the CALFRAC ANNEXATION, ORDINANCE NO. 4010 boundary line; thence along the East Sixteenth line N00°05'27"W a distance of 329.83 feet; thence, S89°59'57E a distance of 1320.85 feet to the Point of Beginning.

Said Parcel of land CONTAINING 405,716 Square Feet or 9.314 Acres, more or less.

INTRODUCED on first reading this ____ day of _____, 2023 and ordered published in pamphlet form.

ADOPTED on second reading this ____ day of _____, 2023 and ordered published in pamphlet form.

Anna M. Stout
President of the Council

ATTEST:

Amy Phillips
City Clerk



Grand Junction Planning Commission

Regular Session

Item #3.

Meeting Date: April 25, 2023
Presented By: Nicole Galehouse, Principal Planner
Department: Community Development
Submitted By: Nicole Galehouse, Principal Planner

Information

SUBJECT:

Consider a request by Foothills Housing 2 LLC and Foothills Housing 5 LLC to amend the phasing schedule of the approved Outline Development Plan for "The Community" development, now known as "Mesa Trails" on approximately 177 acres located at 2350 Highway 6 and 50 between 23 ¼ and 23 ¾ Roads, from G Road to Highway 6 and 50

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the request.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The Applicants, Foothills Housing 2 LLC and Foothills Housing 5 LLC, request an extension to the phasing schedule for the Mesa Trails (fka The Community) Outline Development Plan (ODP). The Applicant received City Council approval for the Planned Development and associated ODP on August 19, 2015 by Ordinance No. 4676. The original approval was amended on May 15, 2019 by Ordinance No. 4855, which included a revised phasing schedule, along with other changes to uses, pod configuration and composition, and bulk standards. Since 2019, the applicant has sought and received approvals for four applications, including two subdivisions, a site plan for a 256,000 SF manufacturing facility, and a site plan for the first phase (77 units) of a multifamily development. A subdivision review is currently underway that encompasses portions of multiple pods. The phasing schedule, however, set the first threshold as a preliminary development plan for any one pod within 4 years. After beginning land planning work on the site, it has become apparent that the broad phasing schedule requiring plans for an entire pod at a time is not feasible. The Applicant is therefore requesting a revised phasing schedule for the PD and ODP that would provide for completion of the remaining phases of development within 10 years from the previous Phase 1 deadline of May 15, 2023.

BACKGROUND OR DETAILED INFORMATION:

BACKGROUND

The Mesa Trails property is a Planned Development scheduled to be completed over a total of three phases. The PD is a mixed-use development that provides a large range of land uses including housing, services, retail uses, commercial, manufacturing, and employment.

The original PD Ordinance that was adopted in 2015 for the project a final development plan and plat to be approved within six years. The detail of what constitutes a final development plan and plat was not spelled out in the PD ordinance and was assumed to mean a final plan and plat for the entire 177 acres. In 2019, an amendment to the PD ordinance was approved, which revised the phasing schedule to the following:

Phase	Pod	Threshold 1	Threshold 2
1	Any one Pod	Preliminary Development Plan approval within 4 years from date of approved PD ordinance	An approved final plat of 25% of the area within 2 years of Preliminary Plan approval
2	Any second Pod	Preliminary Development Plan approval within 7 years from date of approved PD Ordinance	An approved final plat of 25% of the area within 2 years of Preliminary Plan approval
3	Remaining two Pods	Preliminary Development Plan approval within 10 years from date of approved PD Ordinance	An approved final plat of 25% of the area within 2 years of Preliminary Plan approval
The area(s) required as determined by the City for the regional drainage facilities shall be dedicated to the City at the time the first plat is recorded for any land included within the ODP.			

The 2019 amendment assumes that development would occur one pod at a time. However, as development has progressed on the site, this has proven to not be the case. The first projects approved occurred where infrastructure was already in place along 23 ¾ Road and G Road (Mosaic Housing Factory and Three Arrows Apartments). The applicant is currently undergoing subdivision review for another phase of development which includes the major infrastructure along with subdivision of parcels along the major corridors, which spans multiple pods.

The revised phasing schedule is proposed as follows:

Phase	Portion of Site*	Requirement
<i>Approved subdivisions excluded (PLD-2021-523 & PLD-2021-654) – 33 acres</i>		
1	At least 20% (28 acres) of remaining 144 acres.	Final Plat recorded within 5 years from date of approved PD Ordinance
2	At least an additional 25% (36 acres) of remaining 144 acres	Final Plat recorded within 7 years from date of approved PD Ordinance
3	Remaining 80 acres	Final Plat recorded within 10 years from date of approved PD Ordinance

*Acreage only includes final lots created, excluding the remaining site acreage identified on the plat as "Lot 100".

The revision also amends the phasing schedule to provide that as each phase is completed, it is vested under the provisions of the PD and ODP. Only phases which are not completed by the threshold set in the phasing schedule are subject to expiration and reversion to base zone districts.

The Applicant has expressed interest in completing the project consistent with the plan approvals pending modification of the phasing schedule. At the time of plan approval, the City Council determined that the public benefit was met through the provision of more effective infrastructure. The plan continues to provide this same benefit as determined in the prior review and approval process. The modifications to the phasing schedule are the only proposed amendments to the approved plan.

NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

Neighborhood Meeting:

A Neighborhood Meeting regarding the proposed extension request is scheduled for April 18, 2023 in accordance with Section 21.02.080 (e) of the Zoning and Development Code. An update on the outcome of the neighborhood meeting will be provided at the Planning Commission hearing.

Notice was completed consistent with the provisions in Section 21.02.080 (g) of the City's Zoning and Development Code. The subject property was posted with an application sign on April 7, 2023. Mailed notice of the public hearings before Planning Commission and City Council in the form of notification cards was sent to surrounding property owners within 500 feet of the subject property on April 13, 2023. The notice of the Planning Commission public hearing was published April 16, 2023 in the Grand Junction Daily Sentinel.

ANALYSIS

GJMC 21.02.080(n)(ii) requires that the request be submitted in writing prior to the expiration of the deadline. The applicant submitted the request to extend the PD on March 14, 2023. Due to internal review and processing times, the hearing schedule places the adoption of the amendment two days after the PD is set to expire on May 15, 2023. While it is generally desired to have the hearing process complete prior to this

date, the code requirement has been met and staff does not find any deficiency on this matter.

In accordance with the Zoning and Development Code, a development phasing schedule may be set for greater than one year, but not more than 10 years pursuant to Section 21.02.080(n)(2). The Applicant's request to allow the development to be completed in 3 phases over 10 years is consistent with the Code in regard to requisite timeframes for the overall project.

Section 21.02.150(b)(2)(x) of the Code provides that "An ODP application shall demonstrate...an appropriate phasing or development schedule for the entire property or for each development pod/area to be developed."

Section 21.05.150(b)(1) provides that the "purpose of an ODP is to demonstrate conformance with the Comprehensive Plan, compatibility of land use and coordination of improvements within and among individually platted parcels, sections or phases of a development prior to the approval of an ODP." Further, the Code provides the ODP "is recommended for larger, more diverse projects that are expected to be developed over a long period of time." Changes to the Comprehensive Plan that impact this site and/or area are not significant so as to have caused any necessary amendments to the ODP. Staff has found the ODP as previously approved continues to meet the provided purpose of the ODP.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION AND FINDINGS OF FACT

After reviewing the request to amend the Mesa Trails Planned Development phasing schedule, PLD-2023-243, located at 2350 Highway 6 and 50 between 23 ¼ and 23 ¾ Roads, from G Road to Highway 6 and 50, the following findings of fact have been made:

The requested phasing schedule is in compliance with Section 21.02.080(n)(2) of the Zoning and Development Code.

The proposed phasing schedule is an appropriate phasing schedule for the property consistent with Section 21.02.150(b)(2)(x) of the Code; and

The ODP continues to be compliant with Section 21.05.050(b) of the Code.

Therefore, Staff recommends approval of the requested amended phasing schedule.

SUGGESTED MOTION:

Mr. Chairman, on the Mesa Trails request to amend the phasing schedule of the previously approved Planned Development, located at 2350 Highway 6 and 50 between 23 ¼ and 23 ¾ Roads, from G Road to Highway 6 and 50, City file number PLD-2023-243, I move that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of approval to City Council with the findings of fact as provided within the staff report.

Attachments

1. Draft Ordinance
2. Exhibit 1 - Site Maps & Photos

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO

ORDINANCE NO. _____

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING PLANNED DEVELOPMENT ZONING ORDINANCE NO. 4676 AND AMENDING THE OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR “THE COMMUNITY” PLANNED DEVELOPMENT, NOW KNOWN AS “MESA TRAILS” PLANNED DEVELOPMENT, LOCATED AT 2350 HIGHWAY 6 AND 50 BETWEEN 23 ¼ AND 23 ¾ ROADS, FROM G ROAD TO HIGHWAY 6 AND 50

Recitals:

The owner of approximately 177 acres of property located at 2350 Highway 6 and 50 has requested an amendment to revise the proposed phasing schedule of the Planned Development.

The purpose of this Ordinance is to extend the phasing schedule for the Mesa Trails Planned Development provided in Ordinance No. 4855, without modifying any other aspects of Ordinance No. 4855 or of the Outline Development Plan.

After public notice and public hearing as required by the Grand Junction Zoning & Development Code, the Grand Junction Planning Commission recommended approval of the extended phasing schedule for the Mesa Trails Planned Development.

The City Council finds that the review criteria for the planned development that were established at the time of Ordinance No. 4855 was adopted are still applicable and are still met and that the establishment thereof is not affected by the extension of the phasing schedule.

The City Council finds that extending the phasing schedule is reasonable in light of the current market conditions and economic feasibility of the project and is in the best interests of the community.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION THAT:

The development phasing schedule established by Ordinance No. 4855, Section J.1. is amended as follows:

1. Development and Phasing Schedule

Phase	Portion of Site*	Requirement
<i>Approved subdivisions excluded (PLD-2021-523 & PLD-2021-654) – 33 acres</i>		
1	At least 20% (28 acres) of remaining 144 acres.	Final Plat recorded within 5 years from date of approved PD Ordinance
2	At least an additional 25% (36 acres) of remaining 144 acres	Final Plat recorded within 7 years from date of approved PD Ordinance
3	Remaining 80 acres	Final Plat recorded within 10 years

	from date of approved PD Ordinance
--	------------------------------------

*Acreage only includes final lots created, excluding the remaining site acreage identified on the plat as "Lot 100".

2. The area(s) required as determined by the City for the regional drainage facilities shall be dedicated to the City at the time the first plat is recorded for any land included within the ODP.
3. Should the Development and Phasing Schedule need to be extended, the city shall consider and hear the request consistent with the provisions of the Code in place at that time. A request for extension shall be timely in that the request shall be received by the City prior to the lapse or expiration of one of the established phasing Thresholds.
4. Once a Final Plat has been recorded for a phase outlined above, that phase can develop under the provisions of the PD and ODP. Failure to develop the PD and ODP as shown in the adopted Development and Phasing Schedule according to the phasing schedule will result in the lapse of approval of the PD and ODP. Upon lapse, the zoning of the property will revert back to MU (Mixed-Use) and C-2 (Heavy Commercial) as shown in Exhibits A & B.

Introduced for first reading on this _____ day of _____, 2023 and ordered published in pamphlet form.


PASSED and ADOPTED this _____ day of _____, 2023 and ordered published in pamphlet form.

ATTEST:

Anna Stout
President of City Council

Amy Phillips
City Clerk

EXHIBIT A Outline Development Plan (ODP)



ODP LEGEND

- PROPOSED PROPERTY LINE
- PROPOSED B-1
- PROPOSED C-2
- FUTURE
- ACCESSIBILITY

LAND USE	AREA	% OF SITE
TOTAL AREA	± 175.8 ACRES GROSS	100 %
POD 1	± 37.1 ACRES	21%
POD 2	± 54.4 ACRES	30%
POD 3	± 39.4 ACRES	22%
POD 4	± 51.2 ACRES	29%
ROAD R.O.W	± 16.9 ACRES	10%
STORMWATER MANAGEMENT	INCLUDED WITH PODS	

- NOTES**
- SEE COMPLETE LIST OF USES FOR THE DEFAULT ZONES OF BP AND D-2 IN THE PD ORDINANCE.
 - NOTED R.O.W WIDTHS ARE IN ADDITION TO EXISTING R.O.W WIDTHS.
 - RIGHT-OF-WAY DESIGNATION WIDTHS TO BE DETERMINED AT FINAL PLAN.
 - FUTURE POD 5 IS NOT PART OF THIS PD AMENDMENT.

SCALE 1"=200'

<p>1</p>	<p>THE COMMUNITY GRAND JUNCTION, CO</p>		<p>THE COMMUNITY GRAND JUNCTION, CO</p>	<p>DATE: 02/20/2024 TIME: 10:00 AM DRAWN BY: [Name] CHECKED BY: [Name] DATE: 02/20/24</p>
----------	---	--	---	---

EXHIBIT B
Default Zones



Mesa Trails PD Site Map





Printed: 4/12/2023

0.45 1 inch equals 752 feet

Scale: 1:9,028

Packet Page 98

Mesa Trails PD Zoning



Printed: 4/12/2023

0.45 1 inch equals 752 feet

Scale: 1:9,028

Packet Page 99


Site Photos



Looking SW from G Road and 23 ½ Road



Looking North from US Hwy 6 & 50



Looking West from F ½ Road and 23 ¾ Road



Grand Junction Planning Commission

Regular Session

Item #4.

Meeting Date: April 25, 2023

Presented By: David Thornton, Principal Planner, Dani Acosta, Henry Brown, Mobility Planner

Department: Community Development

Submitted By: David Thornton, Principal Planner

Information

SUBJECT:

An Ordinance adopting the Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan as an element of the 2020 One Grand Junction Comprehensive Plan, amending the Active Transportation Corridor Map found in Ordinance 4808 (Grand Junction Circulation Plan) and found in Ordinance 4971 (2020 One Grand Junction Comprehensive Plan) and Repeal and Replace Resolution 48-18 (2018 Complete Streets Policy). This item is being continued from the March 28, 2023 Planning Commission Meeting.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends adoption of the Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan and amending the Grand Junction Circulation Plan Active Transportation Corridor Map, amending the 2020 One Grand Junction Comprehensive Plan Active Transportation Corridor Map and repealing and replacing the Complete Street Policy. The Urban Trails Committee recommended approval at their meeting held March 22, 2023.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

This item has been continued from the March 28, 2023 Planning Commission Meeting.

The city contracted with Fehr and Peers to help develop the first ever Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan (Plan) for the Grand Junction community. This effort worked towards three primary goals:

- Establish a vision for the future pedestrian and bicycle network.
- Identify prioritized investments that the City will gradually implement over time.
- Create a more comfortable and welcoming place for people walking, rolling and biking across all ages and abilities.

The Plan is a long-range plan that is applicable to the City's Urban Growth Area, an area generally located between 21 Road on the west, J Road on the north, 32 Road on

the east and south to a boundary approximately one-quarter of a mile north of the Mesa County Landfill and is an element of the 2020 One Grand Junction Comprehensive Plan. The Plan is a product of 9 months of public outreach, stakeholder discussions, steering committee work, contributions by consultants, and work by City of Grand Junction staff.

The Plan addresses, supports and implements the City's active transportation (multi-modal) programs, policies and infrastructure in alignment with the City's 2020 Comprehensive Plan, Plan Principle 6; Efficient and Connected Transportation and the City Council's Strategic Priority Mobility and Infrastructure.

BACKGROUND OR DETAILED INFORMATION:

NOTE: This section will be updated following Planning Commission Workshop to be held on April 6, 2023

The focus of the Plan is to identify strategies, policies, and performance measures to guide the planning, funding, and implementation of future active transportation projects, and to encourage increased non-motorized trips across all ages and abilities.

The Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan establishes a vision for the future pedestrian and bicycle network, identifies and prioritized facility investments that the City will gradually implement over time to create a more comfortable and welcoming place for people walking, rolling and biking across all ages and abilities within the municipal boundary of the City as well as in its planning area, specifically within the Urban Development Boundary.

This is the first ever Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan (Plan) for the Grand Junction community. The city contracted with Fehr and Peers, a transportation and engineering firm to help create this Plan. The Plan is a long-range plan that is applicable to the City's planning area, an area generally located between 21 Road on the west, J Road on the north, 32 Road on the east and south to a boundary approximately one-quarter of a mile north of the Mesa County Landfill and is an element of the 2020 One Grand Junction Comprehensive Plan. The Plan is a product of 9 months of public outreach, stakeholder discussions, steering committee work, contributions by consultants, and work by City of Grand Junction staff.

Plan Purpose

Grand Junction is authorized to prepare, amend, update a comprehensive plan as a long-range guiding document to achieve its vision and goals under Colorado Revised Statutes §30-28-106 and §31-23-206. The One Grand Junction Comprehensive Plan addresses issues within the municipal boundary of the City as well as in its planning area including many topics, how they interconnect, and setting the City on track for efficiency and coordinated action. The One Grand Junction Comprehensive Plan established Plan Principle 6: Efficient and Connected transportation as part of the City's

framework which established as one of its' goals to "Continue to develop a safe, balanced, and well connected transportation system that enhances mobility for all modes" with a strategy of creating a Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan. The strategy states the need to develop and implement a bicycle and pedestrian plan, prioritizing projects designed to address "missing links" in the system, improve accessibility of under-served neighborhoods, and ensure the plan as a reporting mechanism.

The Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan is not just a policy document for the City organization; it is a guide for the entire community that envisions the kind of pedestrian and bicycle system the community desires in the future, sets the overall direction for the changes we want, and outlines the steps the community will need to take to get there. It is not a definitive course of action or a legally binding obligation of what must be done. Rather, it is a guidance document that describes what transportation system the community would like and what steps and actions, partnerships, and policies will move the City forward to achieving its vision for the future pedestrian and bicycle network. It also replaces the City's Complete Street Policy by incorporating those same policies and strategies established by City Council in 2018.

Public Engagement/Planning Process

The City launched the development of the Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan in August 2022 with the formation of a 17-member steering committee. Members of the Steering Committee played a critical role supporting the completion of the plan. In an effort to ensure the steering committee reflected the everyday user, the City put out a call for applications to the broader community to solicit candidates interested in serving on the Steering Committee. A total of 72 applications were received. Staff solicited a pool of applicants that were geographically diverse and inclusive of different age groups and professions who were part of a target demographic or who may, through their employment, represent vulnerable or underrepresented users, such as individuals with disabilities, youth, low-income populations, and service industry workers.

Following the formation of the steering committee, staff conducted extensive community outreach in September and October of 2022 consisting of 12 intercept events throughout the community, a walk audit and bike audit with members of the steering committee, nine focus groups, an online survey and an interactive mapping exercise, and an open house to collect input on existing conditions and community needs. Approximately 80 community members attended the open house. Through the engagement process, staff made 300 individual points of contact with community members at the intercept events, solicited input from 65 focus group participants, and received 669 comments on the online survey and 1098 comments on the interactive online map.

In December 2022, the City released an Existing Conditions and Needs Assessment Report that synthesized all public input and findings during the first phase of the project. Additionally, the City released the draft network plans for pedestrian corridors and bicycle corridors, and additions to the Active Transportation Corridors map. Both documents were available for review on GJSpeaks.org and the city's website. Staff

workshopped the Existing Conditions and Needs Assessment Report with the City Council on December 19, 2022 and with the Planning Commission on January 5, 2023.

The City released the first draft of the Plan on February 2, 2023. The draft plan presented the identified level of traffic stress (LTS) for corridors in the City ranked for both pedestrians and bikes and recommended treatments. The consultants also prepared a prioritized projects list for infrastructure improvements. The plan also included non-infrastructure policy and programmatic recommendations.

The City began a second round of public outreach in February 2023 to gather input on the elements of the draft Plan. Staff conducted ten intercept events to encourage the public to read and provide comments on the draft plan:

- Mesa County Public Library, Feb 2 and Feb 16
- KAFM Radio Show, Mobile Mesa County, Feb 8
- Downtown Development Authority Board Meeting, Feb 9
- Winter Bike to Work Day, Feb 10
- Colorado E-Bikes, Feb 11
- Horizon Drive BID Board Meeting, Feb 15
- Colorado Mesa University Natural Resources Job Fair, Feb 15
- Virtual Open House, Feb 21.
- In-person Open House at Lincoln Park Barn, Feb 22

Additionally, there was an online survey available to fill out until February 26 seeking public input on the draft Plan.

Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan

The Plan consists of the following:

1. Plan document
2. Appendix A -Existing Conditions and Needs Assessment
3. Appendix B – Project Prioritization Methodology

There is also an Executive Summary document. All four documents are attached to this staff report

Active Transportation Corridors Map

The Grand Junction Circulation Plan (element of the Comprehensive Plan) adopted by City Council in 2018 established the Active Transportation Corridor Map. This map was included also on page 31 of the 2020 One Grand Junction Comprehensive Plan. The map became the base map/network map of the Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan. Through the planning process additional corridors segments were identifies and added to the Active Transportation Corridor Map, now part of the Plan. Adoption of the Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan also updates the 2018 Circulation Plan Active Transportation Corridor Plan Map and the Active Transportation Corridors Map found in the 2020 One Grand Junction Comprehensive Plan.

NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

Notice was completed consistent with the provisions in Section 21.02.080 (g) of the Zoning and Development Code. The notice of the March 28, 2023 City Planning Commission public hearing was published March 19, 2023 in the Grand Junction Daily Sentinel.

ANALYSIS

Comprehensive Plan Amendment Analysis

The criteria for review are set forth in Section 21.02.130 (c) (1). The criteria provide that the City may amend the Comprehensive Plan, neighborhood plans, corridor plans and area plans if the proposed change is consistent with the vision (intent), goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan and at least one of the criteria outlined below;

(1) Subsequent events have invalidated the original premises and findings; and/or This request is to adopt the City’s first ever Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan. There are no original premises and/or findings that are invalidated. The adoption of the One Grand Junction Comprehensive Plan in 2020 supports through its Plan Principle 6 the establishment of efficient and connected transportation as part of the City’s transportation network that enhances mobility for all modes of travel. The Comprehensive Plan calls out the need to create and implement a Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan that prioritizes projects designed to address “missing links” in the system and improve accessibility of under-served neighborhoods in addition to community wide connectivity goals. Staff finds that this criterion is not met.

(2) The character and/or condition of the area has changed such that the amendment is consistent with the Plan; and/or
The character of the community has not changed in a substantive way since the Comprehensive Plan was adopted. The Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan further plans for and provides the vision for the pedestrian network and bicycle network of transportation corridors for pedestrians, rollers and bicyclist. Staff finds this criterion is not met.

(3) Public and community facilities are adequate to serve the type and scope of land use proposed; and/or
The Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan includes an Existing Conditions and Needs Assessment found in Appendix A of the Plan. The Plan has found and identified where public and community facilities for pedestrian and bicycle facilities are not adequate to serve the community and the needs identified by the public, steering committee, consultant team and staff during the planning process. Staff finds this criterion is not met.

(4) An inadequate supply of suitably designated land is available in the community, as defined by the presiding body, to accommodate the proposed land use; and/or
This criterion does not reflect what a Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan provides. Staff finds this criterion is not met.

(5) The community or area, as defined by the presiding body, will derive benefits from the proposed amendment.

The community is defined by the Urban Development Boundary (Planning Area) which establishes the City of Grand Junction’s urban growth area. The community derives benefit from the Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan. The entire community was invited to participate in the planning process providing valuable input of the deficiencies and identifying needs of the walking, rolling and cycling community. The Plan covers the entire Planning Area and identifies and prioritizes corridors and corridor segments for a Pedestrian Network Plan and identifies and prioritizes corridors and corridor segments for a Bicycle Network Plan. The Plan identifies the types of infrastructure and facilities that are needed to improve conditions for walkers, rollers and bicyclists. The Plan identifies strategies, policies, and performance measures to guide the planning, funding, and implementation of future active transportation projects, and to encourage increased non-motorized trips across all ages and abilities. Staff therefore finds this criterion to be met.

Comprehensive Plan Amendment (Adoption of the Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan) is consistent with the vision, goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan. Implementing the Comprehensive Plan. The proposed Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan, an Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan implement’s the following Plan Principles, goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan:

Plan Principle 6: Efficient and Connected Transportation

Goal 1: Continue to develop a safe, balanced, and well-connected transportation system that enhances mobility for all modes.

Strategy a. Balanced Modes. Consider and strive to balance the safety and needs of all transportation modes-driving, bicycling, walking, and taking transit-in day to-day planning, development review, and decision making by the city.

Strategy c. Circulation Plan. Maintain and regularly update the City’s circulation Plan. NOTE: The proposed Active Transportation Corridor Map will replace the same map found in the Circulation Plan (Ordinance 4808).

Strategy d. Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan. Develop and implement a Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan.

Strategy f. Complete Streets. NOTE: The Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan incorporates the policies established in the 2018 Complete Street Policy (Resolution 48-18) and replaces that policy.

Goal 4: Encourage the use of transit, bicycling, walking and other forms of transportation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION AND FINDINGS OF FACT

After reviewing the 2023 Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan request, for adoption to be an element of the 2020 One Grand Junction Comprehensive Plan, the following findings of facts have been made:

1. The Plan meets criteria 5 of Section 21.02.130(c)(1) of the Zoning and Development Code.
2. The Plan develops a community vision with achievable goals.
3. The Plan works to provide accessibility for all users.
4. The Plan prioritizes active transportation corridor segments addressing “missing

links” and improves accessibility of underserved neighborhoods.

5. The Plan will help guide and facilitate decision-making on future pedestrian and bicycle facility infrastructure needs and projects within the City.

6. The Plan incorporates the City’s “Complete Streets” policies adopted in the City’s 2018 Complete Street Policy and the implementation strategies of the 2020 One Grand Junction Comprehensive Plan.

7. The Plan protects, preserves and creates opportunities to enhance quality of life. Therefore, City Staff recommends approval of Plan adoption.

SUGGESTED MOTION:

Mr. Chairman, on the Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan request City file number CPA-2023-167, I move that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation to City Council with the findings of fact as listed in the staff report for adoption of the plan and approval of amendment of the Active Transportation Corridor Map in the Grand Junction Circulation Plan and of amendment of the Active Transportation Corridor Map in the 2020 One Grand Junction Comprehensive Plan, and replace and sunset the Complete Street Policy with the Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan.

Attachments

- 1. GJ PBP_Final Plan_April2023
- 2. Appendix A_Existing Conditions Needs Assess
- 3. Appendix B_Project Prioritization Methodology
- 4. Planning Commission Workshop - 4-6-23 - Final Updates
- 5. PBP Draft Plan to Final Plan Changes Made
- 6. Ordinance



PEDESTRIAN & BICYCLE PLAN

April 2023

FINAL PLAN

Prepared by:



Prepared by:

FEHR & PEERS

Table of Contents



CHAPTER 1.
INTRODUCTION

04



CHAPTER 2.
EXISTING
CONDITIONS
& OUTREACH
SUMMARY

08




CHAPTER 3.
VISION
& GOALS

18



CHAPTER 4.
BICYCLE
NETWORK
PLAN

24




CHAPTER 5.

**PEDESTRIAN
NETWORK
PLAN**




62 CHAPTER 6.

**PROGRAM
& POLICY
RECOMMENDATIONS**



68 CHAPTER 7.

**IMPLEMENTATION
& PRIORITIZATION**



88 APPENDIX

APPENDICES

Appendix A:
Existing Conditions
& Needs Assessment

Appendix B:
Project Prioritization Methodology

123

CHAPTER 1.

INTRODUCTION



The Grand Junction Pedestrian & Bicycle Plan (PBP) is the city's first ever pedestrian and bicycle plan and provides a long-term vision for the future pedestrian and bicycle networks in Grand Junction. The vision, goals, and key elements of the PBP are based on best practice, national research, analysis, and input received through an extensive community engagement process that included over 2,000 touch points with community members.

Ultimately, this PBP identifies strategies and prioritized investments that the city will gradually implement over time to make Grand Junction a more comfortable and welcoming place for people walking, rolling, and biking.

Why Develop a Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan?

In 2021, the city of Grand Junction adopted the *One Grand Junction Comprehensive Plan*, as an update to the 2010 Comprehensive Plan. Community outreach conducted for the Comprehensive Plan revealed a strong desire to improve walking and biking in Grand Junction. A key directive of the *One Grand Junction Comprehensive Plan* was to develop a citywide Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan.

Prior to this PBP, the city developed an Active Transportation Corridor map as part of the 2018 *Grand Junction Circulation Plan* and adopted a complete streets policy in 2018. Both efforts set Grand Junction on a path to improve the pedestrian and bicycle network. The continued growth of e-products (LEVs) is an important consideration of this plan. In addition, the city has been gradually making infrastructure improvements over the past two decades, such as adding new sidewalks, widening sidewalks, improving pedestrian crossings, and adding bike lanes, guided in part by the Urban Trails Committee (UTC). However, many of these improvements are often done piecemeal without a cohesive larger vision. This PBP fills this gap, building off the Active Transportation Corridors and complete streets policy, and providing a vision and clear guidance based on community priorities.

Benefits of Investing in the Pedestrian and Bicycle Environment

The benefits to the community of improving the pedestrian and bicycle network in Grand Junction are far-reaching, including to public health, equity, economic access, private investment, and quality of life:

- **Public Health:** Improved physical and mental health outcomes for community members as well as reduced instances of fatal and injury crashes for people walking and biking.
- **Equity:** Increased equity by providing more transportation choices that are accessible and affordable, particularly to the most vulnerable populations, including youth, seniors, people with disabilities, and low-income households that often rely on walking and bicycling as primary modes of transportation.
- **Access to Transit:** Safe and comfortable routes to transit facilities for those who cannot drive or choose not to drive.

- **Quality of Life:** More opportunities for community members to interact and connect, building social capital in the city, while providing opportunities to be outside experiencing Grand Junction's abundant sunshine.
- **Environmental:** Strengthened environmental sustainability through improved air quality by providing better options for people to travel without a motorized vehicle.
- **Economic:** Improved access to jobs and services, benefiting both employees and employers, increasing economic productivity, as well as increasing the attractiveness of Grand Junction for economic investment.

Coordination with the Transportation Design and Engineering Standards (TEDS) Manual Update

The PBP was developed in coordination with the first update to Grand Junction's Transportation Design and Engineering Standards (TEDS) Manual in nearly 20 years. The TEDS Manual provides regulatory guidance on street design and other transportation related standards in the city. The TEDS Manual is used by city engineers and private developers whenever a new street is constructed or an existing street is reconstructed. The TEDS Manual dictates key active transportation infrastructure design elements, such as the width and placement of sidewalks and bike lanes within different street contexts. Coordinating development of the PBP with the update to the TEDS Manual ensures that the vision for the future pedestrian and bicycle environment and amenities is reflected in the city's transportation design standards. The updated TEDS Manual will be a key component of implementing the PBP.

Implementing Complete Streets in the City of Grand Junction

The Complete Streets Vision is to develop a safe, efficient, and reliable travel network of streets, sidewalks, and urban trails throughout the city of Grand Junction to equitably serve all users and all modes of transportation. Complete Streets will provide residents improved access, safety, health and environment.

The purpose of the policy is to commit to improvements that are planned, designed, constructed, operated, and maintained to support safe, efficient, and convenient mobility for all roadway users—pedestrians,

bicyclists, people who use mobility devices, transit riders, freight traffic, emergency response vehicles, and motorists—regardless of age or ability.

Complete streets are necessary to expand everyone’s mobility choices for safe and convenient travel by different modes between destinations throughout Grand Junction and are designed, appropriate to the context, to balance safety and convenience for everyone using the road.

What’s Included in this Plan?

This PBP includes the following key elements that will be used by the city to guide implementation:

- **Existing Conditions & Community Engagement Key Findings** – Based on the findings of the *Existing Conditions and Needs Assessment* report which is provided in **Appendix A**.
- **Vision, Goals, and Objectives** – Based on priorities identified by the community.
- **Bicycle Network Plan** – Includes a map illustrating the long-term vision for the future bicycle network, planned bicycle facility types, and infrastructure design guidance.
- **Pedestrian Network Plan** – Includes sidewalk and pedestrian crossing policy and design guidance to build out the pedestrian network.

- **Program & Policy Recommendations** – To support active transportation use and infrastructure implementation.
- **Implementation & Prioritization** – To guide systematic implementation of the long-term vision.

Inclusive Community Engagement

The approach to community engagement in developing the PBP recognizes that Grand Junction does not have one voice or one perspective, but is a conglomeration of individuals and families that represent a diverse set of backgrounds, perspectives, and experiences. As such, engagement was conducted in a manner to be inclusive and representative of these diverse perspectives. This was achieved through three distinct strategies:

- Providing a variety of methods for the public to participate including through an online survey, an in-person public open house, via the project website, and interacting with the public at over a dozen in-person community events.
- Conducting nine focus groups with representatives of groups that are directly impacted by the walking and biking environment and can sometimes be difficult to reach through traditional engagement means, such as students (college and K-12), people experiencing homelessness, disabled persons, seniors, and the Spanish speaking community among others.



KEY THEMES

of Plan Development

Two themes are important to acknowledge as they served as overarching principles in developing the PBP.

These include:

.....

1

An inclusive approach to community engagement.

.....

2

A conscientious effort to address the needs for both people walking and people biking.

- Lastly, the PBP was guided by a 17-member Steering Committee selected from a pool of over 70 interested citizens that applied for that role. Selection of the Steering Committee was based on criteria to ensure representation was geographically diverse, inclusive of different age groups and professions, and representative of vulnerable or underrepresented users, such as individuals with disabilities, youth, low-income populations, and service industry workers.

Altogether, the vision, goals, and recommendations included in the PBP reflect the input received through this broad and inclusive public engagement process.

Both a Pedestrian AND a Bicycle Plan

People walking, rolling, and biking are human-scale, have negligible emissions, and primarily bear the cost burden of travel. Unfortunately, they are also more vulnerable users that are more susceptible to severe injury in a crash and often do not have the option to drive. For these reasons, the PBP was developed to address the needs of all of these users. However, the needs of pedestrians, people with mobility challenges, and bicyclists are also often inherently different and the PBP provides guidance that addresses the unique needs of all active transportation user groups. Please also refer to the definitions section of the plan that defines the various forms of transportation.

Best Practices in Pedestrian & Bicycle Design

The design recommendations included in this plan are based on best practices from local and national resources. A leading resource in urban bicycle design is the National Association of Transportation Officials (NACTO). Other resources for pedestrian and bicycle design include the American Association of State Highway Transportation Officials (AASHTO), the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT).

The following publications were used to inform design guidance in the PBP and will be useful resources for city planners and engineers to consult during implementation:

- NACTO *Urban Bikeway Design Guide*
- NACTO *Don't Give Up at the Intersection: Design All Ages and Abilities Bicycle Crossings*
- AASHTO *Guide for Development of Bicycle Facilities*
- FHWA *Guide for Improving Pedestrian Safety at Uncontrolled Intersections*
- CDOT *Roadway Design Guide: Chapter 14 Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities*
- CDOT *Pedestrian Crossing Installation Guide*

Context Sensitive Design

Context Sensitive Design establishes design elements based on the context and character of the street. The City of Grand Junction has a wide variety of settings, unique landscapes, and environmental conditions. Any facility identified in this plan will need to take into consideration existing conditions and characteristics of the surrounding area to ensure that design is context sensitive.

This principle provides and promotes sufficient flexibility to allow application of appropriate roadway elements and dimensions to different situations within the city. Different standards for street cross-sections may be appropriate for a bike or pedestrian facility as it travels through urban, suburban and rural transects, reflecting the different roles of roadway infrastructure among these different transects. Additionally, Context Sensitive Design takes into account existing building encroachments and constraints in right-of-way widths to adjust the facility type where needed.

CHAPTER 2.

EXISTING CONDITIONS & OUTREACH SUMMARY

This section provides a brief summary of analysis performed and key findings of the public outreach and existing conditions assessment of the pedestrian and bicycle environment in Grand Junction. Please refer to the Existing Conditions & Needs Assessment Report in Appendix A for a complete summary.



Key Outcomes of the Existing Conditions Analysis

The *Existing Conditions & Needs Assessment Report* included a review of existing relevant plans, mapping of the existing pedestrian and bicycle network, a level of traffic stress analysis for people walking and biking for every street in Grand Junction, development of an Active Transportation High Injury Network based on existing crash data, and summary of existing pedestrian and bicycle use in Grand Junction based on available data. Key outcomes of these analyses are provided below. Please consult **Appendix A** for more detail on these findings.

Relevant Plans

Key relevant plans and documents to the PBP include the *One Grand Junction Comprehensive Plan*, *The Grand Junction Circulation Plan*, *The Mesa County Regional Transportation Plan*, *Grand Junction's Complete Streets Policy*, the *Fire Code*, and the *Zoning and Development Code*. The Active Transportation Corridors that were developed as part of the *Grand Junction Circulation Plan* were reevaluated and updated as part of the PBP. These corridors serve as the backbone for the vision of the future bike network and key pedestrian corridors in Grand Junction.

Existing Pedestrian Network

Mapping walkways in Grand Junction revealed that the condition of the existing pedestrian network varies considerably by location in the city. **Figure 1** shows the three existing sidewalk types. Many of the major streets in Grand Junction currently have a sidewalk, but there are notable gaps as well with missing or narrow sidewalks, including (but not limited to).

- North Avenue
- Patterson Road
- 24 Road (over US 50/US 6)
- 28 Road
- 9th Street (south of downtown)
- Several key connections in the Orchard Mesa Neighborhood, such as US 50, B ½ Road, 27 Road, and 28 ½ Road.

Of particular importance are streets with missing or inadequate sidewalks along the Active Transportation Corridors, collector and arterial streets, and at major crossings of the Colorado River, railroad tracks, and highways. Analysis revealed there are limited existing options that connect across the river and railroad tracks which separate key destinations in the city.

FIGURE 1: EXISTING SIDEWALK TYPES MAPPED IN GRAND JUNCTION



Existing Bicycle Network

Grand Junction currently has four general types of bicycle facilities as shown in **Figure 2**, including separated multi-use trails, on-street bike lanes, on-street buffered bike lanes, and signed bike routes. One of the city’s most used facilities and a key asset for bicycle mobility across the city is the Riverfront Trail that parallels the Colorado River, generally running east–west. Most of the existing bike facilities overlap with the city’s designated Active Transportation Corridors. However, the existing bike network is disconnected in many places. Most of the Active

Transportation Corridors currently lack bike facilities, and in many parts of the city multi-use trails, bike lanes and bike routes on low volume streets end abruptly. Key gaps in the bike network include, but are not limited to, sections of: 7th Street and 12th Street, North Avenue, Patterson Road, 24 Road, and Orchard Avenue. Similar to the pedestrian network, there are a limited number of crossings of the Colorado River, railroad tracks, and highways (notably US 50 and I-70B) that divide the city and serve as barriers for people walking and biking.

FIGURE 2: EXISTING BICYCLE FACILITY TYPES IN GRAND JUNCTION



Level of Traffic Stress Maps

A methodology and maps of the Level of Traffic Stress (LTS) on a scale of 1 to 4 for people walking, rolling, and biking on all streets in Grand Junction were developed (see **Appendix A**). Streets with LTS 1 and 2 are considered low stress, while streets with LTS 3 or 4 are considered higher stress for people walking, rolling, and biking, see **Figure 3**. The LTS maps show critical gaps in the pedestrian and bicycle network where the existing facilities do not provide a sufficient level of

comfort for people walking, rolling, and biking given key characteristics of the streets, including the volume and speed of traffic, and the number of travel lanes. In general, streets with more traffic, higher speeds, and/or more travel lanes require a higher degree of separation for people walking and bicycling to feel safe and comfortable. The LTS maps were a critical component in developing recommendations for the active transportation network and street design.

FIGURE 3: BICYCLE LEVEL OF TRAFFIC STRESS (LTS) MEASURES



Active Transportation High Injury Network

An Active Transportation High Injury Network (HIN) Map was developed representing the streets with the highest concentration of pedestrian and bicycle involved crashes in the city (see map in **Appendix A**). The HIN map shows that over 80% of pedestrian and bicycle crashes occur on just 5% of city streets. Focusing resources and investment on upgrading active transportation facilities and making safety improvements on these streets will have the greatest impact on improving bicycle and pedestrian safety in Grand Junction. The HIN is an important evaluation tool for project prioritization.

About 84% of all pedestrian and cyclist-involved crashes occurred on just 5% of city streets, which are identified as part of the Active Transportation High Injury Network.



PEDESTRIAN & CYCLIST SAFETY FINDINGS




FIGURE 4: PEDESTRIAN & CYCLIST SAFETY FINDINGS

Pedestrian and Bicycle Demand

In addition to community input which helped reveal important corridors for people walking, rolling, and biking, Strava Metro Data was used to identify important corridors in the city for people walking and biking. This showed key corridors through downtown as well as popular routes used to cross the Colorado River and railroad tracks.

Community Engagement

Community input was an important driver in identifying the vision and goals for the PBP, including understanding existing concerns from the community, informing recommendations, and prioritizing improvements. With a goal of being inclusive and representative of these diverse

perspectives across the city, including reaching those most impacted by pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, the engagement process was multifaceted and comprehensive.

Engagement included an online survey with an interactive webmap, an in-person community open house, nine focus group meetings, a dozen intercept events across the city, and formation of a 17-person resident Steering Committee that guided plan development. In all, over 2,000 touch points were made with the community through this process including over 660 survey responses, and over 1,000 comments on the interactive webmap as shown in Figure 6.

Over 75% of survey respondents reported driving as their primary mode of transportation. Thus, community input reflects the input of both regular bicyclists and non-bicyclists.



FIGURE 5: OUTREACH EVENTS



COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION



FIGURE 6: SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

Key Outcomes of Community Engagement

Appendix A provides a detailed summary of outcomes of community engagement. Key highlights include:

- Improve Traffic Safety** – Safety emerged from the visioning process at the open house and online survey as a top theme. It was also a high priority identified in the focus groups and from the Steering Committee. A lot of people would like to walk and bike more and would like kids to be able to walk and bike more in Grand Junction, but don't feel safe doing so in many areas of the city.
- Improve Active Transportation Infrastructure** – The community consistently reiterated their desire for more sidewalks, wider sidewalks, more bike trails, more bike lanes, wider bike lanes, and more facilities separated from traffic on busy, higher-speed streets.
- Missing Connections** – The public acknowledged many great existing walk and bike facilities in Grand Junction, including the Riverfront Trail, but because there are missing connections in the network, and due to difficulty crossing major streets, many people are not able to or do not feel comfortable walking, rolling, and biking places.
- Key Destinations** – Several important destinations were reiterated by the community, including downtown, the Riverfront Trail, CMU, Mesa Mall, K-12 schools, and medical clinics and businesses, particularly along North Avenue and Patterson Road.
- Key Connections Across Barriers** – A common theme emerged in discussion and feedback received by the community is that there are a limited number of ways to cross the Colorado River, railroad tracks, and highways (including US 50 and I-70B) and many of the existing corridors across these barriers do not adequately support people walking/rolling and biking. These connections are critical for people to connect from downtown, CMU, and the Mesa Mall on the north side of the city to the Riverfront Trail, the Redlands, and Orchard Mesa on the south side of the city.
- Riverfront Trail** – The Riverfront Trail is a key east-west connection for both recreational and utilitarian active transportation in Grand Junction and connecting to/from the Riverfront Trail should be an important aspect of the future pedestrian and bicycle network.
- Unmet Demand** – The community would like to be able to walk and bike more frequently and to more places in Grand Junction, but are not comfortable doing so due to inadequate infrastructure and key missing connections in the pedestrian and bicycle network.

95% of survey respondents said they would like to be able to walk and bike more in Grand Junction.

The biggest challenge(s) associated with walking/rolling in Grand Junction is/are... (select all that apply)





FIGURE 7: SURVEY RESPONSES ON CHALLENGES WALKING AND ROLLING

Most Frequent Theme



Repeated Comments

- ✓ Want to use the canals for trails
- ✓ Lots of people bike on sidewalk along busy streets
- ✓ Unfriendly bike culture/ aggressive drivers
- ✓ Bike lanes are too narrow
- ✓ Bike lanes end abruptly
- ✓ Extend Lunch Loops Trails
- ✓ Signs - wayfinding and Share-The-Road laws
- ✓ More shade trees and better lighting at night
- ✓ Car-free Main Street

FIGURE 8: COMMON THEMES OF 593 GENERAL COMMENTS RECEIVED



VISION

Grand Junction is a city where people of all ages and abilities can safely and conveniently walk, roll, and bike on a connected network of well-maintained facilities for transportation or recreation.

GOALS

The five goals identified to move the city towards its vision are: equitable, safe, connected, multimodal community, and quality. Each goal is further defined in this section.

Equitable

Design and operate the communities' streets and right-of-way to reasonably enable convenient access and travel for people walking and biking of all ages, abilities, and income levels and prioritize improvements that benefit vulnerable users and underserved areas.

Safe

Improve perceived and real safety by reducing the level of traffic stress (LTS) and reducing bicycle and pedestrian involved crashes. Invest and implement countermeasures at and along segments of the Active Transportation High Injury Network where there are known safety challenges.

Connected

Provide convenient access to Community Attractions and reduce the need for out of direction travel. Increase the number of direct and low-stress connections to key destinations within the city.

Multimodal Community

Facilitate a pleasant experience that creates a sense of place, that increases separation of pedestrians/rollers/bicyclists from vehicular travel lanes and makes travel without a vehicle a viable option for more people.

Quality

Invest in high-quality facilities that minimize the level of traffic stress experienced by travelers using the corridor and are well-maintained.

Equitable

OBJECTIVES

- E1:** Design crossings with ADA accessible pedestrian ramps, detectable surfaces, and other universal design features.
- E2:** Prioritize locations for sidewalk gap completion or rehabilitation according to the strategy outlined in the Prioritized Pedestrian Network section.
- E3:** Prioritize bike project locations according to the tiers established in the Prioritized Bicycle Network Map.

Safe

OBJECTIVES

- S1:** Conduct a signalization feasibility study as a first step to determine what improvements are needed at signalized crossings.
- S2:** When upgrading bike facilities on a corridor, incorporate suggested intersection treatments to reduce stress of bicycle crossings, and ensure continuity of high-comfort facilities.
- S3:** When upgrading pedestrian facilities on a corridor, incorporate suggested intersection treatments to reduce stress of crossings, and ensure continuity of high-comfort facilities.
- S4:** Conduct a lighting needs assessment for each active transportation corridor as a first step in identifying lighting needs for safety improvements.
- S5:** Bolster the existing Safe Routes to School program by incorporating new elements of the six Es.
- S6:** Work with local driving schools to expand the curriculum on laws governing interactions with people walking, rolling, and biking.
- S7:** Partner with law enforcement to increase enforcement of speeding and reckless driving in areas with high pedestrian volumes and/or safety issues and consider automated enforcement. Consider expanding the police bike patrol unit.
- S8:** Improve the North Avenue access management policy in alignment with national best practices and consider expanding to all the Active Transportation “High Injury Network” Corridors.
- S9:** Join the statewide program – Moving Towards Zero Deaths – as a first step in solidifying a citywide commitment to supporting multimodal travel through ensuring all trips in the community are as safe as possible.

.....
Connected

OBJECTIVES

- C1:** Complete bike facilities on the Active Transportation Corridors as shown in the Future Bicycle Network Map.
- C2:** Strengthen enforcement and compliance of the existing construction zones policy that requires developers/construction companies to provide pedestrian pathways and bicycle facilities during construction.
- C3:** Require new developments to provide or set aside space for pedestrian and bicycle connections within the local street network of new developments and to adjacent streets in situations where there is a lack of connectivity in the roadway network.
- C4:** Connectivity can be defined by a “connectivity index,” the ratio of pedestrian and bicycle connections to blocks (or intersections). Consider reducing the maximum distance between pedestrian and bicycle connections to be less than the existing maximum block length for vehicular access of 1200 linear feet.

.....
Multimodal Community

OBJECTIVES

- M1:** Prioritize installation of bike and micromobility parking and secure storage in key destinations downtown, outside of city properties, and near major transit hubs, parks, schools, employment centers, and shopping areas.
- M2:** Encourage new and existing developments to provide secure bike parking and amenities through requirements and incentives.
- M3:** When upgrading bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities on a corridor, design high-quality landscaped or hardscaped buffers with street furniture and pedestrian amenities.
- M4:** Grand Junction’s streets shall be designed as public amenities and include aesthetic elements such as street trees, landscaping, pedestrian lighting, street furniture, and wayfinding signage wherever possible.
- M5:** When upgrading bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities on a corridor, concurrently plan for the upgrade of lighting in the project area.
- M6:** Initiate a comprehensive wayfinding and signage study to create a consistent strategy for connecting people walking, biking, and driving to downtown and other key destinations.
- M7:** As the city continues to build out bike facilities and new trails over time, incorporate additional signs with the same wayfinding standards at decision points.
- M8:** Improve signage on the Riverfront Trail.
- M9:** Close the gaps on first-and-last mile connections through the deployment of shared micromobility devices (e-scooters, e-bikes, etc.) and utilize geofencing and parking corrals to accommodate device parking in high-traffic areas.

Multimodal Community

OBJECTIVES CONTINUED

M10: Develop a community-wide incentive program and work with large employers to implement a Guaranteed Ride Home program to encourage and support bike commuters. Incentives can include e-bike rebates, bike-themed events such as bike rodeos and Bike to Work Day, swag such as bike lights and helmets, and gift certificates for those who bike to City events. Guaranteed Ride Home provides commuters who did not drive to work with alternative means home in case of an emergency.

M11: Establish a more positive culture around walking and biking in Grand Junction by creating staff position(s) to assist in public education, promoting the Bicycle Friendly Business program, and/or hosting an LCI seminar.

M12: Explore incentives-based Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures, into which major developments could opt, to provide support for walking and biking. These could include constructing Active Transportation Corridors, bike facilities, showers, car share, or other support for bike commuters.

M13: Revise the parking minimum standards for different land uses to better align with the community's goals; reducing development costs associated with excessive parking to allow for innovations, flexibility, and greater affordability.

Quality

OBJECTIVES

Q1: Install high-comfort bike facilities on the Active Transportation Corridors as recommended in the Future Bicycle Network Map and according to the design guidance in the Bicycle Facility Types section.

Q2: Install high-comfort sidewalks and trails according to the design guidance in the Pedestrian Facility Types section.

Q3: Develop a set of maintenance standards and a maintenance plan to prioritize upkeep of the active transportation network.

Q4: Utilize existing and pursue new funding sources support construction and maintenance of the expanded system.

Q5: Consider expanding the SRTS program by diversifying funding sources to include CDOT funding in addition to dedicated CDBG funding.

Q6: Continue the current policy where planned Active Transportation Corridors that run through or adjacent to a site be constructed as part of the development.

Q7: Explore and pursue funding opportunities to support continual capital construction and maintenance of the projects listed in this plan.

Q8: To the greatest extent practicable given budget constraints include pedestrian and bicycle facilities in all street projects and phases, including new construction, reconstruction, resurfacing, and maintenance.

Q9: Approach every transportation project and program as an opportunity to improve streets and the transportation network for all users, and work in coordination with other departments, agencies and jurisdictions.

Q10: Implement bicycle and pedestrian improvement projects by integrating with other city standard procedures.



CHAPTER 4.

BICYCLE NETWORK PLAN

The bicycle network plan in this section includes the following:

- **Active Transportation Corridors map update.** Includes updates since the original map developed in the 2018 Grand Junction Circulation Plan. This map represents the vision for the ultimate backbone network once completely built out.
- **Bicycle facility design.** Includes a description of the preferred design user that bike facilities will be designed to support.
- **Bicycle facilities by type.** Includes a description of each type of bicycle facility and provides general design guidelines for each.
- **Bicycle network map.** As supported by the Plan's vision, the future bicycle network map shows the alignment and recommended facility types of future bike corridors across the city.
- **Street/intersection crossings.** Includes bicycle crossing guidance to improve comfort and convenience for bicyclists at intersections.



Updated Active Transportation Corridors

The 2018 *Grand Junction Circulation Plan* identified a network of Active Transportation Corridors across the city. The corridors were identified as those that provide continuous and convenient connections for bicyclists and pedestrians and may be on the road network or separate trail. The Active Transportation Corridors are the vision for the backbone of the future bicycle network in Grand Junction and also represent key pedestrian corridors in the city.


As part of the planning process for the PBP, the Active Transportation Corridors developed as part of the 2018 *Grand Junction Circulation Plan* were reevaluated and numerous additions and modifications were made based on input from the community (particularly from the 1,098 comments received from the online interactive map), the Steering Committee, and city staff.

This process resulted in approximately 32 additions to the Active Transportation Corridors from the previous plan, listed in **Table 1**. The additions reflect planned developments, provide additional redundancy in the system (particularly in the core of the city), and provide more direct east-west and north-south connections for people walking and biking. These modifications also improve the feasibility, comfort, convenience, connectivity, and access to key destinations of the bike network. Note: **Table 1** includes a list of additions to the planned Active Transportation Corridors. For a list of planned bicycle projects see the tables by neighborhood starting on page 34 or **Appendix B**.

Many of the new connections added are on local streets that will be designated as bike boulevards (see description of bike boulevards below). These connections will provide additional low-stress options for people biking and fill in key gaps in the network.

TABLE 1: ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION CORRIDOR ADDITIONS

Segment	Miles
5th Street (Orchard to Downtown) & 4th Street (North to Downtown) with Belford Avenue connection	2.0
7th Street (missing segment)	0.4
9th Street (Main to Riverside Parkway)	0.8
Cannell Avenue / 9th Street / Little Bookcliff Drive	1.1
12th Street south of Main (new crossing of railroad)	0.8
28 Road (Riverside Parkway to Riverfront Trail)	0.6
Ridge Road (28 1/4 Rd to 27 1/2 Rd) / 28 1/4 Road	1.0
F 1/2 Road (29 Rd to 30 1/2 Rd)	1.5
Patterson Road (7th St to Independence Ranchman's Ditch)	0.3
Elm Street (3rd Street to 12th Street)	0.9
Gunnison Ave (24th St to 29 Rd)	1.2
Grand Ave (1st Street to 12th Street)	1.0
Main Street (missing segment)	0.5
West Main / Crosby / Base Rock Street	1.1
D Road (9th to Riverside & 29 Rd to 30 Rd)	1.5
Dos Rios Bridge (2nd Street to Riverfront Trail)	0.2
Redlands 360	4.7
C 1/2 Road (27 1/2 Rd to 29 Rd)	1.5
Cheyenne Drive / Hopi Avenue (Unawep to Eagle Rim Park)	0.7
Indian Wash Trail (Matchett Park to 29 Road / I-70 Commercial Area)	1.3
D Road (Monument Road to Rosedale Road)	0.3
S Redlands Road (Monument Road to Rosedale Road)	1.1
30 Road (B Road to US-50 and C Road to B 1/2 Road)	1.2
I-70 Business Loop south side (12th Street to Warrior Way)	4.5
C Road (30 Road to 31 Road)	1.0
Chestnut Drive / G 1/2 Road (26 Road to 27 Road)	1.1
Hill Court / Gunnison Avenue / Ol' Sun Drive (30 Road to E Road)	1.1
30 1/2 Road / Wedgewood Avenue (D1/2 Road to D Road)	0.5
15th Street (Elm Avenue to Gunnison Avenue)	0.5
Pear Park Corridor (Trail / Sandpiper Avenue / Colorado Avenue from 30 Road to 31 Road)	1.2
B 3/4 Road (Durant Street to 30 Road)	0.6
29 3/4 Road (B 3/4 Road to B 1/2 Road)	0.2



 
PEDESTRIAN & BICYCLE PLAN


 Railroads	Street Classification
 Parks	 Local
 Urban Development Boundary	 Collector
 Planned Active Transportation Corridors	 Arterial
 Proposed Active Transportation Corridor Additions	 Highway

FIGURE 10: UPDATED ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION CORRIDORS MAP

Preferred Design User

Based on input from the community, Steering Committee, and city staff, this plan sets forth a goal to have low-stress, high-comfort bike facilities on all Active Transportation Corridors shown in **Figure 10**. Low-stress facilities are defined as those that score an LTS 1 or LTS 2 on the LTS 1-4 rating system as shown in **Figure 11**, meaning they cater to all ages and abilities. Future bicycle facilities in Grand Junction will cater to the most cautious design user, ranging from children, older adults, and people with mobility challenges to the most “strong and fearless” bicyclist. Designing bike facilities to support the “interested but concerned” riders, which represent roughly 60% of the population, will ensure all residents and visitors of Grand Junction can feel comfortable choosing to bike.¹

¹ Geller R. (2006). Four Types of Cyclists. Portland Bureau of Transportation. Retrieved from <http://www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation/article/264746>.

Bicycle Facility Types

Bicycle facility types recommended in the Future Bicycle Network map in **Figure 19** are those needed to achieve an LTS 1 or 2 on Active Transportation Corridors based on the roadway speed, number of lanes, and traffic volumes. This section describes the toolbox of bicycle facility types (summarized in **Figure 12**) and basic design guidance for each type, with more specific guidance found in the updated TEDS Manual. Design guidance is based primarily on NACTO recommendations.

All bicycle facilities will accommodate both directions of travel. Most on-street facilities will be designed as one-way on each side of the street. Multiuse trails will also be on both sides of the street in most contexts to serve land uses on both sides of the street. Protected bike lanes and raised cycle tracks will also typically be designed as one-way on both sides of the street, but can be also be designed as two-way facilities. In these situations special design considerations will be needed at intersections and driveways, especially at signalized intersections. The NACTO Urban Bikeway Design Guide provides guidance on two-way cycle track design.

FIGURE 11: BICYCLE LEVEL OF TRAFFIC STRESS (LTS) MEASURES





PEDESTRIAN & BICYCLE PLAN

BICYCLE FACILITY GUIDE

NOTE: Recommendations shown are the minimum facilities needed to create a high-comfort environment for biking, given street characteristics. Facilities with greater separation and protection than the minimum option are desirable and sometimes warranted.



BIKE BOULEVARD

May include sharrow markings & bike route signage, traffic calming elements like curb extensions, mini roundabouts, traffic diverters

Recommended on streets with:

Low speeds (25 mph or lower), low traffic volumes (1,000 cars per day or fewer), few travel lanes (up to two), parallel routes to major arterials



BIKE LANE

Painted stripe, usually 6' or wider

Recommended on streets with:

Few travel lanes and/or low speeds (two lanes up to 35 mph or three to four lanes up to 25 mph)



BUFFERED BIKE LANE

Painted stripe, usually 5' or wider with 1.5' or wider buffer

Recommended on streets with:

Three to four travel lanes and speeds of 30 or 35 mph



PROTECTED BIKE LANE

Bike lane 5' or wider, protected by 3' or wider buffer such as flex posts, planters, rigid bollards, parking strip, or concrete barriers

Recommended on streets with:

High speeds (40 mph or greater), many travel lanes (more than four)



RAISED CYCLE TRACK

Bike lane 6.5' or wider, elevated from street level to curb height or mid-curb height, separated from sidewalk and roadway

Recommended on streets with:

High speeds (40 mph or greater), many travel lanes (more than four)



TRAIL

Multi-use path 10' feet or wider, separated from the roadway by a high-quality buffer

Recommended on streets with:

High speeds (40 mph or greater), many travel lanes (more than four)

FIGURE 12: BICYCLE FACILITY GUIDE

Table 2 summarizes the minimum bike facility to achieve an LTS 2 or better given the street characteristics of speed, number of travel lanes, and volume. In some cases, a higher comfort facility is recommended than what is shown in Table 2 given other context-sensitive characteristics, such as volume of motor vehicles, volume of bicyclists, frequency of large trucks. The city may also elect to provide a higher comfort facility than what is listed on Table 2 to achieve an LTS 1. Notably, if the city chooses to reduce the

speed and/or number of lanes on a street as part of a corridor project, the recommended minimum bike facility may change. It is recommended that changes to posted speed are accompanied by geometric design changes and traffic calming interventions to be effective. While using the posted speed is acceptable when identifying the best bicycle facility for a given street it is preferred to use the 85th percentile operating speed when possible.

TABLE 2: MINIMUM BIKE FACILITY RECOMMENDED TO ACHIEVE LTS 2 OR BETTER GIVEN STREET CHARACTERISTICS

		Lanes			
		1-2	3-4	5+	
Speed	<25 mph	≤ 1,000 ADT	Bike Boulevard	Bike Lane	Trail, Cycletrack, or Protected Bike Lane
		> 1,000 ADT	Bike Lane		
	25-30 mph		Bike Lane	Bike Lane	Trail, Cycletrack, or Protected Bike Lane
	30-35 mph		Bike Lane	Buffered Bike Lane	Trail, Cycletrack, or Protected Bike Lane
40+		Trail, Cycletrack, or Protected Bike Lane			

Recommendations shown are the minimum facilities needed to create a high-comfort environment for biking, given street characteristics. Facilities with greater separation and protection than the minimum option are desirable and sometimes warranted.

Streets with more than four through lanes, and streets with speeds greater than or equal to 40 mph will require a trail, cycletrack, or protected bike lane.



Trail

Trails will be designed to serve both pedestrians and bicyclists, including people on electric and non-electric mobility devices and electric bikes that meet city standards and obey the city speed limits.

To achieve at least an LTS 2, trails should be at least 10 feet wide and preferably 12 feet, with a 5-foot buffer on local streets, 8-foot buffer on collector streets, and 12-foot buffer on arterials. Striping on major trails can help separate opposing traffic where needed, especially in areas where visibility is limited due to trail curvature. In locations with high concentrations of both pedestrians and bicyclists that may increase frequency of conflict the city may consider widening the trail to 12 feet or 14 feet, or providing separate facilities for pedestrians and bicyclists, such as a 6-foot sidewalk and a raised cycle track (see Raised Cycle Track description).

In a constrained environment with limited right-of-way behind the curb, trails should be as wide as possible, with an absolute minimum width of 8 feet and a minimum buffer width of 2 feet.

Raised Cycle Track

To achieve an LTS 1, raised cycle tracks must be 6.5 feet or wider, with 8 feet or 10 feet suggested for streets with higher volumes of bicyclists. They should be raised from street level between 2 and 6 inches and have horizontal and/or vertical separation from the sidewalk. Buffers should be at least a one-foot mountable curb when adjacent to travel lanes, or 3-foot raised curb buffers when adjacent to parking lanes. Refer to the [Raised Cycle Track](#) section of the NACTO *Urban Bikeway Design Guide* for additional design guidance for raised cycle tracks.

Streets with three to four lanes and speeds of 30 or 35 mph will require a buffered bike lane.

Buffered Bike Lane

Buffered bike lanes (with horizontal buffer) must be 5 feet or wider, and 7 feet is recommended along streets with high volumes of bicyclists or uphill sections to allow passing or side-by-side riding. Buffers should be at least 1.5 feet, and buffers 3 feet or wider should include diagonal hatching. Separation may also be provided between bike lane striping and the parking lane to reduce door conflicts. Refer to the [Buffered Bike Lanes](#) section of the NACTO *Urban Bikeway Design Guide* for additional design guidance.

FIGURE 13: TRAIL ELEMENTS




FIGURE 14: RAISED CYCLE TRACK ELEMENTS





FIGURE 15: BUFFERED BIKE LANE ELEMENTS



Protected Bike Lane

To achieve an LTS 1, protected bike lanes (with vertical buffers) must be 5 feet or wider, with 7 feet or wider suggested for streets with higher volumes of bicyclists or uphill sections to allow passing. They should have buffers of 3 feet or wider, even when parking protected. Possible barriers include flex posts, planters, rigid bollards, parking strips, and/or concrete barriers. Refer to the [One-Way Protected Cycle Track](#) section or [Two-Way Cycle Track](#) section of the NACTO *Urban Bikeway Design Guide* for additional design guidance for protected bike lanes.

Streets with three to four lanes and speeds less than 30 mph and streets with two or fewer lanes will require a striped bike lane.

Striped Bike Lane

Striped bike lanes adjacent to a curb face should be 6 feet, with 4 feet of width from the longitudinal joint (such as a gutter pan) preferred and an absolute minimum of 3 feet of width from the gutter pan. When placed adjacent to a parking lane, bike lanes without a buffer must be 5 feet or wider, and the width from the curb face to the edge of the bike lane should be at least 14 feet and in constrained environments the width should be not less than 12 feet from the curb when adjacent to parking. Refer to the [Conventional Bike Lanes](#) section of the NACTO *Urban Bikeway Design Guide* for additional design guidance.

Major arterials on the active transportation network are all eligible for bicycle boulevards on adjacent local streets, if there is a parallel and relatively direct connection. This treatment is also appropriate on low speed (25 mph or less), low volume (1,000 ADT or less), and narrow streets (1 or 2 lanes).

FIGURE 16: PROTECTED BIKE LANE ELEMENTS





FIGURE 17: STRIPED BIKE LANE ELEMENTS



Bike Boulevards

Bike boulevards are more than just a “shared street” with cars and bicycle traffic sharing the same space. These boulevards often incorporate traffic diversion and/or traffic calming to limit vehicle traffic to local residents on the street and to reduce speeds to no more than 15 to 20 mph to create a more comfortable environment for people biking. Of particular importance along bike boulevards are providing treatments at major street crossings to allow for a comfortable means for bicyclists to cross (see the Bicycle Crossing Guidance section). According to the NACTO *Urban Bikeway Design Guide*, bicycle boulevards incorporate some or all of the following elements, with examples shown in **Figure 18**:

1. **Route Planning:** Direct access to destinations
2. **Signs and Pavement Markings:** Easy to find and to follow
3. **Speed Management:** Slow motor vehicle speeds
4. **Volume Management:** Low or reduced motor vehicle volumes
5. **Minor Street Crossings:** Minimal bicyclist delay
6. **Major Street Crossings:** Safe and convenient crossings
7. **Offset Crossings:** Clear and safe navigation
8. **Green Infrastructure:** Enhancing environments

FIGURE 18: EXAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS OF BICYCLE BOULEVARDS

Speed Management



Minor Street Crossing



Volume Management



Major Street Crossing



Future Bicycle Network Map

Figure 19 shows the existing bike facilities and recommended future bike facility types in Grand Junction. This map illustrates the long-term vision for the bicycle network in Grand Junction. These recommendations are the minimum type of bike facility needed to achieve an LTS 1 or 2 (or provide a high-comfort facility that caters to all ages and abilities) on each Active Transportation Corridor, based on posted speed limits, existing traffic volume, and existing number of lanes on the roadway.

Facilities will generally follow the routes on the Future Bicycle Map, but can also be located along a parallel

street (generally within one block) if found to be more feasible during implementation.

Neighborhood Maps

Maps and tables of projects by priority for each neighborhood are also provided. Refer to the Implementation & Prioritization chapter for how projects were prioritized.

Abbreviations for Minimum Recommended Facility Type

- BB – Bike Boulevard
- BL – Bike Lane
- BBL – Buffered Bike Lane
- T or CT or PBL – Multiuse Trail or Cycle Track or Protected Bike Lane




FIGURE 19: FUTURE BICYCLE NETWORK



LEGEND

- Unincorporated Mesa County
- Urban Development Boundary
- Parks
- Railroads
- Schools

Street Classification


- Local
- Collector
- Arterial
- Highway

Existing Bicycle Facilities

- Signed Bike Route
- Striped Bike Lane
- Buffered Bike Lane
- Trail

Bicycle Facility Recommendation

- Bike Boulevard
- Bike Lane
- Buffered Bike Lane
- Trail, Cycletrack, or Protected Bike Lane
- Trail




OBJECTIVE C1

Implement bike facilities on the Active Transportation Corridors as shown in the Future Bicycle Network Map (Figure 19).

OBJECTIVE Q1

Install high-comfort bike facilities on the Active Transportation Corridors as recommended in the Future Bicycle Network Map and according to the design guidance in the Bicycle Facility Types section.



LEGEND

- | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| Planning Zones | Street Classification | Existing Bicycle Facilities | Bicycle Facility Recommendation |
| Unincorporated Mesa County | Local | Signed Bike Route | Bike Boulevard |
| Urban Development Boundary | Collector | Striped Bike Lane | Bike Lane |
| Railroads | Arterial | Buffered Bike Lane | Buffered Bike Lane |
| Parks | Highway | Trail | Trail, Cycletrack, or Protected Bike Lane |
| | | | Trail |


Appleton

Medium Priority

Corridor Name	Extent (From)	Extent (To)	Length (Miles)	Recommended Facility Type
23 RD	I RD	G RD	2.00	T or CT or PBL
24 1/2 RD	S OF KELLEY DR	S OF AJAY AVE	1.19	T or CT or PBL
FUTURE ATC TRAIL	HUNTER WASH N OF HWY 6 AND 50	G RD W OF ARROWEST RD	2.80	T
FUTURE ATC TRAIL	W OF 24 1/2 RD S OF H RD	24 RD S OF I70 FRONTAGE ROAD	0.55	T

Low Priority

Corridor Name	Extent (From)	Extent (To)	Length (Miles)	Recommended Facility Type
24 RD	H RD	I70 FRONTAGE RD	0.42	T or CT or PBL
26 RD	FREEDOM DR	KELLY DR	0.29	T
FREEDOM DR	26 RD	FREEDOM WAY	0.06	T
FUTURE ATC TRAIL	I RD	HWY 6 AND 50	2.41	T
FUTURE ATC TRAIL	KELLEY DR / 26 RD	BEAVER LDG N OF EGRET CIR	0.40	T
FUTURE ATC TRAIL	I RD E OF 23 RD	24 1/2 RD S OF KELLEY DR	2.19	T
FUTURE ATC TRAIL	23 RD / I RD	NE OF 21 1/2 RD / H RD	1.09	T
H RD	23 RD	24 RD	1.00	BL
H RD	NEW TRAIL E OF 22 RD	23 RD	0.82	T or CT or PBL
I RD	22 RD	22 1/2 RD	0.46	T or CT or PBL
I RD	23 RD	NEW TRAIL E OF 23 RD	0.29	T or CT or PBL
RIVER RD	I70 FRONTAGE RD	PARKWAY RAMP	2.37	T or CT or PBL



LEGEND

- Planning Zones**
- Unincorporated Mesa County**
- Urban Development Boundary**
- Railroads**
- Parks**
- Street Classification**
 - Local
 - Collector
 - Arterial
 - Highway
- Existing Bicycle Facilities**
 - Signed Bike Route
 - Striped Bike Lane
 - Buffered Bike Lane
 - Trail
- Bicycle Facility Recommendation**
 - Bike Boulevard
 - Bike Lane
 - Buffered Bike Lane
 - Trail, Cycletrack, or Protected Bike Lane
 - Trail

City Center

High Priority

Corridor Name	Extent (From)	Extent (To)	Length (Miles)	Recommended Facility Type
26 1/2 RD	HORIZON DR	PATTERSON RD	0.26	BBL
26 RD	KELLY DR	PATTERSON RD	1.78	BL
28 1/4 RD	ELM AVE	I70 BUSINESS LOOP	0.74	BL
29 RD	E NORTH AVE	RIVER BEND LN	2.16	T or CT or PBL
BELFORD AVE	N 4TH ST	N 5TH ST	0.09	BL
BROADWAY	RIVERSIDE TRAIL	SPRUCE ST	0.51	BBL
BROADWAY	22 1/2 RD	RIVERSIDE TRAIL	3.39	T or CT or PBL
CANNELL AVE	ELM AVE	E NORTH AVE	0.26	BB
CANNELL AVE	ORCHARD AVE	TEXAS AVE	0.18	BB
D RD	S 9TH ST	RIVERSIDE PKWY	0.72	BBL
ELM AVE	N 7TH ST	COLLEGE PL	0.33	BB

ELM AVE	N 12TH ST	28 3/4 RD	1.75	BB
FUTURE ATC TRAIL	N 5TH ST N OF ELM CT	ELM AVE / N 7TH ST	0.21	T
FUTURE ATC TRAIL	PATTERSON RD W OF W PARK DR	W ORCHARD AVE / LAKESHORE DR	0.53	T
FUTURE ATC TRAIL	N 12TH ST N OF BOOKCLIFF AVE	29 RD N OF PINYON AVE	2.10	T
FUTURE ATC TRAIL	PATTERSON RD W OF VIEWPOINT DR	N 12TH ST S OF WELLINGTON AVE	0.43	T
FUTURE ATC TRAIL	W OF WILLOWBROOK RD AND E OF HORIZON PL	PATTERSON RD / N 7TH ST	0.26	T
FUTURE ATC TRAIL	N 27TH ST / GUNNISON AVE	29 RD N OF I70 BL	1.02	T or CT or PBL
GRAND AVE	N 1ST AVE	N 8TH ST	0.62	BBL
GRAND AVE	N 8TH ST	28 1/4 RD	1.67	BL
GUNNISON AVE	N 10TH ST	N 12TH ST	0.19	BL
GUNNISON AVE	N 15TH ST	N 27TH ST	0.73	BL
HWY 6	I70 FRONTAGE RD	N 1ST ST	0.20	BBL
HWY 6	NORTH AVE W OF MOTOR ST	NORTH AVE E OF N 1ST ST	0.34	T or CT or PBL
HWY 6 AND 50	W GUNNISON AVE	GRAND AVE	0.53	BBL
HWY 6 AND 50	NORTH AVE	SE OF MULBERRY ST	0.64	T or CT or PBL
I70B	DESERT VISTA / PITKIN AVE	WARRIOR WAY	4.10	T or CT or PBL
INDEPENDENT AVE	INDEPENDENT AVE	HWY 6 AND 50	0.03	BL
INDUSTRIAL BLVD	24 1/2 RD	25 RD	0.50	BB
LINCOLN PARK TRAIL/15TH ST	NORTH AVE	GUNNISON AVE	0.27	T
LITTLE BOOKCLIFF DR	BOOKCLIFF AVE	DEAD END	0.23	BB
MAIN ST	S 1ST ST	S 8TH ST	0.62	BB
N 12TH ST	LAKESIDE DR	GRAND AVE	1.80	T or CT or PBL
N 15TH ST	ELM AVE	E NORTH AVE	0.25	BL
N 23RD ST	ORCHARD AVE	E NORTH AVE	0.50	BL
N 4TH AVE	NORTH AVE	MAIN ST	0.69	BL
N 5TH ST	GRAND AVE	MAIN ST	0.21	BL
N 5TH ST	ORCHARD AVE	BELFORD AVE	0.57	BL
N 7TH ST	GRAND AVE	MAIN ST	0.21	BL
N 7TH ST	PATTERSON RD	GRAND AVE	1.49	T or CT or PBL
N 9TH ST	BOOKCLIFF AVE	ORCHARD AVE	0.29	BB
NORTH AVE	N 1ST AVE	N 12TH ST	1.00	T
NORTH AVE	N 23RD ST	I70 BL	2.14	T
ORCHARD AVE	WEST MIDDLE SCHOOL	N 7TH ST	0.61	BL
ORCHARD AVE	N 12TH ST	CINDY ANN RD	1.06	BL
PATTERSON RD	26 1/2 RD	26 3/4 RD	0.25	BBL
PATTERSON RD	24 1/2 RD	26 RD	1.50	T or CT or PBL
PATTERSON RD	28 1/4 RD	E OF 31 RD	2.68	T or CT or PBL
S 12TH ST	MAIN ST	D RD	0.34	BL
S 1ST ST	W GRAND AVE	PITKIN AVE	0.50	BBL
S 7TH ST	MAIN ST	STRUTHERS AVE	0.80	BL
S 9TH ST	MAIN ST	STRUTHERS AVE	0.80	BL
W ORCHARD AVE	25 1/2 RD	POPLAR DR	0.26	BB
W PINYON AVE	25 RD	25 1/2 RD	0.50	BL


City Center

Medium Priority

Corridor Name	Extent (From)	Extent (To)	Length (Miles)	Recommended Facility Type
25 RD	BLICHMANN AVE	PATTERSON RD	0.34	T or CT or PBL
26 3/4 RD	CAPRA WAY	PATTERSON RD	0.19	BB
28 1/4 RD	VILLAGE PARK DR	BRITTANY DR	0.67	BBL
28 1/4 RD	BRITTANY DR	ORCHARD AVE	0.07	BL
BELFORD AVE	DIRT ROAD	N 24TH ST	0.04	BB
BOOKCLIFF AVE	N 7TH ST	N 12TH ST	0.47	BB
C 1/2 RD	27 1/2 RD	29 RD	1.50	BL
CROSBY AVE	BASE ROCK ST	W GRAND AVE	0.32	BL
D 1/2 RD	29 RD	30 RD	1.03	T
E SHERWOOD DR	N 3RD ST	N SHERWOOD DR	0.19	BB
ELM AVE	N 1ST ST	W SHERWOOD DR	0.10	BB
FUTURE ATC TRAIL	LAS COLONIAS TRAIL	29 RD N OF COLORADO RIVER	1.78	T
FUTURE ATC TRAIL	ELM AVE / W SHERWOOD DR	E SHERWOOD DR / N 3RD ST	0.09	T
N 12TH ST	GRAND AVE	MAIN ST	0.21	BBL
N 23RD ST	E NORTH AVE	BELFORD AVE	0.12	BB
N 24TH ST	BELFORD AVE	GRAND AVE	0.37	BB
N SHERWOOD DR	E SHERWOOD DR	N 5TH ST	0.04	BB
PITKIN AVE	S 12TH ST	DESERT VISTA E OF S 15TH ST	0.39	T or CT or PBL
S 12TH ST	D RD	KIMBALL AVE	0.41	BB
SOUTH AVE/S 2ND ST	PITKIN AVE	S 10TH ST	0.78	BB
W GRAND AVE	SPRUCE ST	N 1ST ST	0.07	BBL

Low Priority

Corridor Name	Extent (From)	Extent (To)	Length (Miles)	Recommended Facility Type
25 RD	TROLLEY ST	INDEPENDENT AVE	0.17	BBL
28 RD	RIVERSIDE PKWY	NEW TRAIL S OF C 1/2 ROAD	0.64	T or CT or PBL
FUTURE ATC TRAIL	RIVERSIDE PKWY W OF 29 RD	N OF COLORADO RIVER	0.99	T
FUTURE ATC TRAIL	N OF BASE ROCK ST S OF HWY 6 AND 50	NW OF MULBERRY ST S OF HWY 6 AND 50	0.44	T
RIMROCK AVE	HWY 6 AND 50	BASE ROCK ST	0.32	BL
RIVERSIDE PKWY	INDEPENDENT AVE	RIVERSIDE PKWY	0.31	BBL
RIVERSIDE PKWY	S 7TH ST	S 9TH ST	0.21	T or CT or PBL
RIVERSIDE PKWY	WEST AVE	N OF LAWRENCE AVE	0.32	T or CT or PBL
RIVERSIDE PKWY	RIVER RD	25 RD	0.29	T or CT or PBL
STRUTHERS AVE	DEAD END	S 7TH ST	0.12	BB
STRUTHERS AVE	S 9TH ST	DEAD END	0.03	BB
W COLORADO AVE	RIVERSIDE PARK DR	WEST AVE	0.02	BB
W MAIN ST	DEAD END	WEST AVE	0.05	BB
WEST AVE	RIVERSIDE PKWY	W GRAND AVE	0.16	BBL
WEST AVE	W GRAND AVE	W MAIN ST	0.05	BB



LEGEND

Planning Zones	Local	Signed Bike Route	Bike Boulevard
Unincorporated Mesa County	Collector	Striped Bike Lane	Bike Lane
Urban Development Boundary	Arterial	Buffered Bike Lane	Buffered Bike Lane
Railroads	Highway	Trail	Trail, Cycletrack, or Protected Bike Lane
Parks			Trail

Fruitvale

High Priority

Corridor Name	Extent (From)	Extent (To)	Length (Miles)	Recommended Facility Type
29 1/2 RD	BRET DR	E NORTH AVE	1.67	BL
29 RD	E NORTH AVE	RIVER BEND LN	2.16	T or CT or PBL
30 RD	F RD	170 BL	0.97	T or CT or PBL
BOOKCLIFF AVE	30 RD	31 RD	0.99	BB
FUTURE ATC TRAIL	GRAND VALLEY CANAL N OF PINYON AVE	29 1/2 RD S OF SUNSET DR	0.52	T
FUTURE ATC TRAIL	F RD E OF 31 RD	RAIL ROAD S OF 170 FRONTAGE RD	0.75	T or CT or PBL
170B	DESERT VISTA / PITKIN AVE	WARRIOR WAY	4.10	T or CT or PBL
NORTH AVE	N 23RD ST	170 BL	2.14	T
ORCHARD AVE	29 1/4 RD	30 RD	0.75	BL
PATTERSON RD	28 1/4 RD	E OF 31 RD	2.68	T or CT or PBL


Fruitvale

Medium Priority

Corridor Name	Extent (From)	Extent (To)	Length (Miles)	Recommended Facility Type
E 1/2 RD	30 RD	WARRIOR WAY	1.24	BL
FUTURE ATC TRAIL	F 1/2 RD / CITY BOUNDARY	F RD / CITY BOUNDARY	0.50	T
FUTURE ATC TRAIL	F 1/2 RD E OF STARLIGHT DR	CITY BOUNDARY S OF PRICE DITCH CT	0.91	T
NORTH AVE	170 BL W	JERRY'S OUTDOOR SPORTS	0.19	BL
TRAIL CONNECTION	31 RD / BOOKCLIFF AVE	LONG FAMILY MEMORIAL PARK	0.17	T

Low Priority

Corridor Name	Extent (From)	Extent (To)	Length (Miles)	Recommended Facility Type
29 RD	F 1/2 RD	PATTERSON RD	0.50	T or CT or PBL
30 RD	F 1/2 RD	F RD	0.50	BL
BRODICK WAY/ HERON DRIVE	29 RD	30 RD	1.09	T
F 1/2 RD	29 RD	29 1/2 RD	0.50	BL
F 1/2 RD	29 1/2 RD	OX-BOW RD	0.22	T or CT or PBL
F 1/2 RD	30 RD	E OF THUNDER RIDGE DR	0.82	T or CT or PBL



Horizon

High Priority

Corridor Name	Extent (From)	Extent (To)	Length (Miles)	Recommended Facility Type
26 1/2 RD	HORIZON DR	PATTERSON RD	0.26	BBL
26 1/2 RD	N OF I70 BRIDGE	S OF I70 BRIDGE	0.05	BL
26 RD	KELLY DR	PATTERSON RD	1.78	BL
27 RD	N OF I70 BRIDGE	S OF I70 BRIDGE	0.05	BL
FUTURE ATC TRAIL	W OF WILLOWBROOK RD AND E OF HORIZON PL	PATTERSON RD / N 7TH ST	0.26	T
N 12TH ST	LAKESIDE DR	GRAND AVE	1.80	T or CT or PBL
PATTERSON RD	28 1/4 RD	E OF 31 RD	2.68	T or CT or PBL


Horizon

Medium Priority

Corridor Name	Extent (From)	Extent (To)	Length (Miles)	Recommended Facility Type
26 3/4 RD	CAPRA WAY	PATTERSON RD	0.19	BB
28 1/4 RD	VILLAGE PARK DR	BRITTANY DR	0.67	BBL
FUTURE ATC TRAIL	26 RD / F RD	26 1/2 RD / GLEN CT	0.56	T
FUTURE ATC TRAIL	HORIZON DR E OF 26 1/2 RD	NE OF 8TH CT / NW OF VIEWPOINT DR	0.19	T
FUTURE ATC TRAIL	HORIZON DR E OF HORIZON 70 CT	HORIZON DR NE OF I70	0.12	T
FUTURE ATC TRAIL	E OF I RD / OVERVIEW RD	HORIZON DR NE OF I70	3.11	T
HAWTHORNE AVE	27 1/2 RD	DEAD END	0.76	BB
HORIZON DR	G RD	H RD	1.20	BBL
INDIAN WASH TRAIL FROM MATCHETT PARK	STREAM S OF AIRPORT	E OF CORTLAND AVE / TAMARRON DR	0.68	T
MATCHETT PARK ATC	E OF CORTLAND AVE / TAMARRON DR TO F 1/2 RD	TAMARRON DR / HAWTHORNE AVE	1.37	T

Low Priority

Corridor Name	Extent (From)	Extent (To)	Length (Miles)	Recommended Facility Type
26 1/2 RD	CATALINA DR	H RD	0.33	BL
26 RD	FREEDOM DR	KELLY DR	0.29	T
27 1/2 RD	HAWTHORNE AVE	HERMOSA AVE	0.22	BL
28 RD	APPLEWOOD PL	RIDGE DR	0.33	BL
29 RD	F 1/2 RD	PATTERSON RD	0.50	T or CT or PBL
BRODICK WAY/ HERON DRIVE	29 RD	30 RD	1.09	T
CHESTNUT DR	DEAD END	26 1/2 RD	0.28	BB
F 1/2 RD	26 RD	26 1/2 RD	0.51	BL
F 1/2 RD	29 RD	29 1/2 RD	0.50	BL
F 1/2 RD	TRAILS END CT	26 RD	0.33	BB
F 1/2 RD	DEAD END	29 RD	0.15	BB
FREEDOM DR	26 RD	FREEDOM WAY	0.06	T
FUTURE ATC TRAIL	HORIZON DR / VISITORS WAY	N OF 28 RD / APPLEWOOD PL	0.64	T
FUTURE ATC TRAIL	H RD W OF N CREST DR	HORIZON DR NE OF I70	0.67	T
FUTURE ATC TRAIL	KELLEY DR / 26 RD	BEAVER LDG N OF EGRET CIR	0.40	T
G 1/2 RD	BEAVER LDG	26 RD	0.18	BL
G 1/2 RD	26 1/2 RD	27 RD	0.51	BB
G RD	26 RD	N 12TH ST	1.00	BL
H RD	27 RD	27 1/4 RD	0.25	BL
H RD	N CREST DR	WALKER FIELD DR	0.45	BL
H RD	27 1/4 RD	N CREST DR	0.59	T or CT or PBL
HERMOSA AVE	N 15TH ST	27 1/2 RD	0.26	BB
I RD	OVERVIEW RD	DEAD END	0.01	BB
LAKESIDE CT	DEAD END	LAKESIDE DR	0.20	BB
LAKESIDE DR	LAKESIDE CT	N 12TH ST	0.05	BB
LEVI CT	26 1/2 RD	DEAD END	0.06	BB
NEIGHBORHOOD CONNECTION TO 26 RD	E OF 26 RD N OF G RD	CHESTNUT DR	0.07	T
RIDGE DR	N 12TH ST	N 15TH ST	0.25	BB
RIDGE DR	CUL DE SAC	MATCHETT	0.60	BB
TRAIL CONNECTION	26 RD S OF G 1/2 RD	SW OF ASH DR / CHESTNUT DR	0.19	T



LEGEND

- | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| Planning Zones | Street Classification | Existing Bicycle Facilities | Bicycle Facility Recommendation |
| Unincorporated Mesa County | Local | Signed Bike Route | Bike Boulevard |
| Urban Development Boundary | Collector | Striped Bike Lane | Bike Lane |
| Railroads | Arterial | Buffered Bike Lane | Buffered Bike Lane |
| Parks | Highway | Trail | Trail, Cycletrack, or Protected Bike Lane |
| | | | Trail |



North West

High Priority


Corridor Name	Extent (From)	Extent (To)	Length (Miles)	Recommended Facility Type
24 RD/REDLANDS PKWY	PATTERSON RD	PARKWAY RAMP	0.41	T OR CT OR PBL
26 RD	KELLY DR	PATTERSON RD	1.78	BL
INDUSTRIAL BLVD	24 1/2 RD	25 RD	0.50	BB
PATTERSON RD	24 1/2 RD	26 RD	1.50	T or CT or PBL
W PINYON AVE	25 RD	25 1/2 RD	0.50	BL

Medium Priority

Corridor Name	Extent (From)	Extent (To)	Length (Miles)	Recommended Facility Type
23 RD	I RD	G RD	2.00	T or CT or PBL
24 1/2 RD	S OF KELLEY DR	S OF AJAY AVE	1.19	T or CT or PBL
25 RD	BLICHMANN AVE	PATTERSON RD	0.34	T or CT or PBL
FUTURE ATC TRAIL	REDLANDS PKWY S OF I70 BL	I70 BL E / HWY 6 AND 50	0.47	T
FUTURE ATC TRAIL	26 RD / F RD	26 1/2 RD / GLEN CT	0.56	T
FUTURE ATC TRAIL	24 RD S OF G RD	G RD E OF 25 1/2 RD	1.75	T
FUTURE ATC TRAIL	HUNTER WASH N OF HWY 6 AND 50	G RD W OF ARROWEST RD	2.80	T
FUTURE ATC TRAIL	W OF 24 1/2 RD S OF H RD	24 RD S OF I70 FRONTAGE ROAD	0.55	T
HANNAH LN	24 1/2 RD S OF HANNAH LN	25 RD / BLICHMANN AVE	0.55	T

Low Priority

Corridor Name	Extent (From)	Extent (To)	Length (Miles)	Recommended Facility Type
23 1/2 RD	G RD	E 1/2 RD	0.50	BL
24 1/2 RD	PATTERSON RD	HWY 6 AND 50	0.30	BBL
24 1/2 RD	HANNAH LN	PATTERSON RD	0.50	BL
24 RD	I70 FRONTAGE RD	F 1/2 RD	0.99	T OR CT OR PBL
25 1/2 RD	G RD	MOONRIDGE DR	0.20	BL
25 RD	TROLLEY ST	INDEPENDENT AVE	0.17	BBL
25 RD	WAITE AVE	F 1/2 RD	0.14	T OR CT OR PBL
25 RD	NEW TRAIL S OF G 3/8 RD	FOUNTAIN GREENS PL	0.05	T OR CT OR PBL
F 1/2 RD	23 3/4 RD	24 1/2 RD	1.00	BL
F 1/2 RD	25 1/2 RD	TRAILS END CT	0.22	BL
F 1/2 RD	TRAILS END CT	26 RD	0.33	BB
FOUNTAIN GREENS PL	FOUNTAINHEAD BLVD	25 RD	0.06	BB
FUTURE ATC TRAIL	REDLANDS PKWY N OF I70 BL	1ST MESA MALL E OF 24 RD	0.25	T
FUTURE ATC TRAIL	25 1/2 RD N OF FOUNTAIN GREENS PL	F 1/2 RD E OF YOUNG ST	1.37	T
FUTURE ATC TRAIL	KELLEY DR / 26 RD	BEAVER LDG N OF EGRET CIR	0.40	T
G 1/2 RD	BEAVER LDG	26 RD	0.18	BL
G 1/4 RD	DEAD END	MOUNTAIN VIEW DR	0.02	BB
G RD	26 RD	N 12TH ST	1.00	BL
G RD	ARROWEST RD	25 RD	2.25	T OR CT OR PBL
G RD	25 1/2 RD	26 RD	0.46	T OR CT OR PBL
GARDEN RD	24 1/2 RD	DEAD END	0.12	BB
RAILHEAD CIR	MONUMENT VIEW TRAIL	RIVER RD	0.35	BB
RIVER RD	I70 FRONTAGE RD	PARKWAY RAMP	2.37	T OR CT OR PBL
RIVERSIDE PKWY	RIVER RD	25 RD	0.29	T OR CT OR PBL
TRAIL CONNECTION	26 RD S OF G 1/2 RD	SW OF ASH DR / CHESTNUT DR	0.19	T



LEGEND

- | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| Planning Zones | Street Classification | Existing Bicycle Facilities | Bicycle Facility Recommendation |
| Unincorporated Mesa County | Local | Signed Bike Route | Bike Boulevard |
| Urban Development Boundary | Collector | Striped Bike Lane | Bike Lane |
| Railroads | Arterial | Buffered Bike Lane | Buffered Bike Lane |
| Parks | Highway | Trail | Trail, Cycletrack, or Protected Bike Lane |
| | | | Trail |

Orchard Mesa

High Priority

Corridor Name	Extent (From)	Extent (To)	Length (Miles)	Recommended Facility Type
27 1/2 RD	C RD	B 1/2 RD	0.50	T OR CT OR PBL
27 RD	C RD	HWY 50	0.37	BL
27 RD	HWY 50	B RD	0.54	T OR CT OR PBL
28 1/2 RD	C RD	HWY 50	1.01	BL
28 RD	C RD	B 1/2 RD	0.50	BB
29 RD	E NORTH AVE	RIVER BEND LN	2.16	T OR CT OR PBL
B 1/2 RD	GLOUCESTER AVE	W OF 28 1/2 RD	0.49	T OR CT OR PBL
B 1/4 RD	27 RD	27 1/2 RD	0.50	BB
FUTURE ATC TRAIL	27 RD N OF B 3/4 RD	B 1/2 RD E OF 27 1/2 RD	0.61	T
FUTURE ATC TRAIL	NE OF SHERMAN DR	NW OF ARLINGTON DR	0.95	T
FUTURE ATC TRAIL	N OF CHRISTOPHER WAY	N OF OM MIDDLE SCHOOL	0.17	T


HWY 50	GRAND MESA AVE	28 1/2 RD	3.50	T or CT or PBL
HWY 50 RAMP	HWY 50	B 1/2 RD	0.35	BL
LINDEN AVE	C RD	B 1/2 RD	0.50	BL
OXFORD AVE	ARLINGTON DR	28 1/2 RD	0.49	BB
PINON ST	SANTA CLARA AVE	C RD	0.13	BB
S REDLANDS RD/26 3/8 RD	LITTLE PARK RD	26 3/8 RD	0.52	T

Medium Priority

Corridor Name	Extent (From)	Extent (To)	Length (Miles)	Recommended Facility Type
26 1/4 RD	LEGACY WAY	GETTYSBURG ST	0.21	BB
26 3/8 RD	RAILROAD	LEGACY WAY	0.14	BB
27 3/4 RD	B 1/2 RD	HWY 50	0.18	BB
29 1/2 RD	B RD	NEW TRAIL N OF A 1/2 RD	0.44	T or CT or PBL
29 RD	COLORADO RIVER	HWY 50	1.09	BL
B 1/2 RD	LINDEN AVE	27 RD	0.25	BL
B 1/2 RD	W PARKVIEW DR	GLOUCESTER AVE	0.48	BL
B 1/2 RD	LIVING HOPE CHURCH	29 RD	0.59	BL
B 1/2 RD	DEAD END	LINDEN AVE	0.21	BB
B 1/2 RD	29 RD	W OF 31 RD	1.98	T or CT or PBL
B RD	TENNESSEE ST	30 RD	1.35	BL
B RD	27 RD	GLORY VIEW DR	1.39	T or CT or PBL
CHEYENNE DR	27 3/8 RD	HOPI DR	0.62	BB
FUTURE ATC TRAIL	29 RD / UNWEEP AVE	B 1/2 RD W OF DURANT ST	0.42	T
LEGACY WAY	26 3/8 RD	26 1/4 RD	0.29	BB
OLSON AVE	DEAD END	SANTA CLARA AVE	0.01	BB
RIVER CIR	DEAD END	SANTA CLARA AVE	0.01	BB
SANTA CLARA AVE	ROUBIDEAU ST	DEAD END	0.25	BB
SANTA CLARA AVE	CHRISTOPHER CT	PINON ST	0.06	BB

Low Priority

Corridor Name	Extent (From)	Extent (To)	Length (Miles)	Recommended Facility Type
29 3/4 RD	B 3/4 RD	B 1/2 RD	0.23	BB
30 RD	B RD	HWY 50	0.73	BL
30 RD	C RD	B 1/2 RD	0.50	T or CT or PBL
ATHENA ST	DURANT ST	B 3/4 RD	0.37	BB
B 3/4 RD	29 3/4 RD	30 RD	0.24	BB
B RD	30 RD	30 1/2 RD	0.50	BB
C RD	30 RD	W OF 31 RD	0.99	T or CT or PBL
FUTURE ATC TRAIL	29 1/2 RD N OF HWY 50	CITY BOUNDARY / B RD	1.95	T
FUTURE ATC TRAIL	B 1/2 RD E OF FRONTIER ST	B RD / 30 RD	0.55	T
HOPI DR	CHEYENNE DR	C RD	0.20	BB



LEGEND

Planning Zones	Street Classification	Existing Bicycle Facilities	Bicycle Facility Recommendation
Unincorporated Mesa County	Local	Signed Bike Route	Bike Boulevard
Urban Development Boundary	Collector	Striped Bike Lane	Bike Lane
Railroads	Arterial	Buffered Bike Lane	Buffered Bike Lane
Parks	Highway	Trail	Trail, Cycletrack, or Protected Bike Lane
			Trail

Pear Park

High Priority


Corridor Name	Extent (From)	Extent (To)	Length (Miles)	Recommended Facility Type
29 RD	E NORTH AVE	RIVER BEND LN	2.16	T or CT or PBL
30 RD	F RD	I70 BL	0.97	T or CT or PBL
FUTURE ATC TRAIL	F RD E OF 31 RD	RAIL ROAD S OF I70 FRONTAGE RD	0.75	T or CT or PBL
I70B	DESERT VISTA / PITKIN AVE	WARRIOR WAY	4.10	T or CT or PBL

Medium Priority

Corridor Name	Extent (From)	Extent (To)	Length (Miles)	Recommended Facility Type
30 1/2 RD	D 1/2 RD	SANDPIPER AVE	0.34	BB
30 1/4 RD	COLORADO AVE	RED PEAR DR	0.04	BB
30 RD	E RD	D 1/2 RD	0.38	T or CT or PBL
31 RD	S OF I70 BL E	D RD	1.16	T or CT or PBL
C 1/2 RD	27 1/2 RD	29 RD	1.50	BL
CHATFIELD DR	CITY BOUNDARY	D 1/2 RD	0.01	T
COLORADO AVE	30 1/4 RD	WEDGEWOOD AVE	0.13	BB
COLORADO AVE	MEADOWVALE WAY	31 RD	0.28	BB
COLOROW DR	HILL CT	GUNNISON AVE	0.07	BB
D 1/2 RD	29 RD	30 RD	1.03	T
D 1/2 RD	W OF BISMARCK ST	FOX MEADOWS ST	0.87	T
D RD	29 RD	W OF 32 RD	2.98	T or CT or PBL
E RD	30 RD	W OF 31 1/2 RD	1.47	T or CT or PBL
FUTURE ATC TRAIL	LAS COLONIAS TRAIL	29 RD N OF COLORADO RIVER	1.78	T
FUTURE ATC TRAIL	D 1/2 RD S OF D 1/2 CT	30 1/4 RD / RED PEAR DR	1.19	T
GUNNISON AVE	COLOROW DR	OL SUN DR	0.69	BB
HILL CT	30 RD	COLOROW DR	0.14	BB
NORTH AVE	I70 BL W	JERRY'S OUTDOOR SPORTS	0.19	BL
SANDPIPER AVE	30 1/2 RD	MEADOWVALE WAY	0.19	BB

Low Priority

Corridor Name	Extent (From)	Extent (To)	Length (Miles)	Recommended Facility Type
30 RD	D RD	COLORADO RIVER	0.62	BL
30 RD	ROOD AVE	D RD	0.38	T or CT or PBL
COLORADO AVE	WEDGEWOOD AVE	30 1/2 RD	0.04	BB
FUTURE ATC TRAIL	S OF D 1/2 RD AND W OF 29 1/4 RD	29 RD / D RD	0.61	T
MEADOWVALE WAY	COLORADO AVE	SANDPIPER AVE	0.05	BB
OL SUN DR	E RD	GUNNISON AVE	0.23	BB
WEDGEWOOD AVE	COLORADO AVE	D RD	0.39	BB



LEGEND

- | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| Planning Zones | Street Classification | Existing Bicycle Facilities | Bicycle Facility Recommendation |
| Unincorporated Mesa County | Local | Signed Bike Route | Bike Boulevard |
| Urban Development Boundary | Collector | Striped Bike Lane | Bike Lane |
| Railroads | Arterial | Buffered Bike Lane | Buffered Bike Lane |
| Parks | Highway | Trail | Trail, Cycletrack, or Protected Bike Lane |
| | | | Trail |

Redlands

High Priority

Corridor Name	Extent (From)	Extent (To)	Length (Miles)	Recommended Facility Type
24 RD/REDLANDS PKWY	PATTERSON RD	PARKWAY RAMP	0.41	T OR CT OR PBL
BROADWAY	22 1/2 RD	RIVERSIDE TRAIL	3.39	T or CT or PBL
S REDLANDS RD/26 3/8 RD	LITTLE PARK RD	26 3/8 RD	0.52	T

Low Priority

Corridor Name	Extent (From)	Extent (To)	Length (Miles)	Recommended Facility Type
23 RD	S RIM DR	BROADWAY	0.49	BL
23 RD	BROADWAY	DEAD END	0.22	BB
BROADWAY	W GREENWOOD DR	GREENWOOD DR	0.11	T or CT or PBL
BROADWAY	W OF CANYON CREEK DR	COLONIAL DR	1.57	T or CT or PBL
CANYON CREEK DR	DEAD END	BASELINE DR	0.30	BB
CANYON RIM DR	S CAMP RD	DEAD END	0.49	BB
COLONIAL DR	BROADWAY	CARLSBAD DR	0.18	BB
D RD	S BROADWAY	ROSEVALE RD	0.30	BB
DESERT HILLS RD	S BROADWAY	DEAD END	0.33	BB
DESERT HILLS RD	DEAD END	ESCONDIDO CIR	0.26	T
E 1/2 RD	20 1/2 RD	W GREENWOD CT	0.82	BB
E MAYFIELD DR	BROADWAY WB	BROADWAY EB	0.04	BL
EASTER HILL DR	N EASTER HILL DR	S BROADWAY	0.05	BB
ESCONDIDO CIR	DESERT HILLS RD	S BROADWAY	0.34	BB
FUTURE ATC TRAIL	MOCKINGBIRD LN S OF BROADWAY	ESCONDIDO CIR / S BROADWAY	0.95	T
FUTURE ATC TRAIL	2292 S BROADWAY TO S OF S BROADWAY	23 RD N OF S BROADWAY	0.14	T
FUTURE ATC TRAIL	E OF CANYON CREEK DR NE OF BROADVIEW CT	DESERT HILLS RD E OF KINDERED RESERVE	2.83	T
FUTURE ATC TRAIL	COLONIAL DR / CARLSBAD DR	NE OF VILLAGE VIEW CT / RIO HONDO RD	0.24	T
MARIPOSA DR	W RIDGES BLVD	MONUMENT RD	0.66	BL
MONUMENT RD	CITY BOUNDARY / LUTCH LOOPS CONNECTOR TRAIL	GLADE PARK RD	1.42	T or CT or PBL
MONUMENT VILLAGE DR	DEAD END	BROADWAY	0.28	BB
REDLANDS 360 TRAIL	S OF REDLAND PKWY AND BROADWAY	CANYON RIM DR	3.61	T
RIDGES BLVD	TURNING LANE	BROADWAY	0.02	BL
ROSEVALE RD	D RD	LITTLE PARK RD	0.91	BL
ROSEVALE RD	DEAD END	D RD	0.22	BB
S BROADWAY	E HALF RD	ESCONDIDO CIR	1.50	BL
S BROADWAY	EASTER HILL DR	2292 S BROADWAY	0.18	BB
S BROADWAY	ESCONDIDO CIR	S CAMP RD	0.51	T or CT or PBL
S BROADWAY	W OF 20 RD	20 1/2 RD	0.51	T or CT or PBL
S CAMP RD	E DAKOTA DR	MONUMENT RD	0.96	T or CT or PBL
S CAMP RD	CANYON RIM RD	BUFFALO DR	0.07	T or CT or PBL
S REDLANDS RD	MIRA MONTE RD	ROSEVALE RD	0.65	BB
S RIM DR	GREEBBELT CT	23 RD	0.04	BL
W GREENWOOD CT	W GREENWOOD DR	DEAD END	0.06	BB
W GREENWOOD DR	BROADWAY	W GREENWOOD CT	0.13	BB
W RIDGES BLVD	TURNING LANE	MARIPOSA DR	0.02	BL

Bicycle Crossing Guidance

When creating a low-stress bike network, it is paramount to consider where bicycle facilities cross at intersections or at midblock designated crossings. The weakest link approach acknowledges that a low-stress bicycle facility is only as comfortable as the lowest comfort component; this component is often the intersection.

The NACTO [Urban Bikeway Design Guide](#) provides guidance on best practices for intersection design treatments for urban bikeway crossings. Additionally, NACTO also published a supplemental design guide for effectively designing low-stress bikeways through intersections for all ages and abilities titled [Don't Give Up at the Intersection](#). Refer to these publications for supplemental design guidance on bicycle crossing treatments at intersections. Low-stress bicycle facility crossing applies design strategies and tools at the intersection to reduce the conflict between vehicles and people on bikes by targeting three key elements:

1. Reduce vehicle turning speeds
2. Increase the visibility of bicyclists
3. Give priority to bicyclists

The characteristics of the roadway being crossed and the bicycle facility type influence what crossing treatment is necessary. NACTO defines three main types of low-stress bicycle crossing types. These three, plus a fourth - roundabouts (which are present in Grand Junction), are applied to any permutation of bike facility type and street classification:

1. Protected intersections
2. Dedicated intersections
3. Minor street crossings
4. Roundabouts

Table 3 shows what category of crossing treatment is most appropriate for each facility type and street type.

Intersection Types

A brief summary of contextual applications and design considerations of each bicycle crossing intersection type is provided below. Refer to NACTO's *Don't Give Up at the Intersection* for guidance on the specific intersection treatments and considerations for designing protected intersections, dedicated intersections, and minor street crossings. Refer to Chapter 14 of CDOT's *Roadway Design Guide* for design guidance for carrying bikeways through roundabouts.

Protected Intersections

Protected intersections are recommended where protected bike lanes meet collectors and arterials, as shown in **Figure 20**.

According to NACTO: "Protected intersections can be applied on any street where enhanced bike comfort is desirable. They are most commonly found on streets with parking-protected bike lanes or buffered bike lanes. Protected intersections can also be implemented using interim materials. Where no parking lane exists, a setback can be created by shifting the bikeway or motor vehicle lanes away from one another as they approach the intersection."

TABLE 3: BICYCLE CROSSING INTERSECTION TYPE IDENTIFICATION

BICYCLE FACILITY TYPE	LOCAL	COLLECTOR	ARTERIAL	DRIVEWAY	ROUNDBOUT
Bike Boulevard	Minor Street Crossing	Dedicated Intersection	Dedicated Intersection	Minor Street Crossing	Merge with traffic
Bike Lane	Minor Street Crossing	Dedicated Intersection	Dedicated Intersection	Minor Street Crossing	Merge with traffic and/or provide ramps to multiuse trail
Protected Bike Lane/Cycle Track	Dedicated Intersection	Protected Intersection	Protected Intersection	Minor Street Crossing	Provide ramps to multiuse trail
Multiuse Trail	Minor Street Crossing	Dedicated Intersection	Dedicated Intersection	Minor Street Crossing	



FIGURE 20: PROTECTED INTERSECTION

SOURCE: NHRP

Dedicated Intersections

Dedicated intersections are recommended when bike boulevards, bike lanes, and trails meet collectors and arterials and where protected bike lanes meet local streets. An example of a dedicated intersection is shown in Figure 21.

According to NACTO: "Dedicated intersection geometry should be considered where there is not enough space to set back the bikeway from mixed traffic at the intersection. This condition often arises when a protected bike lane runs close to mixed traffic lanes without a parking or loading lane between them."




FIGURE 21: DEDICATED INTERSECTION

SOURCE: NACTO

Minor Street Crossings

Minor street crossings are recommended when bike boulevards, bike lanes, or trails cross local roads or driveways (with the exception of protected intersection treatments for some protected bike lanes). An example of a minor street crossing is shown in **Figure 22**.

According to NACTO: “Minor street crossings use compact corners and raised elements to keep turn speeds low. The raised crosswalk and bikeway indicate to drivers that they are entering a low-speed environment, and must prepare to yield to other

users. Traffic control devices, such as signals, are uncommon. Ensuring a clear approach sightline is essential to encourage drivers to yield to people in the bikeway or the crosswalk. Raised bikeway crossings should be considered where bikeways cross minor streets, neighborhood streets, driveways, and other small streets. Where the bikeway is not signalized, such as at uncontrolled or stop controlled on-minor intersections, the raised crossing provides unambiguous priority to bikes in the intersection.”




FIGURE 22: MINOR BICYCLE CROSSING

SOURCE: NACTO

Roundabouts

When bike facilities meet a single lane roundabout with a designated speed of <15 mph bike boulevards and bike lanes can merge with traffic. Additional signage should also be provided, as well as on-street painted arrows.

When a protected bike lane or trail meets a roundabout, or when any bicycle facility meets a two-lane roundabout, separated facilities for bicyclists (perhaps shared with pedestrian infrastructure and with pedestrian crossings) should be clearly marked. Separated facilities can also be included when a standard bike lane meets a one-lane roundabout. This infrastructure should have ramps

and clear crossing markings for where bikes are to cross the legs of the roundabout. An example is shown in **Figure 23** and at the existing roundabout at 12th Street and Horizon Drive in **Figure 24**.

Intersection Treatments at Bicycle Crossings

Refer to NACTO's [Urban Bikeway Design Guide](#) for treatment strategies for different bicycle crossing contexts, including specific design guidance. Several bicycle crossing treatment options, including specific recommendations most relevant to Grand Junction are provided below.




Figure 14-28 Multi-lane Roundabout

14-45

FIGURE 23: BIKE CROSSING AT ROUNDABOUT

SOURCE: CDOT



FIGURE 24: BIKE LANE RAMPS AT 12TH STREET AND HORIZON DRIVE ROUNDABOUT

Bike Boulevard Crossings

Since bike boulevards will most commonly occur on local streets, special consideration should be given to intersection treatments along these streets. NACTO provides treatment guidance for two basic types of intersections: minor street crossings and major street crossings.

Minor Street Crossings - At minor street crossings on bike boulevards, the primary consideration is mitigating frequent stops, which can be a significant inconvenience for bicycle mobility. Frequent placement of stop signs along low-volume, low-speed streets is a common strategy to mitigate speeding and cut-through vehicle traffic, especially in residential areas where most bike boulevards will occur. NACTO recommends that “bicycle boulevards should have right-of-way priority and reduce or minimize delay by limiting the number of stop signs along the route.” Therefore, it is recommended to consider flipping the stop sign to be directed to the non-bike priority street, creating a two-way stop-controlled intersection, which could be paired with a neighborhood traffic circle to limit vehicle speeds. Other speed and volume control treatments should be used on the bike boulevard in lieu of frequent stop signs, such as speed humps, chicanes, bulb-outs, neighborhood traffic circles, and diverters (see **Figure 18**).

Major Street Crossings – Because bike boulevards are typically along local streets that have two-way stop control at major cross streets, the primary consideration at these locations is providing a safe and convenient way for bicyclists to cross. Effective treatments at major crossings will be essential to implementing effective bike boulevards in Grand Junction. In fact, many of the streets designated as future bike boulevards on the Future Bicycle Network Map (see **Figure 19**) are already low-volume and low-speed and the primary treatment that will be needed along these corridors will be crossing improvements particularly at major crossing. NACTO provides guidance on potential treatments where bike boulevards cross major streets, including curb extensions, flashing beacons, median refuge islands, and signals (see **Figure 18**).

Through Bike Lanes

Carrying bike lanes through the intersection approach is important so bicyclists have the opportunity to correctly position themselves to avoid conflicting with turning traffic. This typically includes positioning bike lanes to the left of right turn lanes and providing a dotted transition lane for bikes of the appropriate width and distance in advance of the intersection (see **Figure 25**). Green skip paint can be used for intersections with high right turn volumes.



FIGURE 25: THROUGH BIKE LANE



FIGURE 26: COMBINED BIKE LANE/TURN LANE

SOURCE: NACTO

In addition, ending the bike lane prior to the intersection should be avoided as much as possible. This was a common barrier to bicycling identified by the community during the public engagement process. In constrained environments where there may not be enough space to accommodate a bike lane through the intersection under the existing lane configuration, the city should evaluate removing a turn lane, providing a combined bike/turn lane (see example in **Figure 26**), widening the intersection, or providing a ramp to/from a shared multiuse trail similar to a roundabout configuration (see **Figure 23**).

Signal Phasing

At signalized intersections, there are several strategies related to signal phasing to enhance bicycle safety, visibility, and prioritization. They are:

Protected Left Turn Phasing: Vehicles making a left turn on streets with a bikeway may not be looking for crossing bicyclists. Permitted-protected and protected-only signal phasing are proven safety countermeasures that can mitigate crashes with left turning vehicles.

Lagging Left Turn: A lagging left turn provides the vehicle with a left turn green arrow after the through movement, to allow bicyclists to pass through the intersection first.

Bike Signal: A bike signal provides the bicyclist with a separate phasing from vehicles which can be useful at intersections with high volumes of right turning vehicles and where the bikeway is to the right of the turn lane. Phasing may be in the form of protected or protected-permissive right turns.

Leading Bike Interval (LBI): An LBI is where the bicyclist receives a green bike signal a few seconds in advance of vehicles, allowing the bikes to get a head start into the intersection to become visible, especially if there is not a dedicated right turn lane. This phasing requires a separate bike signal head.

Signal Progression: Setting signal progressions to bike-friendly speeds (around 12 mph) on streets prioritized for bike movements can reduce bicycle delay and improve bicycle compliance, while supporting bus transit reliability and disincentivizing vehicular speeding.

Prohibit Right-turn-on-Red: Beyond situations outlined in [Section 2B.54 of the Manual for Uniform Traffic Control Devices \(MUTCD\)](#) to consider a No Turn on Red sign, this prohibition should also be considered at intersections with streets where a multiuse trail is present to mitigate conflicts caused by drivers looking left for gap in traffic and failing to see a bicyclist on a multiuse trail approaching from the right.

According to NACTO: “A LBI can be provided if a shared through/turn lane is next to the bikeway. If a dedicated right or left turn lane is next to the bikeway, protected-permissive bike signal phasing should be considered. Protected signal phases should be considered if turn volumes from the adjacent lane exceed 120 to 150 vehicles per hour (vph). Protected signal phases should also be considered if conflicting left turn volumes (on two-way streets) across the bikeway exceed 60 to 90 vph, or if these turns cross multiple traffic lanes.”

Signal Detection & Actuation

At all signalized intersections in Grand Junction where an existing or planned bikeway crosses the intersection the following should be considered in the signal design so a bicyclist can reliably actuate a green signal. There are several options to achieve this:

Automatic Bike Detection: The most effective bike detection use video or radar to detect the presence of a bicyclist and actuate the signal. This should be paired with pavement markings and/or signage directing bicyclists where to position to actuate the signal (see Figure 27).

.....

OBJECTIVE S1

Conduct a signalization feasibility study as a first step to determine what improvements are needed at signalized crossings.

.....



FIGURE 27: BIKE DETECTION AT SIGNAL

Push-Button: A user activated button (similar to a pedestrian push button) mounted on a pole adjacent to the bikeway and at a level that a bicyclist can activate without dismounting or leaving the bikeway.

Automatic Recall: The simplest way to ensure bicyclists can call a green signal is to set the signal phasing to automatic recall so that a green phase is actuated every signal cycle.

Providing a reliable and convenient way for bicyclists to actuate a signal is important to bicycle comfort, convenience, and safety when crossing busy streets, and will deter red light running.

Recessed Stop Bar or Bike Box

Installing recessed stop bars for vehicles at intersections increases the visibility of bicyclists and can be applied across all controlled intersection treatment strategies. Figure 28 shows a recessed



FIGURE 28: RECESSED STOP BAR



FIGURE 29: BIKE BOX AT INTERSECTION

vehicle stop bar. This can also take the form of a bicycle box, which is a designated area in front of the travel lane at a signalized intersection that is safe and visible for bicyclists to wait. This allows cyclists to get ahead of queueing traffic during the red signal phase which helps to mitigate conflicts with right turning vehicles. It is recommended that this be paired with prohibiting right turns on red. An example of a bike box is shown in Figure 29.



FIGURE 30: CROSSBIKE

Intersection Crossing Markings

NACTO recommends the implementation of crossbike across the intersection; a crossbike is similar to a crosswalk but for bikes—intersection crossing markings for bikes. This can consist of bike lane line extensions with broken white lines and/or dashed green bars. An example of a crossbike is shown in Figure 30.

Bridges and Underpasses

Grand Junction is bisected by the Colorado River, Union Pacific railroad, and several major urban highways, including US-50 and I-70B, all of which were identified by the community as significant barriers for bicycle and pedestrian movement between important destinations in the city. To mitigate the impact of these barriers additional pedestrian and bicycle crossings are recommended in the updated Active Transportation Corridor map. All future bridge and underpass crossings along Active Transportation Corridors should be designed to accommodate pedestrians and bicyclists via a low-stress facility generally following the pedestrian and bicycle facility design guidance in the PBP.

Design Considerations

Given the unique nature of bridge and underpass crossings, possibly including narrower cross-sections, higher vehicle speeds, and walls or railings, special consideration should be given to pedestrian and bicycle accommodations in these contexts. Traffic volume, speed, number of travel lanes, and length of the bridge will determine the facility most appropriate for bicycles. The AASHTO *Guide for Development of Bicycle Facilities* provides recommendations for special considerations of bicycle facilities on bridges including the height and spacing of railings, and additional clear zone spacing. AASHTO also recommends on longer bridges (a half mile or more) with a design speed of over 45 mph that bicyclist be provided a separate shared-use path with a concrete barrier. In these instance merge ramps may be needed to allow bicyclist to transition from on-street to off-street facilities on either end of the bridge similar to roundabouts. AASHTO also recommends in these cases that multiuse trails be implemented on both sides to support bicycle mobility and prevent wrong-way riders. Connections to adjacent bicycle and pedestrian corridors on either side of the bridge or underpass should also be made to ensure adequate access and connectivity to the bridge or underpass. Lastly, bridges and underpasses should also be well-lit.

Bridge and Tunnel Retrofits

Bridges and tunnels are expensive to replace and are often designed to last 50 years or more. Thus, in cases where there is an existing bridge or tunnel not slated for replacement in the near future, the city may need to retrofit the crossing to adequately accommodate pedestrian and bicycle movement. Refer to AASHTO on guidance for best practices in bridge and tunnel retrofits. Potential strategies in situations where there is not enough width to accommodate bicycle facilities may include widening the sidewalk, by narrowing or reducing travel lanes, or adding a cantilever structure.

.....

OBJECTIVE S2

When upgrading bike facilities on a corridor, incorporate suggested intersection treatments to reduce stress of bicycle crossings, and ensure continuity of high-comfort facilities.

.....

CHAPTER 5.

PEDESTRIAN NETWORK PLAN

The pedestrian network plan in this section includes the following:

- A description of the preferred design user that pedestrian facilities will be designed to support.
- A description of pedestrian facility types and their design guidelines.
- Pedestrian crossing guidance on how to improve safety for pedestrians at street crossings.

This plan sets the goal for all streets in Grand Junction to provide high comfort locations for people to walk. Given there are hundreds of miles of streets in Grand Junction, the initial focus should be on completing sidewalks and trails on the Active Transportation Corridors, many of which are arterial streets with high traffic speeds and volumes.

The prioritization strategy described in the Implementation section of this plan identifies the most critical pedestrian infrastructure using criteria sourced from the community, prioritizing the locations with both the greatest need and that will have the greatest impact to pedestrian circulation.



Preferred Design User

Based on input from the community, Steering Committee, and city staff, this plan sets forth a goal to have low-stress, high-comfort places to walk or roll on all streets in Grand Junction. Low-stress facilities are defined as those that score an LTS 1 or LTS 2 on the LTS 1-4 rating system as shown in **Figure 31**, meaning

they cater to all ages and abilities. Future sidewalks and trails in Grand Junction will cater to the most cautious design user, including children, older adults, and people with mobility challenges, to the most confident pedestrian. Designing sidewalks to this standard will ensure all residents, employees, and visitors of Grand Junction can feel comfortable choosing to walk or roll.

FIGURE 31: PEDESTRIAN LEVEL OF TRAFFIC STRESS



Pedestrian Facility Types

Pedestrian facility types recommended in this plan, consisting of sidewalks and crossings, are those needed to achieve an LTS 1 or 2 on streets based on the roadway speed, number of lanes, and traffic volumes. Unlike the bicycle network plan, where specific streets will have bicycle facilities (primarily on the Active Transportation Corridors), it is assumed that the majority of, if not all, streets in the city will be a part of the future pedestrian network.¹

However, this plan prioritizes where upgrades in the pedestrian network should be made first. The Prioritized Pedestrian Network map in **Figure 44** shows all sidewalks in the city prioritized in order of importance to complete or upgrade based on the prioritization criteria. This section describes design guidance for sidewalks and trails, with additional design specifications found in the updated TEDS Manual. Guidance is based on best practices from NACTO, FHWA, and from best practices established in other municipalities.

¹ Note: While certain streets are planned as part of the bike network that will have specific design treatments to provide high comfort for bicyclists, it is expected that bicyclist will also use all streets in Grand Junction.

Sidewalks

To achieve at least an LTS 2, streets with three travel lanes or fewer and speeds of 30 mph or less (generally local and collector streets) require a 6-foot sidewalk with an 8-foot buffer. Streets with four travel lanes or more and/or speeds of 35 mph or more require an 8-foot sidewalk with 12-foot buffer. These recommendations follow a “weakest link approach,” meaning that a street with two travel lanes but a posted speed limit of 35 mph will require an 8-foot sidewalk with 12-foot buffer. Notably, if the city chooses to reduce the speed and/or number of lanes on a street as part of a corridor project, the recommended width of sidewalk and buffer may be reduced. It is recommended that changes to posted speed are accompanied by geometric design changes and traffic calming interventions to be effective.

FIGURE 32: SIDEWALK ELEMENTS




TABLE 4: SIDEWALK FACILITY RECOMMENDATIONS TO ACHIEVE LTS 2 OR BETTER GIVEN STREET CHARACTERISTICS

		LANES	
		3 or fewer	4 or more
Speed	30 mph or less	6 ft sidewalk, 8 ft buffer	8 ft sidewalk, 12 ft buffer
	35 mph or more	8 ft sidewalk, 12 ft buffer	8 ft sidewalk, 12 ft buffer

In constrained environments with limited right of way behind the curb, the sidewalk should be as wide as possible, with a minimum width of 5 feet and a minimum buffer width of 2 feet. Note: bike lanes and on-street parking can count as part of the buffer width as explained in the Buffer/Amenity Zone section.

On local streets in existing residential neighborhoods where there is no sidewalk, an LTS 2 has been


assigned when speed limits are 25 mph or less and volumes average less than 1,000 vehicles per day. These streets are the lowest priority to improve with sidewalk facilities unless they are part of a Safe Routes to School corridor. Neighborhood residents typically utilize the street surface to walk and roll with the motorized traffic. Generally, this sharing of the roadway has been found to be an acceptable level of comfort on these low-volume, low-speed streets.

Trails

To achieve at least an LTS 2, trails should be 10 feet or wider (with 12-foot as the desired width) with a 5-foot buffer on local streets, 8-foot buffer on collector streets, and 12-foot buffer on arterials. Striping on major trails can help separate bi-directional traffic for people walking/rolling and people biking where needed, especially in areas where visibility is limited due to trail curvature or topography.

In constrained environments with limited right-of-way behind the curb, trails should be as wide as possible, with a minimum width of 8 feet, and minimum buffer width of 2 feet.

FIGURE 33: TRAIL ELEMENTS



Buffer/Amenity Zone

The buffer/amenity zone is an area that separates trails and sidewalks from travel lanes. The highest-quality buffers include both horizontal and vertical separation, for additional protection for those walking, rolling, and biking. Wider buffers better accommodate shared dockless micromobility (such as scooter- and bike-share), by allowing users of bike- and scooter-share to park devices safely outside of the sidewalk, and in the amenity zone. This maintains a clear path of travel for people using wheelchairs and other mobility devices, while also reducing visual clutter.

While Figure 32 and Figure 33 show tree lawns in the zone, this is for illustrative purposes. This zone should provide a high-quality buffer with landscaping and street trees or a hardscaped surface with street furniture including streetlamps, benches, planters, and bike racks. Pedestrian lighting within the buffer zone improves safety for pedestrians, rollers and bicyclists using active transportation corridors and encourages the use of these facilities after dark. Parked cars, bike lanes, or painted shoulders (such as painted edge lines) can also be included in the overall buffer width.

OBJECTIVE Q2

Install high-comfort sidewalks and trails according to the design guidance in the Pedestrian Facility Types section.

Pedestrian Crossing Guidance

There are two main types of marked roadway crossings for pedestrians: controlled crossings and uncontrolled crossings.

- A **controlled crosswalk** is a legal crossing across a roadway approach controlled by a stop sign or traffic signal.
- An **uncontrolled crosswalk** is a legal crosswalk across a roadway approach without any control, such as a stop sign or traffic signal. Note: while a pedestrian can legally cross at uncontrolled crossings, the Colorado Revised Statutes Section 42-4-803 states: (1)....*Every pedestrian crossing a roadway at any point other than within a marked crosswalk or within an unmarked crosswalk at an intersection shall yield the right-of-way to all vehicles upon the roadway.*

Crosswalks may also be marked or unmarked:

- A **marked crosswalk** is a legal crosswalk that features traffic control markings.
- An **unmarked crosswalk** is a legal crosswalk that does not feature any traffic control markings.

An example of different crosswalk types in Grand Junction is shown in **Figure 34**.

FIGURE 34: PEDESTRIAN CROSSING EXAMPLES IN GRAND JUNCTION

Controlled Crossing



Uncontrolled Crossing



The specific treatment (marked crosswalk, signage, beacon, etc.) for a specific crossing can be determined using the *Grand Junction Pedestrian Crossing Installation Guidelines* (2016), including when and where to place different types of crossings. Additional guidance on uncontrolled pedestrian crossings can be found in the FHWA *Guide for Improving Pedestrian Safety at Uncontrolled Crossing Locations*, and the CDOT *Pedestrian Crossing Installation Guide*.

.....
OBJECTIVE S3

When upgrading pedestrian facilities on a corridor, incorporate suggested intersection treatments to reduce stress of crossings, and ensure continuity of high-comfort facilities.
.....

The city should pay special attention to the universal accessibility of crossings for all ages and abilities, including for people with mobility challenges or with visual impairments. Crossings should be designed with ADA accessible pedestrian ramps, detectable surfaces, and other universal design features.

.....
OBJECTIVE E1

Design crossings with ADA accessible pedestrian ramps, detectable surfaces, and other universal design features.
.....

The TEDS Manual provides design standards for each of the treatments identified. Existing crossings should be evaluated regularly to help ensure the current standards are being met. In addition to these local standards, the city can reference Federal guidance.

CHAPTER 6.

PROGRAM & POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS



Programs


Programs will work in tandem with the build-out of the pedestrian and bicycle networks in Grand Junction to further support people walking, rolling, and biking. Programs to maintain new facilities, provide pedestrian and bicycle amenities, create Safe Routes to School, reduce commute trips, and improve education and awareness will each establish a culture friendly to walking and biking. Based on the existing conditions analysis, feedback from the community and in collaboration with the project Steering Committee, the following set of programs are recommended to support buildout and use of the future bicycle and pedestrian network.

Maintenance

As the city of Grand Junction bike, sidewalk, and trail networks expand during implementation of the PBP, a set of maintenance standards and a maintenance plan can help city staff assess and prioritize maintenance needs to keep infrastructure in a state of good repair. This will ensure the bike and pedestrian network is a reliable and comfortable transportation resource for all community members.

Planning and budgeting for maintenance needs can be overlooked during planning, design, and construction of new facilities. Funding for capital construction tends to be more readily available than funding for routine upkeep. While initial construction costs far outsize those of maintenance and improvement of existing facilities, funding for routine upkeep is more difficult to secure. Deferring routine upkeep can result in facilities degrading faster and requiring more expensive maintenance interventions later. Early, frequent maintenance can reduce overall costs over time, as seen in **Figure 35**.

FIGURE 35: EXTENDED LIFE SPAN OF FACILITIES WITH CONSISTENT REINVESTMENT VERSUS LIFE SPAN OF FACILITIES WITHOUT MAINTENANCE (SOURCE: FORT COLLINS 2021 PARKS & RECREATION MASTER PLAN)



RESPONSIBLE PARTIES

The Parks Operations Division of the Parks and Recreation Department is responsible for maintaining 21 miles of the urban trail system and over 500 acres of open space. The Street Systems Division of the Public Works Department is responsible for maintenance of all on-street bikeways, as well as street sweeping, drainage maintenance, leaf

removal, pavement maintenance, and sidewalk maintenance. As the system expands, maintenance work completed by volunteers can supplement work performed by local maintenance entities. Volunteers can assist with routine upkeep responsibilities and can reduce overall maintenance costs. Volunteers can perform a variety of tasks, including trash removal, vegetation management, and physical infrastructure maintenance, as shown in **Table 5**.

TABLE 5: COMMON MAINTENANCE TASKS FOR VOLUNTEERS

Volunteers can most likely:	Volunteers may not be able to:	To get help with this task:
Keep the trail clear of trash and debris.	Haul material to a disposal facility.	Contact your local government or waste hauler.
Clear brush and trees.	Dispose of the material.	Borrow or rent a chipper.
Plant and maintain trees, shrubs, and flowers and do most gardening and landscaping tasks.	Provide the items to be planted.	Get donated or discounted plant materials from a local nursery or home center. Establish an inventory of donated hand tools.
Operate mowers, trimmers, and chain saws.	Supply their own tools.	Establish an inventory of donated power tools.
Operate a tractor, loader, or bobcat.	Operate specialized heavy equipment like a dozer, grader, or roller.	
Make minor repairs to non-asphalt trails.	Lay asphalt or operate a paving machine.	Ask your local road crew or hire a paid contractor.
Keep drainage structures clear.	Dig a trench and install pipes or culverts.	
Perform surface cleaning of restrooms.	Remove waste from portable toilets or restrooms.	Hire a paid contractor.
Install signs, gates, bollards, and fences.	Manufacture same.	Purchase using donated funds or get donated or discounted materials from a lumber yard or home center.
Build and install picnic tables, benches, kiosks, and other wood structures.	Provide materials.	
Bridge decking and minor bridge and tunnel maintenance.	Perform structural inspection and maintenance of bridges and tunnels.	Hire a professional engineer and paid contractor.

RECOMMENDED MAINTENANCE ACTIVITIES

This section identifies recommended maintenance activities including trash removal, surface cleaning, vegetation maintenance, snow removal and drainage, pavement maintenance, amenity maintenance, physical infrastructure maintenance, and trailhead maintenance.

Trash Removal: Trash removal is important not only for upholding the aesthetic character of trails, but also for protecting public health and safety and respecting natural habitat, wildlife, air, water, and soil quality. Frequency of trash removal can vary based on trail use and location. For more remote or less trafficked trails, the city could reduce maintenance costs related to trash removal by placing bins at

select locations and requesting that the public hold on to trash generated along the trail. Locations at trail entry points, in parking areas, and near street crossings are more easily accessed and serviced by maintenance staff. Additionally, on trails where dogs are permitted, there should be signage and stations with disposable bags placed next to trash containers. These stations make it convenient for pet owners to pick up pet waste and can reduce the frequency of users dropping bags along the trail.

Surface Cleaning: Surface cleaning of trails is necessary for removing obstacles that could cause injury or impede universal access. Staff may blow or sweep the surface clear of leaves and other debris.

Vegetation Management: Vegetation management is another maintenance activity that is necessary to remove obstacles that could cause injury or impede universal access. Best practices for trail clearance generally state that the edges of paved trails should have 2-3 feet of horizontal clearance from vertical obstructions, and trails should have a minimum vertical clearance of 8-12 feet. Clearing includes the removal of downed or leaning trees, protruding roots, loose limbs, or large pieces of bark from the trail and buffer zone.

Snow Removal and Drainage: The goal of snow removal and drainage is to avoid weather-related blockages to trail access. In general, snow removal should occur as soon as possible after a snowfall on hard surface trails. Drainage maintenance is important for preventing damage to trails from storms and water erosion and for keeping trails open for use. Common drainage activities include clearing ditches and culverts. Ditches must be deep and wide enough to carry water volumes during heavy storms. Vegetation or trash that may block water flow must be removed from ditches, and slumping banks should be rectified. Drainage culverts should also be checked and cleared prior to major storms to ensure functionality during and after a weather event.

Pavement Maintenance: Asphalt pavement generally requires more maintenance than concrete and has fallen out of favor in many Colorado communities. Asphalt trails more frequently crack due to intruding vegetation, and a smooth trail surface is needed to better serve users of all abilities. Well-maintained concrete trails can last 25 years. However, concrete surfaces can still be damaged by water and erosion, tree roots, and frost and freeze cycles. Other trail design characteristics with an impact on maintenance should be considered when constructing new facilities. New trails should be 10-12 feet to have adequate passing width and space for users to pause to the side, but also to allow access by maintenance and emergency vehicles. Trails should also be wider at intersections with other trails, at smaller radius curves, and at underpasses to allow for safe travel by users and to facilitate maintenance activities.

Amenity Maintenance: Trailside elements such as benches, picnic tables and shelters, drinking fountains, bicycle parking, bicycle repair stations, fencing, gates, bollards, and workout equipment may experience

damage and require maintenance. Striping on major trails can help separate opposing traffic where needed, especially in areas where visibility is limited due to trail curvature. Striping and markings should be replaced where needed citywide on an annual basis. Maintenance activities include cleaning, painting, repair, and replacement. During the construction of new trails, consideration should be given to whether these amenities should be installed (contingent on whether sufficient resources for maintenance are available), and if so, consideration should also be given to material types, durability, and placement for ease of maintenance and repair.

Physical Infrastructure Maintenance: Preventative maintenance can ensure pedestrian bridges remain in a state of good repair. Wooden bridges require checking for damage or deterioration of wooden decking. General bridge maintenance includes replacing boards or screws, bridge washing, debris clearing, deck sealing, steel bearings lubrication, and painting load-carrying steel members. More intensive maintenance includes replacement of bridge elements such as joints, bearings, pedestals, bridge seat/pier cap, or columns/stems. The city may also apply products that enhance bridge grip and reduce slipperiness to improve safety for users in all weather conditions.

Trailhead Specific Maintenance: As the trail system expands, new trailheads and amenities may be installed. According to Rails-to-Trails, the most common trailhead elements are information kiosks, parking lots, tables and benches, trash receptacles, and toilets. As these facilities are planned, the city should consider material types, durability, and placement with regard to the ease of maintenance and repair.

.....

OBJECTIVE Q3

Develop a set of maintenance standards and a maintenance plan to prioritize upkeep of the active transportation network.

.....

SOURCING FUNDS

Total annual maintenance cost estimates per mile vary greatly across communities, based on the type of facility (e.g., width, surface, structural design), as well as context-sensitive characteristics, such as the types of vegetation, amenities included, and number of annual users. The City of Grand Junction should continue to plan for increases in the budget of the Parks and Recreation Department and Public Works Department commensurate with additional assets and capital facilities that the Parks Operations Division and Street Systems Division must operate and maintain.

In communities nationwide, usually more funding exists for capital construction than for maintenance. According to Rails-to-Trails, trail system managers nationally report receiving funding primarily from municipal budget allocations (49%), then from local fundraising activities (39%), in-kind donations (29%), the state budget (24%), community fees or taxes (9%), and federal funding (7%).

Many funding sources could be used for construction and maintenance. The city can explore these and more:

- Department of Local Affairs/Great Outdoors Colorado/Conservation Trust Fund(Colorado Lottery)
- Land and Water Conservation Fund
- Colorado Parks and Wildlife
- Conservation, trail advocacy groups, local organizations, non-profits
- Federal Highway Administration RAISE Grants, Recreational Trails Program Funding, Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP)
- Federal Safe Streets for All (SS4A) grants
- Highway Safety Improvement Program, National Highway Performance Program, FASTER Safety Grants
- City Capital Improvement fund (sales tax)
- City General Fund (sales tax)

OBJECTIVE Q4

Utilize existing and pursue new funding sources support construction and maintenance of the expanded system.

Pedestrian & Bicycle Amenities


The following section outlines guidance for pedestrian and bicycle amenities for the city to incorporate alongside installation of new sidewalks, trails, and bikeways. With any corridor upgrade, the city should consider how to improve the overall streetscape to create a more pleasant environment for those walking and biking.

BICYCLE STORAGE & PARKING

Alongside bike lanes and trails, a key component of the bicycle network is secure bicycle storage and parking. Without ample and safe bike parking, people may be more reluctant to choose to bike. Installing and maintaining end-of-trip facilities such as bike racks/parking, bike lockers/secure bike storage, showers, and personal locker encourages commuting by bicycle by making it more convenient.

The city should refer to the [Association of Professional Bicycle Professionals \(APBP\) resource, Essentials of Bike Parking](#), which outlines design and installation guidelines for short-term and long-term bike parking (**Figure 36**). Placement and selection of these facilities should consider not just traditional bikes but cargo, e-bikes and adaptive devices. Grided bike racks, loop bike racks, and other similar bike racks that do not allow the user to easily lock the frame and wheel of the bike to a post should be avoided. These racks are typically inefficiently used, harder to secure one's bike, and less compatible with larger e-bikes and cargo bikes. The inverted U or other similar bike racks as shown in **Figure 37** are preferred.

FIGURE 36: TYPES OF APBP-COMPLIANT PARKING



The city should prioritize installation of bike parking and secure bike storage in key destinations such as downtown, outside of city properties, and near major transit hubs, parks, schools, employment centers, and shopping areas. Secure bicycle parking incorporates a “post” or “rack” where the front tire and the frame of the bicycle can be easily locked. The city should also accommodate alternative micromobility devices such as e-bikes and scooters by constructing dedicated micromobility parking in high-demand areas. Bike parking could take the form of bike racks, micromobility corrals, bike lockers, bike shelters, and repurposed parking spaces.

FIGURE 37: BIKE PARKING IN GRAND JUNCTION



Regardless of the type of bike parking used, it is important that it holds the number of bikes as they are designed to hold and it stores them securely. For example, on many traditional “bike racks” a bicycle can only be secured on each end of the rack where one can lock both the front wheel and the frame of the bicycle to the rack. The spots between are difficult to use with limited distance between bike slots to lock up to and not as secure due to only a single tire being secured to the rack. This results in the total number of bicycle parking spaces the rack was designed for not being met and those bikes locked up not as secure. These concerns are magnified for e-bike users due to the larger size of the bike.

The city should also encourage new and existing developments to provide secure bike parking and amenities. The Development Code should require bike parking with new construction and a requirement or create an incentive such as vehicular parking amenity credit for covered, secure, easily accessible bike rooms in multifamily developments and office buildings. Additionally, the city should explore options for incentivizing existing developments to add secure bike parking, such as a grant program. The city could work with existing businesses to provide bike parking by sharing the cost and promoting the League of American Cyclists Bicycle Friendly Business program.

OBJECTIVE M1

Prioritize installation of bike and micromobility parking and secure storage in key destinations downtown, outside of city properties, and near major transit hubs, parks, schools, employment centers, and shopping areas.

OBJECTIVE M2

Encourage new and existing developments to provide secure bike parking and amenities through requirements and incentives.



FIGURE 38: BICYCLE PARKING OUTSIDE OF SCHOOLS CAN BE ESPECIALLY IMPORTANT

STREET FURNITURE

The buffer/amenity zone described alongside the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facility Types is an area that separates trails and sidewalks from travel lanes. These buffers should include both horizontal and vertical separation. Wider buffers provide distance from moving traffic, but also create a valuable space to park micromobility devices like scooters and bikes, to rest, to wait for the bus, and more.

Some buffer/amenity zones may be landscaped with native grasses, shrubs, and trees. Hardscaped buffers however, offer the opportunity to install street furniture like benches, streetlamps, bus stops, bike parking, waste receptacles, fountains, public art, and more. Each of these present amenities to people walking, of all ages and abilities. Benches cater to people waiting for the bus, as well as older adults and small children, who may need to take more breaks. Pedestrian lighting, discussed below, create a sense of safety on a street at night. Each amenity listed creates a more pleasant and comfortable environment, making it more attractive to walk.

Along trails, amenities like shade, water fountains, seating, and ADA accessible restrooms support recreation and active transportation.

OBJECTIVE M3

When upgrading bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities on a corridor, design high-quality landscaped or hardscaped buffers with street furniture and pedestrian amenities.

OBJECTIVE M4

Grand Junction's streets shall be designed as public amenities and include aesthetic elements such as street trees, landscaping, pedestrian lighting, street furniture, and wayfinding signage wherever possible.



FIGURE 39: BENCHES, BIKE RACKS, WASTE RECEPTACLES, AND SIGNAGE CREATE A PLEASANT SPOT

PEDESTRIAN-SCALE LIGHTING

Comments received from the public engagement process included the need to provide safety for nighttime users. Lighting plays an important role in establishing a safe and inviting environment for people to walk and bike. Many are likely familiar with Main Street environments that create an appealing place to walk at all times of day, with lampposts and cheerful string lights that continue to draw visitors to shops and restaurants throughout the evening. The opposite is also true. Dark, unlit corridors, regardless of whether they are a local street or a major arterial, feel uninviting and unsafe to the average person.

For those already unsure about walking or biking, especially vulnerable users like mothers with children

or older adults, knowing that they will have to return home at night in the dark is likely to discourage choosing to walk or bike. Installing lighting of the appropriate scale and spacing can improve ambiance dramatically and increase one's sense of safety and "being seen" at night.

When updating pedestrian and bike facilities on a corridor, the city should concurrently plan for the upgrade of lighting in the project area. Lighting considerations include:

Scale and Aesthetics: The dimensions of streetlights should be scaled to the width and characteristics of the street. Smaller lampposts between 25 and 30 feet should be chosen for local and collector roads to support street character and walkability of



FIGURE 40: EXAMPLES OF PEDESTRIAN LIGHTING IN GRAND JUNCTION

neighborhoods and local commercial districts. Taller poles of 30 feet or more are appropriate for wider arterial streets and highways. Other attractive types of lighting beyond lampposts can support illumination of the public realm, such as string lights, storefront lighting, lit signs, etc.

Spacing: Spacing between streetlights should be roughly 2.5 to 3 times the height of the pole. Density along a corridor and traffic speeds also affect ideal spacing. Lighting will be less frequent in rural areas, but alongside new development, lighting frequency should increase. Light cones are roughly the same diameter as the height of the fixture, which will influence the maximum distance between streetlights to avoid dark areas.

Light Pollution and Energy Efficiency: “Dark sky friendly” lighting fixtures focus lighting directly downward onto the street to minimize flare and light pollution, while maximizing useful light. Shielded and cut-off fixtures with energy-efficient LED light bulbs are more cost-effective and reduce light pollution by directing light toward the ground. Solar powered fixtures should be installed when possible to take advantage of Grand Junction’s climate.

For more information, the city can refer to lighting design guidance in the Global Designing Cities Initiative’s *Global Street Design Guide*.

WAYFINDING & SIGNAGE

Signage is a practical component of a community’s transportation system, directing users to key destinations. However, it also offers an opportunity for the city to create a sense of place and cohesive, artistic system for orienting visitors and bringing people into the downtown core and commercial districts to explore shops and restaurants. In this way, wayfinding can simultaneously act as an economic development driver and unite transportation and land use.

Signage should indicate where to find key destinations, such as shopping and dining, the town hall and post office, trailheads, the nearest bus stop, and more. Thoughtful design and placement of this signage can help visitors and residents orient themselves downtown and easily locate key destinations. **Figure 41** shows how simple this kind of signage can be, while remaining aesthetically pleasing. The pedestrian scale of this signage caters to people walking downtown and in commercial districts, but it can also be read by those on a bike or in a car. Signage at range of scales, including gateways, directional signs, street banners, pavement markings, map kiosks, and bikeway signage can assist all types of travelers with navigation.

.....

OBJECTIVE S4

Conduct a lighting needs assessment for each active transportation corridor - as a first step in identifying lighting needs for safety improvements.

.....

.....

OBJECTIVE M5

When upgrading bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities on a corridor, concurrently plan for the upgrade of lighting in the project area.

.....



FIGURE 41: EXAMPLE OF WAYFINDING SIGNAGE

Wayfinding systems should also include estimated walking time to each destination listed to further highlight ease of pedestrian access.

As recommended in the *Vibrant Together* downtown plan, Grand Junction should initiate a comprehensive wayfinding and signage study to create a consistent strategy for connecting people walking, biking, and driving to downtown and other key destinations.

.....

OBJECTIVE M6

Initiate a comprehensive wayfinding and signage study to create a consistent strategy for connecting people walking, biking, and driving to downtown and other key destinations.

.....

Bikeway and trail signage is especially important to help people walking, rolling and biking reach major destinations and landmarks. In partnership with the Urban Trails Committee, in 2020 the city installed 300 wayfinding signs to guide cyclists throughout the community. As the city continues to build out bike facilities and new trails over time, they should incorporate additional signs with the same wayfinding standards at decision points – typically at the intersection of two or more bicycle facilities and at other key locations along bicycle routes.

Signage should be regularly refreshed or replaced as it becomes damaged, faded, or out of date. Over time, outdated signage should also be replaced with new, updated information. Signs may be directional and related to routing users to key destinations, mile markers to help users self-locate, or pertaining to trail etiquette.

.....

OBJECTIVE M7

As the city continues to build out bike facilities and new trails over time, incorporate additional signs with the same wayfinding standards at decision points.

.....

The Steering Committee was particularly concerned with signage on the Riverfront Trail and suggested two major changes in that specific area – first, striping a centerline on the trail starting on the east end of Las Colonias Park and continuing to the west through the high use area of the trail; and second, installing signage on trail etiquette along the Riverfront Trail. The centerline is recommended to highlight two-way traffic on the trail, maintain space for passing, and reduce safety conflicts. Trail etiquette signage is intended to communicate responsibilities of trail users to keep to the right, leash dogs, respect proper cycling speeds, pay attention at high traffic intersections, etc.

.....

OBJECTIVE M8

Improve signage on the Riverfront Trail.

.....

SHARED MICROMOBILITY

In 2022, the City released a Referral for Proposals to solicit shared micromobility (e.g., bike and scooter share) to evaluate the effectiveness of this mode of transportation on first- and last-mile connections and modal shifts. The 18-month pilot study is slated to start 2023.

Scooters and bike share have been successfully deployed in several Front Range communities including Fort Collins, Boulder, Colorado Springs, Denver, and Longmont. Sharing services are most successful and financially sustainable where there is a higher density of land uses, since people can travel shorter distances to reach destinations, the ideal trip type for micromobility to support.

Shared micromobility has numerous benefits, including flexible travel options, better first- and last-mile connections to transit, and replacement of vehicle trips.

The city will use geofencing and micromobility corrals and will eventually explore a docked system to keep walkways clear for pedestrians and people using wheelchairs and other mobility devices, while also reducing visual clutter along the sidewalk.

The city will build and encourage development to provide additional bike parking. Should the micromobility pilot be successful, property owners may choose to provide device parking, in coordination with micromobility vendors.

The street standards could be updated to include a buffer/amenity zone in new sidewalks in core areas of the city which could be used for micromobility parking safely outside of the sidewalk.

.....

OBJECTIVE M9

Close the gaps on first-and-last mile connections through the deployment of shared micromobility devices (e-scooters, e-bikes, etc.) and utilize geofencing and parking corrals to accommodate device parking in high-traffic areas.

.....

Safe Routes to School (SRTS)

Safe Routes to School (SRTS) programs are designed to make it safer for students to walk and bike to school, and thus encourage more walking and biking. Beyond supporting safety, SRTS programs can reduce traffic congestion, provide environmental benefits, and improve health outcomes by promoting habits of walking and biking that may influence travel decisions later in life.

The city of Grand Junction dedicates a portion of the federal Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) distribution it receives each year to the city's Safe Routes to School Program. Since 2016, the city has invested more than \$700,000 in walking and biking infrastructure improvements around schools, including new sidewalks, crosswalks, traffic calming, and accessibility projects. The Mesa County Regional Transportation Planning Office (RTPO) has a separate program that conducted STRS assessments of 12 elementary schools and 8 middle schools in School District 51.

.....

OBJECTIVE S5

Bolster the existing Safe Routes to School program by incorporating new elements of the six Es.

.....

The city of Grand Junction can bolster their Safe Routes to School program by incorporating all elements of a successful SRTS program: the “six Es.” The six Es represent an integrated and comprehensive approach to making streets healthier and safer for everyone, regardless of their destination or travel mode. The following section describes each of the six Es and related initiatives.

Education – Providing students and the community with the skills to walk and bicycle safely, educating them about benefits of walking and bicycling, and teaching them about the broad range of transportation choices.

- Schools can launch advertising campaigns to promote travel to school by means other than driving.
- Public education can include information distributed to students about travel options, including safe walking and biking routes, transit services, and carpools.

Encouragement – Generating enthusiasm and increased walking and bicycling for students through events, activities, and programs.

- Walk Pools/Walking School Bus: Organized walking groups for children, chaperoned by an adult, that encourage students to walk together to school.
- Bike Bus: Organized bike rides to school chaperoned by an adult(s), that provide a fun morning experience and safety in numbers.
- Walk, Roll, and Bike to School Day: Event that encourages participation and educates students on the benefits and ways to walk and bike to school comfortably and safely.
- Partner with local organizations to lead/help with SRTS programs.
- Engage parents as volunteer crossing guards and walk/bike bus leaders.
- Create a yard sign program.

Engineering – Creating physical improvements to streets and neighborhoods that make walking and bicycling safer, more comfortable, and more convenient.

- High quality sidewalks and crosswalks near schools: Refer to the recommended facility types and alignments in this plan – proximity to schools and crash history were both factors used in project identification and prioritization, with projects close to schools and near crash hot spots considered higher priority.
- High visibility signage and markings in school zones.
- Designated curb space outside schools for pick-up and drop-off zones.

Traffic calming in neighborhoods around schools like curb extensions, pedestrian refuge islands, etc.

(Figure 42).

Enforcement – Deterring unsafe traffic behaviors and encouraging safe habits by people walking, bicycling and driving in school neighborhoods and along school routes.

- The city can work with schools to identify if there are particular behaviors that cause safety issues that could be alleviated through a form of enforcement of better practices, and how to generally enhance awareness of school zones where children may be present.

- Crossing guards/police enforcement during peak travel times.
- Reduce school zone speed limits.

Evaluation – Assessing which approaches are more or less successful, ensuring that programs and initiatives are supporting equitable outcomes, and identifying unintended consequences or opportunities to improve the effectiveness of each approach.

- Maintain an open forum to collect parent, teacher, staff, and student concerns.
- Conduct surveys on travel behavior to and from school and barriers to walking and biking.
- Evaluate barriers in the built environment to walking and biking near school properties.
- Conduct safety audits at pick-up and drop-off times to identify safety issues.
- Expand successful programs.

Equity – Ensuring that Safe Routes to School initiatives are benefiting all demographic groups, with particular attention to ensuring safe, healthy, and fair outcomes for low-income students, students of color, students of all genders, students with disabilities, and others.

- Ensure ADA access to school properties.
- Focus attention on schools in low-income neighborhoods/with many students of color.





FIGURE 42: EXAMPLE OF TRAFFIC CALMING NEAR SCHOOLS



Grand Junction uses CDBG funding for its SRTS program, but has not pursued SRTS funding through CDOT’s Transportation Block Grant due to “administrative challenges associated with the state program.” Almost all funding for SRTS is federal but distributed at the state level. There are a range of project types eligible for SRTS funding, including campaigns, educational initiatives, sidewalk and crossing repairs, and equipment pilot programs. It is recommended that the city consider expanding its SRTS program by diversifying funding sources to include CDOT funding in addition to dedicated CDBG funding.

.....

OBJECTIVE Q5

Consider expanding the SRTS program by diversifying funding sources to include CDOT funding in addition to dedicated CDBG funding.

.....

The city is most likely to be successful for grants to implement infrastructure that improves bicycle and pedestrian safety by formalizing the SRTS program, including ongoing action items to collect data on travel behavior to and from schools. A well-organized and complete SRTS program will benefit transportation in Grand Junction by providing users with a range of transportation options and enhance the real and perceived safety of those options.

When the focus of transportation planning and design is on the most vulnerable users, children walking and biking, the safety benefits reach everyone. Increased walking and biking provide environmental and health benefits to students, but also provides the transportation benefits of reduced traffic congestion and lower transportation costs for school districts and families. Safer streets, reduced congestion, and a greater share of trips occurring through walking and biking all support the vision of the plan.

More information and resources on Safe Routes to School can be found through the Safe Routes to School National Partnership: <https://www.saferoutespartnership.org/>.

Community-wide Incentive Program

Through their Bicycle Friendly Community Designation, the League of American Cyclists encourages municipalities to develop a community-wide commute trip reduction (CTR) ordinance, incentive program, and/or a Guaranteed Ride Home program to encourage and support bike commuters.

Through this program, the city would work with large employers to implement a voluntary incentive program to support walking and biking to work. Incentives can include e-bike rebates, bike-themed events such as bike rodeos and Bike to Work Day, shwag such as bike lights and helmets, and gift certificates for those who bike to City events. Guaranteed Ride Home provides commuters who did not drive to work with alternative means home in case of an emergency.

.....

OBJECTIVE M10

Develop a community-wide incentive program and work with large employers to implement a Guaranteed Ride Home program to encourage and support bike commuters. Incentives can include e-bike rebates, bike-themed events such as bike rodeos and Bike to Work Day, shwag such as bike lights and helmets, and gift certificates for those who bike to City events. Guaranteed Ride Home provides commuters who did not drive to work with alternative means home in case of an emergency.

.....

Education & Awareness

Numerous comments received during the public engagement process referred to the need for education and awareness to establish a more positive culture around walking and biking in Grand Junction. Residents noted that drivers are often unaware of cyclists in the roadway and don't expect them. Many residents also have had negative experiences with drivers, ranging from distracted and dangerous driving to verbal and physical harassment, hostility, and aggression.

OBJECTIVE S6

Work with local driving schools to expand the curriculum on laws governing interactions with people walking, rolling, and biking.

Better driver education is needed to establish respect for people walking and biking and create a more "peaceful coexistence," as one commenter wrote. City law enforcement should work with local driving schools to expand the curriculum on laws governing interactions with people walking, rolling, and biking, such as three-foot passing distance, permission for cyclists to occupy a full travel lane, requirements to stop for people in the crosswalk, window tinting laws; as well as the danger of running red lights and turning right on red during a walk cycle.

In a similar vein, several comments highlighted negative cyclist interactions with law enforcement in Grand Junction and the need to improve relations with people walking and biking. City staff should partner with law enforcement to increase enforcement of speeding and reckless driving in areas with high pedestrian volumes and/or safety issues and consider automated enforcement. The police department may also consider expanding their bike patrol unit to improve bicyclist/officer relations, and ensure that all law enforcement officers have basic training or experience with bicycling.

OBJECTIVE S7

Partner with law enforcement to increase enforcement of speeding and reckless driving in areas with high pedestrian volumes and/or safety issues and consider automated enforcement. Consider expanding the police bike patrol unit.

OBJECTIVE M11

Establish a more positive culture around walking and biking in Grand Junction by creating staff position(s) to assist in public education, promoting the Bicycle Friendly Business program, and/or hosting an LCI seminar.

Beyond these measures, the city should pursue the following recommendations highlighted in the Bicycle Friendly Community Designation and the Walk Friendly Community Report Card:

- Educate staff on walking, walkability, and pedestrian safety.
- Encourage more local businesses, agencies, and organizations to promote cycling to their employees and customers and to seek recognition as a Bicycle Friendly Business.
- Host a League Cycling Instructor (LCI) seminar to increase the number of local LCIs.
- Expand the audience for educational programs to include high school students, college students, and new drivers.
- City staff can take the lead on these actions, along with many of the other programs and policies in this plan.

Policies

One of the most tangible and cost-effective ways to improve the bicycle and pedestrian environment in Grand Junction will be to implement effective policies. Policies can be used by city departments as they perform street construction projects and routine maintenance. The policies can also be used to guide the private sector in new development or redevelopment projects. Adopting policy(ies) may assist in ensuring projects incorporate the city’s goals for the bicycle and pedestrian environment and create a consistent experience for users.

Based on the existing conditions analysis and in collaboration with the Steering Committee, the following set of actionable policies are recommended to support buildout and use of the future bicycle and pedestrian network.

Access Management

Access management is an important strategy to mitigate curb cut frequency and conflicts between pedestrians, bicyclists, and turning vehicles. The TEDS Manual states that access should be provided on the lower street classification when a property is adjacent to multiple streets. Additionally, the North Avenue Zoning Overlay provides access management guidance to limit curb cuts specifically along North Avenue.

The city should consider expanding this type of policy to Active Transportation Corridors and corridors identified on the Active Transportation High Injury Network (Figure 14, Appendix A) to mitigate conflict points between vehicles and pedestrians and bicyclists. Potential access management strategies typically include redirecting access to side-streets and alleys, consolidating driveways among single and adjacent property owners, and adding medians.

OBJECTIVE S8

Improve the North Avenue access management policy in alignment with national best practices and consider expanding to all the Active Transportation “High Injury Network” Corridors.

Vision Zero

Through their Bicycle Friendly Community designation, the League of American Bicyclists encourages municipalities to adopt a comprehensive road safety plan or a Vision Zero policy. It is increasingly common for municipalities around the country to adopt Vision Zero policies and programs.

These Vision Zero policies and programs consist of communities committing to eliminating traffic crashes that result in fatalities or serious injuries by providing safety training, implementing engineering solutions that are proven to slow vehicle speeds while reducing conflicts with other roadway users, and forming multidisciplinary initiatives for implementing safety programming.

Grand Junction can join Colorado’s statewide program – Moving Towards Zero Deaths – as a first step in solidifying a citywide commitment to supporting multimodal travel through ensuring all trips in the community are as safe as possible.

OBJECTIVE S9

Join the statewide program – Moving Towards Zero Deaths – as a first step in solidifying a citywide commitment to supporting multimodal travel through ensuring all trips in the community are as safe as possible.

Construction Zones

Pedestrian and bicycle accommodation in work zones is already a federal standard defined in the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, and the city currently has a work zone policy consistent with federal standards.

The city should strengthen compliance with the work zone policy that requires developers and construction companies to reroute sidewalks and bicycle facilities that are impacted by construction, similar to the way that they must currently continue to facilitate roadway access for people driving.

This means accommodating people walking and biking with a temporary walkway and bikeway adjacent to the work zone (Figure 43), or at minimum signing alternate

detour routes on either end of the construction zone. The city could consider more active enforcement of current work zone policy along the Active Transportation Corridors.

.....

OBJECTIVE C2

Strengthen enforcement and compliance of the existing construction zones policy that requires developers/construction companies to provide sidewalks and bicycle facilities during construction.

.....




FIGURE 43: EXAMPLE OF COVERED WALKWAY AT CONSTRUCTION SITE

Constructing Active Transportation Facilities

Consistent with current Municipal Code, when an Active Transportation Corridor (ATC) is shown as part of a Collector or Arterial street, the city should continue to plan for and construct the facility. If an ATC is along a local street within a development, a developer should continue to construct deficient or missing facilities, unless other funding sources are secured. The city should continue its current policy for new development to construct an ATC within or adjacent to the site, unless other funding sources are secured. Additionally, bicycle parking should be provided at commercial and multifamily residential locations.

.....
OBJECTIVE Q6

Continue the current policy where planned Active Transportation Corridors that run through or adjacent to a site be constructed as part of the development.
.....

.....
OBJECTIVE C3

Require new developments to provide or set aside space for pedestrian and bicycle connections within the local street network of new developments and to adjacent streets in situations where there is a lack of connectivity in the roadway network.
.....

Building a Connected Network

Public input and an analysis of the existing transportation network highlighted the lack of connectivity between many neighborhoods in Grand Junction due to the curvilinear street network, especially for people walking or bicycling.

The city's existing Subdivision Standards already require connectivity to "Promote pedestrian uses, bicycling, and transportation modes other than private automobile." This connectivity standard should remain, as creating a connection between two otherwise unconnected streets/neighborhoods can greatly decrease the trip lengths for people walking, rolling, and bicycling, as conveyed in **Figure 44**.

In established neighborhoods, these connections can be created by finding existing easements or right-of-way or by acquiring new right-of-way or easements if none currently exists.

The City's current maximum block length of 1200 linear feet is established in the Transportation Engineering Design Standards (TEDS) for vehicular access. The City should consider pedestrian and bicycle connections at an interval closer to 600 feet, which is the distance data indicates is a more comfortable block length for pedestrians to navigate. A "Connectivity Index" could also be used.

.....
OBJECTIVE C4

Connectivity can be defined by a "connectivity index," the ratio of pedestrian and bicycle connections to blocks (or intersections). Consider reducing the maximum distance between pedestrian and bicycle connections to be less than the existing maximum block length for vehicular access of 1200 linear feet.
.....

Applying Transportation Demand Management

Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures are strategies typically designed to facilitate the use of alternate transportation modes to decrease demand on the roadway system by single occupant vehicles. The city should explore incentives-based measures, such as updating its Transportation Impact Study guidelines (Chapter 29.08.200 of the Municipal Code) to encourage TDM strategies, into which major developments could opt, specifically to support walking and biking. These could include constructing Active Transportation Corridors, bike facilities, showers, car share, or other support for bike commuters. Incentive-based measures may weigh some TDM measures over others.

.....

OBJECTIVE M12

Explore incentives-based Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures, into which major developments could opt, to provide support for walking and biking. These could include constructing Active Transportation Corridors, bike facilities, showers, car share, or other support for bike commuters.

.....

Parking Policy

Encouraging developments to right-size off-street parking increases the walkability of an area by increasing density, activating the pedestrian experience, prioritizing pedestrian infrastructure, and reallocating space for people instead of vehicles. The city’s Municipal Code (21.06.050) currently identifies parking minimums for different land uses. Reducing or, in some cases, relieving all parking requirements is a strategy which may better align with the community’s goals of mobility and affordability, as well as reduce one of the highest costs associated with new development. Other parking strategies that warrant further study include:

- **Fee-in-lieu:** Fee-in-lieu allows a developer the choice to pay a fee into a municipal fund instead of providing on-site parking spaces required per Municipal Code. This policy is especially effective for small parcels where redevelopment may be less viable due to parking requirements. This fee can assist in financing public parking spaces or/and fund other transportation demand management and multimodal investments that will help to reduce single occupancy vehicle use.
- **Paid and time restricted parking:** Paid and time restricted parking is a management approach to shift behaviors and encourages more walking and biking.

.....

OBJECTIVE M13

Revise the parking minimum standards for different land uses to better align with the community’s goals; reducing development costs associated with excessive parking to allow for innovations, flexibility, and greater affordability.

.....





FIGURE 44: CONCEPTUAL DISPLAY OF INCREASE IN CONNECTIVITY WITH BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN CUT-THRU

CHAPTER 7.

IMPLEMENTATION & PRIORITIZATION

This section will guide the city's buildout of the future pedestrian and bicycle network through the following five elements:

1. Implement the City's Complete Streets Policy to improvements that are planned, designed, constructed, operated, and maintained to support safe, efficient and convenient mobility to all road users.
2. Performance measures to allow the community to track the plan's progress toward achieving the vision and goals set out in this plan.
3. Project prioritization to define the highest priority bicycle and pedestrian projects.
4. Incorporating implementation into routine city procedures for data maintenance and implementation of projects.
5. Federal, state, regional, and local funding opportunities.



PERFORMANCE MEASURES

This section outlines specific performance measures to track progress over time toward and provide a quantitative way to ensure that the city moves towards its defined goals.

Tracking performance measures will provide accountability and transparency to the community and provide valuable information to the city as to whether the implementation strategy should be adjusted over time. It is recommended that city staff collect data annually and publish findings through a report, dashboard, and/or via the city website. The performance measures are organized by each goal.

Equitable

Design and operate the communities' streets and right-of-way to reasonably enable convenient access and travel for people walking and biking of all ages, abilities, and income levels and prioritize improvements that benefit vulnerable users and underserved areas.

- **Metric:** Miles of bike lanes and sidewalks installed or upgraded in low-income areas (those below the median household income in Grand Junction).
- **Metric:** Number of crossings implemented or upgraded to achieve ADA compliance.

Safe

Improve perceived and real safety by reducing the level of traffic stress (LTS) and reducing bicycle and pedestrian involved crashes. Invest and implement countermeasures at and along segments of the Active Transportation High Injury Network where there are known safety challenges.

- **Metric:** Number of miles of Active Transportation Corridors that score an LTS 1 or 2.
- **Metric:** Total bicycle and pedestrian crashes.

Connected

Provide convenient access to Community Attractions and reduce the need for out of direction travel. Increase the number of direct and low-stress connections to key destinations within the city.

- **Metric:** Number of key destinations (schools, childcare facilities, healthcare facilities, grocery stores, shopping centers, parks & recreation centers, libraries & public buildings, trailheads, and bus stops) within a quarter mile of a low-stress bike facility.
- **Metric:** Miles of missing sidewalks within a half mile of key destinations (schools, childcare facilities, healthcare facilities, grocery stores, shopping centers, parks & recreation centers, libraries & public buildings, trailheads, and bus stops).

Multimodal Community

Implement infrastructure and programs that make walking and biking accessible to people of all ages and abilities throughout the city, with a focus in areas of highest need, such as serving low-income areas.

- **Metric:** Miles of bike lanes and sidewalks installed or upgraded in low-income areas (those below the median household income in Grand Junction).
- **Metric:** Number of crossings implemented or upgraded to achieve ADA compliance.

Quality

Invest in high-quality facilities that minimize the level of traffic stress experienced by travelers using the corridor and are well-maintained.

- **Metric:** Amount of funding dedicated annually for active transportation improvements that supports facility maintenance and the installation of new capital projects each year.

Project Prioritization

Prioritization Factors

The prioritization factors in **Table 6** were developed based on input from the public, Steering Committee, and city staff reflecting the community's priorities. These inputs were used to prioritize proposed bicycle and sidewalk projects into three tiers: low, medium, and high priority. For more information on the project prioritization methodology, refer to **Appendix B**.

Priorities may be amended in the future as land uses change and new growth occurs that may increase (or decrease) the priority for new connections.

TABLE 6: PRIORITIZATION FACTORS AND RELATED GOALS

Factor	Equitable	Safe	Connected	Multimodal Community	Quality
Located in low-income neighborhoods	✓				
Provides access for low-income residents	✓				
Provides access across barriers	✓		✓		
Access to bus stops	✓		✓	✓	
Frequent & severe crash locations		✓			
Has low lighting		✓			
Active Transportation Corridors			✓	✓	✓
Access to parks & recreation centers			✓		
Access to libraries & public buildings			✓		
Access to social services	✓		✓		
Access to schools			✓		
Access to childcare facilities			✓		
Access to healthcare facilities			✓		
Access to grocery stores & shopping centers			✓		
Access to trailheads			✓		

Prioritized Pedestrian Corridors

A pedestrian prioritization analysis was conducted for all roadways, regardless of whether sidewalks already exist, based on the criteria in **Table 6** and according to the methodology in **Appendix B**.

This prioritization resulted in two maps – first, of the highest priority missing sidewalks to complete (**Figure 46**), and second, of the highest priority existing sidewalks to upgrade or rehabilitate to meet ADA requirements and standards defined in this plan (**Figure 47**).

FIGURE 45: ORDER IN WHICH TO PRIORITIZE SIDEWALK PROJECTS

	High Priority	Medium Priority	Low Priority
Fill gaps in pedestrian network	1	2	3
Sidewalk, trail, or crossing rehabilitation	3	4	5

As shown in **Figure 45**, the City should first complete missing sidewalks shown in **Figure 46**, then perform priority sidewalk retrofits shown in **Figure 47** as needed. It should be noted that due to data availability, **Figure 47** shows all existing sidewalks, irrespective of sidewalk quality and buffer width. Following completion of sidewalk gaps, the city will need to determine which existing sidewalks are deficient. Within each of the six categories in **Figure 45**, the city should review and prioritize specific locations for gap completion or rehabilitation annually and on a case-by-case basis. It is also acknowledged that streets with higher speeds and volumes are in greater need of sidewalks to separate pedestrians from traffic. Thus, for each priority tier (high, medium, low), the city should additionally prioritize projects based on street classification starting with arterial streets, followed by collector streets, followed by local streets before moving on to streets in the next priority tier. Using this strategy, the city would first complete the sidewalk network on all arterial streets with missing sidewalks that are shown as high


priority in **Figure 46** followed by all collector streets with missing sidewalks that are high priority, and so on. In addition to the designated tier, decision makers should also consider the following factors that may shift when a sidewalk is completed, regardless of its tier:

- Is it part of a city street reconstruction project and designed under the City’s Complete Streets Policy?
- Is there new development and/or a property owner willing to fund sidewalk enhancements adjacent to the sidewalk location?
- How/when does this location tie into the street paving/rehabilitation schedule?
- Is the existing condition of the sidewalk posing a safety risk?
- Is there a funding source available such as a Safe Routes to School grant?
- Could partnerships be formed with local entities to perform upgrades?

OBJECTIVE E2

Prioritize locations for sidewalk gap completion or rehabilitation according to the strategy outlined in the Prioritized Pedestrian Network section.






LEGEND

Unincorporated Mesa County	Street Classification	Missing Sidewalk Priority
Urban Development Boundary	Local	Low
Railroads	Collector	Medium
Parks	Arterial	High
	Highway	

FIGURE 46: MISSING SIDEWALK PROJECT PRIORITIZATION




Grand Junction
PEDESTRIAN & BICYCLE PLAN

LEGEND

Unincorporated Mesa County	Street Classification	Sidewalk Retrofit Priority
Urban Development Boundary	Local	Low
Railroads	Collector	Medium
Parks	Arterial	High
	Highway	


FIGURE 47: SIDEWALK RETROFIT PROJECT PRIORITIZATION

Note: not all streets shown in this map will require a sidewalk retrofit. The city will evaluate each street shown in this map to determine the locations do not meet the standards in this plan and thus will require a retrofit.




Appleton

Missing Sidewalk Prioritization




Appleton

Sidewalk Retrofit Prioritization




City Center

Missing Sidewalk Prioritization




City Center

Sidewalk Retrofit Prioritization




Fruitvale

Missing Sidewalk Prioritization




Fruitvale

Sidewalk Retrofit Prioritization



Horizon

Missing Sidewalk Prioritization




LEGEND

- | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Planning Zones | Parks | Street Classification | Missing Sidewalk Priority |
| Unincorporated Mesa County | | Local | Low |
| Urban Development Boundary | | Collector | Medium |
| Railroads | | Arterial | High |
| | | Highway | |

Horizon

Sidewalk Retrofit Prioritization




LEGEND

- | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------|---|-------|---|--|
|  | Planning Zones |  | Parks | Street Classification | Sidewalk Retrofit Priority |
|  | Unincorporated Mesa County |  | |  |  Low |
|  | Urban Development Boundary |  | |  |  Medium |
|  | Railroads |  | |  |  High |
| | |  | |  | |
| | | | | Local | |
| | | | | Collector | |
| | | | | Arterial | |
| | | | | Highway | |


North West

Missing Sidewalk Prioritization




North West

Sidewalk Retrofit Prioritization




Orchard Mesa

Missing Sidewalk Prioritization




Orchard Mesa

Sidewalk Retrofit Prioritization




Pear Park

Missing Sidewalk Prioritization




Pear Park

Sidewalk Retrofit Prioritization




Redlands

Missing Sidewalk Prioritization



Redlands

Sidewalk Retrofit Prioritization



Prioritized Bicycle Network Corridors

Figure 48 illustrates the prioritization of the planned bicycle corridors in Grand Junction based on the criteria in **Table 6** and methodology in **Appendix B**.

The maps and tables by neighborhood in the Bicycle Network Plan chapter detail High, Medium, and Low Priority bike projects shown in **Figure 19** and **Figure 48**. The city will prioritize implementing the highest priority bicycle corridors first. While the city will use this prioritization to allocate fundings specifically for bicycle improvements, it is possible that opportunities will arise to implement low priority and medium priority projects sooner as part of new street construction or reconstructions projects or other opportunities. In these situations, bicycle facilities should be implemented on these corridors as defined in the Bike Network Plan.

.....


OBJECTIVE E3

Prioritize bike project locations according to the tiers established in the Prioritized Bicycle Network Map.

.....







LEGEND

- Unincorporated Mesa County
- Urban Development Boundary
- Railroads
- Parks


Street Classification

- Local
- Collector
- Arterial
- Highway

Bike Project Priority

- Low
- Medium
- High

**FIGURE 48:
BIKE PROJECT
PRIORITIZATION**



Funding Opportunities

As additional funding becomes available, the city can allocate new funding resources towards implementing currently unfunded projects. The funding landscape is competitive and often requires city departments to enter the planning phase thinking about grant requirements that will set the city up for success in being awarded grants. A critical step in obtaining external grants is having the project priorities identified in the adopted Pedestrian & Bicycle Plan.

Many of the projects in this plan could be funded by grants. It will be critical to have the projects planned, designed and “shovel ready” so that the funding can be used for implementation. In most cases, the list of external funding sources requires local matching funds. Many grants will also require the city to report on safety, equity, and sustainability performance measures—another reason to implement the data collection effort described in the prioritization section. Funding sources will continue to change between 2023 and 2050, but this section identifies grant and funding streams available as of January 2023.

This section identifies potential funding sources that supplement existing funding streams in Grand Junction. The descriptions provided for grant opportunities come from federal, state, and regional sources.

.....

OBJECTIVE Q7

Explore and pursue funding opportunities to support continual capital construction and maintenance of the projects listed in this plan.

.....

Federal

Federal Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP): Eligible projects in this category include improvements or corrections to safety issues on any local or regional public roads and trails or paths. Funded activities must be consistent with Colorado’s Strategic Highway Safety Plan. Projects are selected competitively through CDOT.

USDOT Rebuilding American Infrastructure with Sustainability and Equity (RAISE) (formerly BUILD and TIGER): Since 2009, USDOT has distributed grants for planning and capital investments in surface transportation infrastructure. Grants are awarded on a competitive basis for projects that will have a significant local or regional impact. RAISE funding can support roads, bridges, transit, rail, ports, or intermodal transportation.

FTA (Federal Transit Administration) §5307 Urbanized Area Formula Program: This program makes federal resources available to urbanized areas for transit capital and operating assistance. Urbanized areas are those areas with a population of 50,000 or more as designated by the U.S. Census Bureau.

Infrastructure for Rebuilding America (INFRA): The FAST (Fixing America’s Surface Transportation) Act established the Nationally Significant Freight and Highway Projects (NSFHP) program to provide financial assistance—competitive grants, known as INFRA grants, or credit assistance—to nationally and regionally significant freight and highway projects that align with the program goals to improve safety, efficiency and reliability of freight; improve global competitiveness; reduce highway congestion; improve connectivity; and address growing demand for freight.

State

CDOT Funding Advancements for Surface Transportation and Economic Recovery Act (FASTER): This category includes safety-related projects, such as: asset management, transportation operations, intersection and interchange improvements, and shoulder and safety-related widening, and pedestrian and bicycle facilities. Projects are advanced by local governments and selected based on priority and data within each CDOT Region.

Safe Routes to School (SRTS): This program was formed to: Enable and encourage children to

walk and bike to school; make walking and biking safer and more appealing; facilitate planning, development, and implementation of projects that improve safety, and reduce traffic, fuel consumption, and air pollution around schools. There is no longer dedicated federal SRTS funding, but the Colorado SRTS program has been continued with state funding and a local agency match requirement. This is a competitive program where projects are screened by a statewide selection advisory committee.

Great Outdoors Colorado (GOCO): Funding from the Colorado Lottery is awarded to a variety of project types, including trail projects, across the state by the GOCO Board. GOCO Board members are appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the Colorado State Senate.

Regional Priorities Program (RPP): The goal of this program is to implement regionally significant projects identified through the transportation planning process. These funds are flexible in use and are allocated to the regions by the Colorado Transportation Commission on an annual basis. The allocations are based on regional population, CDOT on-system lane miles, and CDOT on-system truck VMT.

Highway Users Tax Fund (HUTF): Revenues generated from the Road Safety Surcharge, Oversize Overweight Surcharge, Rental Car Surcharges, and late vehicle registration fees are credited to the Highway Users Tax Fund (HUTF) and distributed per statute to the Colorado Department of Transportation, counties, and municipalities.

Revitalizing Main Streets: Revitalizing Main Streets grant program, run by CDOT as a part of Colorado's COVID-19 Recovery Plan, enhances active transportation safety and strengthens the connection of people to main streets and central economic hubs. The program encourages physical activity and enhances local economic vitality in towns and cities across Colorado through funding infrastructure improvements to make walking and biking easy, yielding long-term benefits that bolster community connections.

Regional

Metropolitan Planning: Federal funds are allocated to the GVMPO to provide for a continuing, comprehensive, and cooperative (3C) transportation planning process in the region. In addition, CDOT estimates that the Grand Valley Metropolitan Planning

Organization (GVMPO) should expect to receive approximately \$168.7 million dollars in transportation funding between now and 2029 if CDOT continues to receive an additional \$500 million per year statewide for six years (\$3 billion total) above the base program amounts. These projects are identified in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

Multimodal Options Fund (MMOF): The legislation states that the Multimodal Options Fund should promote a "complete and integrated multimodal system" through objectives such as benefiting seniors, providing enhanced mobility for the disabled population, or providing safe routes to school. Local recipients are required to provide a match of project funding equal to the amount of the grant, with exemptions allowed.

Local

Community input received during this planning process indicated interest in a dedicated local funding source. Continued community involvement in the budgeting process can support establishment of this source.

Dedicated Sales Tax: Grand Junction currently has a \$.75 sales tax that funds transportation projects.

Grand Junction's Downtown Partnership (DP): The DP consists of two special districts, the Downtown Development Authority (DDA) and the Business Improvement District (BID). These two groups have the ability to fund bicycle and pedestrian amenities and facilities.

The Horizon Drive District (HDD): The HDD — Gateway to Grand Junction® — is just off I-70 at Exit 31 and adjacent to the Grand Junction Regional Airport. This beautiful and convenient entrance to the core businesses, services, and tourism resources of Grand Junction, Colorado, exemplifies the mission of the business improvement district — to build community, enhance beauty, and advocate the economic vitality of the Horizon Drive District (HDD).

Other funding options that could be considered with further analysis include public-private partnerships and private foundations. Public-private partnerships could be agreements with large employers, businesses, or services that can fund transportation projects.

Integrating Implementation with City Process

In addition to identifying a stable and reliable funding source to actively implement bicycle and pedestrian improvement processes the city can also integrate implementation with other standard procedures. This includes planning for pedestrian and bicycle facilities in all street projects and phases, including new construction, reconstruction, resurfacing, and maintenance. This means that the City approaches every transportation project and program as an opportunity to improve streets and the transportation network for all users, and work in coordination with other departments, agencies and jurisdictions.

A few recommended strategies for integrating implementation with other city procedures include:

Integrate Bicycle and Pedestrian Design in the TEDS Manual: The TEDS Manual provides standards for street design and was updated to reflect the bicycle and pedestrian design standards in this PBP. The TEDS Manual will be a key tool to implement pedestrian and bicycle improvements as part of future street construction projects.

Add Bike Detection During Signal Upgrades: The city periodically upgrades and replaces outdated traffic signals that have exceeded their useful life. When new actuated signals are installed (or upgraded) at locations where an existing or planned bicycle facility crosses the intersection bicycle detection should be added as standard practice.

Incorporate Active Transportation Improvements on Street Projects: Whenever a new street is constructed or an existing street is reconstructed sidewalk and bicycle facilities should be included as guided by this plan and in accordance with the standards in the TEDS Manual and supported by the City's Complete Streets Policy.

Maintain a Geodatabase of Active Transportation Infrastructure: Its recommended that the city maintain a geodatabase with all bicycle facilities and sidewalk locations, including widths, buffer widths, and hardscape versus softscape buffer that will be updated as improvements are made. This will make it easier for the city to track progress, evaluate conditions and network gaps, and identify and prioritize future projects.

.....

OBJECTIVE Q8

To the greatest extent practicable given budget constraints include pedestrian and bicycle facilities in all street projects and phases, including new construction, reconstruction, resurfacing, and maintenance.

.....

.....

OBJECTIVE Q9

Approach every transportation project and program as an opportunity to improve streets and the transportation network for all users, and work in coordination with other departments, agencies and jurisdictions.

.....

.....

OBJECTIVE Q10

Implement bicycle and pedestrian improvement projects by integrating with other city standard procedures.

.....



Glossary

Accessibility: The ability of a facility, product, or service to be used by people with disabilities

Active transportation: Self-propelled, human-powered transportation modes like walking or biking

Arterial: A higher capacity roadway that delivers traffic from collectors to freeways and through urban settings

Bicycle facilities: Amenities created to accommodate people bicycling; these include bicycle routes, bicycle lanes, and shared use paths

Bicycle routes: Streets with low motorized traffic volumes and speeds that use signs and pavement markings to create comfortable streets for bicyclists to share the road with people driving

Collector: A lower to moderate capacity roadway that serves to connect local street traffic with arterial roadways

Comfortable: Accommodating of and safe for users of all abilities

Complete streets: Streets that are designed to allow for convenient and comfortable travel by users of all transportation modes

Connectivity: The density of the path or road network and the directness of those links to provide travel access with minimal out of direction travel

First-last mile: The challenge of connecting passengers between their origin and a transit stop and between a transit stop and their destination

Grade separation: Separation of facilities by elevation, such as a cycletrack a few inches above

the roadway, or a pedestrian overpass or underpass

High Injury Network (HIN): The set of roadway segments that have the highest number of fatal and severe crashes

Infrastructure: Improvements that take up many forms providing amenities to the public

Level of Traffic Stress (LTS): An approach that quantifies the level of comfort felt by people walking or biking based on factors such as the speed and volumes of adjacent vehicular traffic and presence of bicycle or pedestrian facilities

Micromobility: Bikes, scooters, skateboards, and other lightweight transportation options; both electric and non-electric

Mode share: Share of people that travel by vehicle, transit, biking, walking, etc.

Multimodal: A transportation system that provides safe and convenient options for getting around by all transportation options, including walking, biking, transit, and driving

Pedestrian network: All of the components that comprise the facilities used by pedestrians, including sidewalks, mid-block and signalized crossings, and curb ramps

Performance measures: Data metrics that help track progress toward specific goals

Protected bike lanes: On-street bike lanes that have a vertical buffer (such as a curb or plastic bollard) between the bike lane and travel lane

Rapid flashing beacon: A type of pedestrian infrastructure that includes yellow diamond-shaped

signage, LED flashing lights and a clearly demarcated crosswalk to allow people walking and rolling to cross safely at key points

Road diet: Lane reduction or right-sizing (reduction of the number of general travel lanes) to add improvements for other modes

Safe Systems: An evidenced-based approach defined by FHWA to reduce fatal and severe traffic crashes

Shared mobility: Shared use of a vehicle, bicycle, or other transportation mode that allows users to access transportation services on an as-needed basis; made more common with emerging app-based on demand transportation technologies

Trail: A multiuse path that may be separated from the roadway by a wide vegetated buffer

Roller: Someone who uses a wheelchair or other assisted mobility device

Single occupancy vehicle (SOV) trips: Car trips made by a solo driver

Transit-Oriented Development (TOD): The practice of designing and planning areas where residential and commercial spaces are more conveniently connected with various forms of transportation to make communities more livable, vibrant, and accessible

Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT): The sum of all the miles driven by motor vehicles in a specific area (ex: City of Thornton) over a specific period of time (often daily)

Wayfinding: The information system, usually comprised of signs, that helps users navigate an area

APPENDIX

Appendix A:
Existing Conditions
& Needs Assessment

Appendix B:
Project Prioritization Methodology



PEDESTRIAN & BICYCLE PLAN

EXISTING CONDITIONS & NEEDS ASSESSMENT

**Prepared for:
City of Grand Junction**

December 2022

DN22-0742

FEHR  PEERS

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Summary of Relevant Plans	2
Previous Plans	2
Relevant Documents	5
Existing Pedestrian Network	9
Existing Bicycle Network	12
Level of Traffic Stress	15
What is Level of Traffic Stress (LTS)?	15
Methodology	16
Bicycle LTS	19
Pedestrian LTS.....	22
Active Transportation High Injury Network	24
What is a High Injury Network (HIN)?	24
Methodology	24
Findings.....	25
Pedestrian & Bicycle Demand	28
Community Input	28
Strava Heatmap	28
Community Engagement Findings	33
Introduction	33
Survey Results	34
Steering Committee	43
Focus Groups.....	45
Intercept Events.....	46
Walk and Bike Audits.....	48
Geographic Input	49
Summary	60
Existing Conditions Assessment	60
Community Engagement Findings	61

List of Figures

FIGURE 1: PLANNED ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION CORRIDORS MAP FROM THE 2018 GRAND JUNCTION CIRCULATION PLAN	4
FIGURE 2: SIDEWALK CONDITION EXAMPLES.....	9
FIGURE 3: EXISTING PEDESTRIAN NETWORK.....	11
FIGURE 4: EXISTING BICYCLE FACILITY TYPES IN GRAND JUNCTION.....	12
FIGURE 5: EXISTING BICYCLE NETWORK	14
FIGURE 6: BICYCLE LTS.....	15
FIGURE 7: PEDESTRIAN LTS	16
FIGURE 8: CURB CUTS AND SIDEWALK CONDITIONS ON NORTH AVENUE	18
FIGURE 9: BICYCLE LEVEL OF TRAFFIC STRESS DOWNTOWN	20
FIGURE 10: BICYCLE LEVEL OF TRAFFIC STRESS, CITYWIDE.....	21
FIGURE 11: PEDESTRIAN LEVEL OF TRAFFIC STRESS, DOWNTOWN.....	22
FIGURE 12: PEDESTRIAN LEVEL OF TRAFFIC STRESS, CITYWIDE	23
FIGURE 13: PEDESTRIAN AND CYCLIST SAFETY FINDINGS.....	25
FIGURE 14: ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION HIGH INJURY NETWORK (2016-2020)	27
FIGURE 15: STRAVA HEATMAP OF BICYCLE DEMAND, CITYWIDE (DEC 2021-NOV 2022).....	29
FIGURE 16: STRAVA HEATMAP OF BICYCLE DEMAND, CITY CORE (DEC 2021-NOV 2022).....	30
FIGURE 17: STRAVA HEATMAP OF PEDESTRIAN DEMAND, CITYWIDE (DEC 2021-NOV 2022)	31
FIGURE 18: STRAVA HEATMAP OF PEDESTRIAN DEMAND, CITY CORE (OCT 2021-SEPT 2022)	32
FIGURE 19: EXAMPLES OF COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT FOR THE PEDESTRIAN & BICYCLE PLAN	33
FIGURE 20: SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION.....	34
FIGURE 21: RESPONDENT AGE	35
FIGURE 22: RESPONDENT GENDER.....	35
FIGURE 23: PRIMARY RESPONDENT ASSOCIATION WITH GRAND JUNCTION.....	36
FIGURE 24: TYPICAL MODE OF TRANSPORTATION.....	36
FIGURE 25: CURRENT AND DESIRED WALK AND BIKE TRIP TYPES.....	37
FIGURE 26: DESIRE TO WALK AND BIKE	38
FIGURE 27: CHALLENGES WALKING AND ROLLING	38
FIGURE 28: CHALLENGES BIKING	39
FIGURE 29: VISION FOR WALKING AND BIKING IN GRAND JUNCTION (SURVEY).....	40
FIGURE 30: VISION FOR WALKING AND BIKING IN GRAND JUNCTION (OPEN HOUSE).....	40
FIGURE 31: STUDENT TRANSPORTATION CHOICES.....	41
FIGURE 32: INFRASTRUCTURE ON ROUTE TO SCHOOL.....	41
FIGURE 33: TOP CONSIDERATIONS IN STUDENT MODE CHOICE	42
FIGURE 34: MOST FREQUENT THEME OF GENERAL COMMENTS	43
FIGURE 35: INTERCEPT EVENT AT CMU MESA FEST	47

FIGURE 36: BIKE AUDIT AND WALK AUDIT	48
FIGURE 37: HEATMAP OF CURRENT WALKING AND BIKING LOCATIONS, CITYWIDE	51
FIGURE 38: HEATMAP OF CURRENT WALKING AND BIKING LOCATIONS, DOWNTOWN.....	51
FIGURE 39: HEATMAP OF DESIRED WALKING AND BIKING LOCATIONS, CITYWIDE	53
FIGURE 40: HEATMAP OF DESIRED WALKING AND BIKING LOCATIONS, DOWNTOWN.....	53
FIGURE 41: HEATMAP OF LOCATIONS RESPONDENTS FEEL UNSAFE WALKING/ROLLING, CITYWIDE	55
FIGURE 42: HEATMAP OF LOCATIONS RESPONDENTS FEEL UNSAFE WALKING/ROLLING, DOWNTOWN	55
FIGURE 43: HEATMAP OF LOCATIONS RESPONDENTS FEEL UNSAFE BIKING, CITYWIDE	57
FIGURE 44: HEATMAP OF LOCATIONS RESPONDENTS FEEL UNSAFE BIKING, DOWNTOWN	57
FIGURE 45: FLOOR MAP EXERCISE AT THE COMMUNITY OPEN HOUSE	58
FIGURE 46: IN PERSON COMMENT MAP	59

List of Tables

TABLE 1: BUFFERED BIKE LANES	17
TABLE 2: STRIPED BIKE LANES	17
TABLE 3: SIGNED BIKE ROUTES/NO FACILITY/MIXED TRAFFIC.....	17
TABLE 4: DETACHED SIDEWALKS.....	19
TABLE 5: ATTACHED SIDEWALKS.....	19
TABLE 6: INTERCEPT EVENTS	46

Introduction

This report provides a summary of the existing conditions and needs assessment of the bicycle and pedestrian network in Grand Junction, including a summary of the community outreach findings conducted as part of the *Grand Junction Pedestrian & Bicycle Plan*. The existing conditions needs assessment includes the following major components:

- Summary of Existing Relevant Plans
- Existing Pedestrian Network
- Existing Bicycle Network
- Level of Traffic Stress Analysis for Pedestrians and Bicyclists
- Active Transportation High Injury Network Analysis
- Existing Pedestrian and Bicycle Demand
- Input Received from the Community

The findings of the analysis and data summarized in this report informed strategies and recommendations in the *Pedestrian & Bicycle Plan*.

Summary of Relevant Plans

The section provides a summary of existing local and regional plans, documents, and existing technical design standards relevant to the Grand Junction Pedestrian & Bicycle Plan. These documents provide a foundation for developing the vision for active transportation in Grand Junction.

Previous Plans

ONE Grand Junction Comprehensive Plan (2020)

The city adopted the *One Grand Junction Comprehensive Plan* in 2021, as an update to the *2010 Comprehensive Plan*, addressing changes that occurred over the intermediate decade and setting strategies to guide decision-making for the next 10 to 20 years. Community input helped drive the development of the plan principles that will guide the vision for Grand Junction until 2040. *One Grand Junction* is comprised of eleven plan principles that examine current conditions and goals for the future. The Plan Principles are:

- Plan Principle 1: Collective Identity
- Plan Principle 2: Resilient and Diverse Economy
- Plan Principle 3: Responsible and Managed Growth
- Plan Principle 4: Downtown and University Districts
- Plan Principle 5: Strong Neighborhoods and Housing Choices
- Plan Principle 6: Efficient and Connected Transportation
- Plan Principle 7: Great Places and Recreation
- Plan Principle 8: Resource Stewardship
- Plan Principle 9: Quality Education and Facilities
- Plan Principle 10: Safe, Healthy, and Inclusive Community
- Plan Principle 11: Effective and Transparent Government

Plan Principle 6 outlines strategies to create an efficient, connected transportation network where Grand Junction residents have multiple convenient travel options. This principle includes numerous recommendations that will be incorporated within the *Pedestrian & Bicycle Plan*:

- Balance all modes in decision-making by the city
- Continue implementation of the Complete Streets Policy, with priority given to projects near schools, employment corridors, bus stops, Active Transportation Corridors and other key destinations; and specific infrastructure such as sidewalks, bike lanes, protected intersections, pedestrian bridges and underpasses, and median islands
- Reduce severe crashes by providing safe, healthy, and equitable mobility for all users and modes
- Improve first and last mile connections to transit
- Encourage bicycle commuting by requiring bike parking, lockers, and/or shower facilities with development

- Implement better wayfinding

Finally, the development of this *Pedestrian & Bicycle Plan* fulfills the recommendation to establish such a plan to prioritize pedestrian and bicycle projects in Grand Junction.

Grand Junction Circulation Plan (2018)

The Grand Junction Circulation Plan was developed in coordination with the city's comprehensive planning process and updated in 2018. The plan sets forth transportation principles, strategies, and vision that will improve access to jobs, healthcare, goods, services, recreation, and other community amenities. The plan includes numerous maps to guide future planning efforts.

The Network Map is a conceptual view of the community from an overall "30,000 foot" vantage point that identifies important corridors and linkages connecting centers, neighborhoods, and community attractions. It is implemented through capital construction of streets, sidewalks and trail infrastructure.

As a part of the *Circulation Plan*, the city also identified Active Transportation Corridors important for non-motorized travel (shown in **Figure 1**). The Active Transportation Corridors Map replaces the *Urban Trails Master Plan*, adopted by the city in 2001.

These corridors will create Grand Junction's backbone active transportation network, improving comfort for people walking, rolling, and biking as the city upgrades or completes pedestrian and bicycle facilities. The intent of this map is to establish a complete, connected network of sidewalks, bike lanes, and trails that connects communities across Grand Junction via existing and planned infrastructure.




FIGURE 1: PLANNED ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION CORRIDORS MAP FROM THE 2018 GRAND JUNCTION CIRCULATION PLAN

Active transportation corridors total 275 miles, with 236 miles along the road, 24 miles along canal corridors, and 15 miles along drainage ways. The Active Transportation Corridors can accommodate users on the road network or separate trail. The city will need to construct any future routes along canals, ditches, and drainage corridors in cooperation with property owners and those holding other use and/or easement rights.

The Pedestrian & Bicycle Plan will refine this network to ensure it reflects the community's current network vision and improves access to key destinations. The updated Active Transportation Corridors will be the vision for the future bike network and key pedestrian corridors in Grand Junction.

Grand Valley Regional Transportation Plan (2020)

The *Grand Valley 2045 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)* was adopted to maintain the region's transportation system, ensure the efficient movement of people and goods, and support future growth and development. The RTP is anchored by goal statements for active transportation, transit, regional roadways, safety, freight, funding, and maintenance. The active transportation goal is to "foster active transportation by providing a regionally connected network of low-stress facilities that are safe for people walking and biking."

To support this goal, the plan outlines strategies to guide practitioners on how to prioritize active transportation projects:

- Prioritize on-street projects that connect to the Grand Valley's existing and planned off-street multi-use path network.
- Identify new opportunities for regional travel on foot or bicycle that supplement the *Circulation Plan* by identifying gaps in the off-street multi-use path network that connect major population centers, major employment centers, parks, and public lands across the Grand Valley.
- Improve the pedestrian and bicycle experience by prioritizing sidewalks, bike facilities, and crossings that connect to bus stops, parks, schools, grocery stores, and public lands.
- Prioritize implementation of active transportation facilities on corridors that provide comfortable and low-stress connections for the first-last mile gaps between transit stops and key destinations, including parks and public land trailheads.

Relevant Documents

Complete Streets Policy (2018)

The city adopted a Complete Streets Policy in 2018 to encourage street design that enables safe use and mobility for people of all ages and abilities, whether they are traveling as pedestrians, bicyclists, transit riders, or drivers. It also sets context-sensitive design standards and approaches for all construction and reconstruction of the city's transportation system. These standards will be consulted during the development of the *Pedestrian & Bicycle Plan* and *Transportation Engineering Design Standards (TEDS) Manual Update* that will guide recommendations on how to improve implementation of the policy.

The vision of the Complete Streets Policy is to develop a safe, efficient, and reliable travel network of streets, sidewalks, and urban trails throughout Grand Junction. The transportation strategies identified in the comprehensive plan and *Circulation Plan* will help the community achieve its complete streets vision. The purpose of the Complete Streets Policy is to expand everyone's travel choices, particularly safe and convenient mode options. Safety, including a reduction in hazards for pedestrians and bicyclists is a main driver of the Policy. To meet the vision of the Complete Streets Policy, the city established a series of complete street principles and context sensitive design standards to determine priority investments to guide implementation.

The policy is applicable to all development and redevelopment in the public realm within the City of Grand Junction. It applies to the work of all city departments and other entities working within the public right-of-way. In addition, it is intended to guide all private development that affects streets, the transportation system, and the public realm. The city outlined performance measures in the areas of safety, access, and health and environment to track the success of the policy. The city can collect and analyze data such as crashes, the number of Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant curb ramps, and the percentage of students who walk or bike to school to measure policy success. To ensure implementation of the policy, Grand Junction aims to integrate it with other existing and new policies, transportation projects, and consistently throughout departments.

Transportation and Engineering Design Standards (TEDS) Manual

The *TEDS Manual* provides the teeth for implementation of bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure around the city. It guides developers and city engineers on how to design new and reconstructed streets, the impacts of which will be felt for many generations. Fehr & Peers is concurrently helping the city update the pedestrian and bicycle components of the *TEDS Manual* in tandem with the development of the new *Pedestrian & Bicycle Plan*, to ensure cohesive guidance in both documents.

Updates may include better transit stop design guidance, pedestrian and bicycle crossing guidelines, street cross sections, and more. This will support implementation of the *Pedestrian & Bicycle Plan*, while considering the context of Grand Junction's existing street network and environment.

Grand Junction Fire Code

Ordinance Number 4830 prescribes regulations governing conditions hazardous to life and property from fire, explosion, and chemical release. Grand Junction's *TEDS Manual* is responsible for the design standards of dead-end fire apparatus road turnarounds. Additionally, all residential and commercial/industrial cul-de-sac designs shall adhere to *TEDS Manual*. Design standard requirements will be reviewed and updated in accordance with the latest guidance.

Zoning and Development Code

Grand Junction is in the process of updating their zoning code to better reflect the goals and policies described in the *ONE Grand Junction Comprehensive Plan*, especially those key principles related to responsible and managed growth and strong neighborhoods and housing choices. The following sections have existing design practices, mostly along North Avenue that will be reflected in the *TEDS Manual* update.

- **Section 32.48.030 Designing Street Intersections** - Design of intersections should follow AASHTO's guide for the Planning, Design and Operation of Pedestrian Facilities. Community input identified that safety is needed for cyclists and pedestrians without impeding traffic.
- **Section 32.48.0070 Curb Cut Consolidation** - To reduce curb cuts along North Avenue, at the time of redevelopment curb cuts will be consolidated.
- **Section 32.48.100 Transit** - All transit stops on North Avenue should be off-street pull-outs. Bus shelters should be incorporated at higher use transit stop locations.

Vibrant Together: A Downtown Initiative

The Downtown Development Authority launched this effort to build upon the successes of the *1981 Plan of Development* and identify a new vision for downtown Grand Junction that aligns with the needs of the community. *Vibrant Together* sets five main goals for identity, downtown development, vibrancy, connectivity, and safety and comfort. To bring more people downtown and better link it with the river, the plan identifies three main strategies to improve connectivity, placemaking, and infill development. Strategies around connectivity will be relevant to this planning effort and they include:

- Convert 4th and 5th to two-way streets
- Prioritize pedestrian and bike improvements to improve mobility throughout downtown and to the river

- Create a 2nd Street Promenade connecting the Train Depot to Two Rivers Plaza
- Initiate a gateway and wayfinding study to improve ease of navigation for people walking, biking, and driving downtown

Horizon Drive Business Improvement District Trails Master Plan

The Horizon Drive District is a business improvement district that uses a fee on its member businesses along Horizon Drive, a major gateway to the city, to make capital investments in the corridor. They stimulate business in this area through beautification projects, transportation improvements, and promotion of tourism.

The trails plan recommends aligning the existing trail network with businesses along Horizon Drive to increase connectivity for pedestrians. Proposed future trail additions to the BID network use the canal trail and are contingent upon the canal trail loop completion, construction of which would occur in phases beginning with the South West Loop. Art installations, workout stations, rest areas, and other amenities would anchor each loop. The plan documents drainageway conditions and constraints as well as graphic examples of alignments. New recommendations for trails in this area will consider the suggestions already made in this plan.

Bicycle Friendly Community Designation

The League of American Bicyclists recognized Grand Junction as a bronze-level Bicycle Friendly Community in 2018. A bronze designation recognizes the great trails and bikeways that have been established over the years and gives the city some additional goals to work toward. Grand Junction performs well in many performance criteria but has room for improvement in the categories of engineering, education, encouragement, enforcement, and evaluation and planning. Recommended steps for Grand Junction to achieve a higher designation include:

- Prioritize planned projects and a reporting mechanism for the community to follow progress on infrastructure improvements.
- Increase the amount of high quality, Association of Professional Bicycle Professionals (APBP)-compliant bicycle parking.
- Launch a public bike share system.
- Expand the audience for educational programs to include high school students, college students, and new drivers.
- Host a League Cycling Instructor (LCI) seminar to increase the number of local LCIs.
- Develop a community-wide trip reduction ordinance/program, incentive program, and/or a Guaranteed Ride Home program to encourage and support bike commuters.
- Encourage more local businesses, agencies, and organizations to promote biking to their employees and customers and to seek recognition as a Bicycle Friendly Business.
- Develop a bike patrol unit to improve bicyclist/officer relations, and ensure that all law enforcement officers have basic training or experience with biking.
- Adopt a comprehensive road safety plan or a Vision Zero policy.
- Formalize a Bicycle & Pedestrian Coordinator position.

Walk Friendly Community Report Card

Grand Junction applied for and failed to receive a Walk Friendly Communities designation from Walk Friendly Communities. The *Walk Friendly Community Report Card* identified the Urban Trails Committee, ADA transition plan, and collection of pedestrian and bicycle counts as positive progress in the community. Grand Junction is on the right track in planning and engineering efforts, but areas that need attention are education/encouragement, enforcement, and evaluation of metrics. Grand Junction has the potential to become a Walk Friendly Community through the following steps:

- Formalize a Bicycle & Pedestrian Coordinator position.
- Establish a pedestrian safety action plan with performance targets and metrics.
- Set mode share and safety goals.
- Reform parking policy via parking maximums or absence of minimums.
- Continue implementing Complete Streets Policy.
- Expand Safe Routes to School Program.
- Educate staff on walking, walkability, and pedestrian safety.
- Improve bicycle and pedestrian wayfinding.
- Maintain and complete the sidewalk network.
- Establish concrete design guidelines.
- Enforce in areas with high pedestrian volumes/safety issues and consider automated enforcement.
- Increase share of enforcement that occurs on foot or bike.
- Establish permanent bicycle and pedestrian count locations.
- Perform regular safety evaluation of completed projects.

Existing Pedestrian Network

The existing pedestrian network map in **Figure 3** shows which streets in the Grand Junction planning area currently have an attached sidewalk, detached sidewalk, or no sidewalk on either side of the street. Examples of each of these walkway conditions are shown in **Figure 2**.



FIGURE 2: SIDEWALK CONDITION EXAMPLES

Conditions supportive of pedestrians include wide and smooth sidewalks, a buffer zone between the sidewalk and roadway (particularly vertical buffers like landscaping and street furniture, which also provide shade and places to sit), accessible curb ramps at corners, a gridded street network, and shorter block lengths. While the first few factors are more straightforward, shorter blocks and gridded streets (or at least streets with numerous connections north-south and east-west) provide more route options and allow people walking and rolling to choose more direct paths between destinations.

The condition of the existing pedestrian network in Grand Junction varies considerably by location in the city. Many of the major streets in Grand Junction currently have a sidewalk, but there are notable gaps as well across the city. The pedestrian environment in the core of the city around downtown is dominated by relatively short blocks, a gridded street network, and importantly, detached sidewalks that make the area generally more comfortable to pedestrians than other parts of the city. Other high-comfort facilities for pedestrians include the relatively robust trail network through Grand Junction, currently confined mostly to the Colorado River corridor.

Many parts of the city outside the historic core lack direct connections through neighborhoods and these areas more commonly feature attached sidewalks or no sidewalks.

Street characteristics like roadway width, speed, and volume, affect the comfort of someone walking or rolling on an attached sidewalk. Missing sidewalks in neighborhoods and commercial areas can pose a significant barrier to choosing to walk for even short trips. These areas of missing sidewalks, along with major arterials with uncomfortable and inaccessible sidewalks and roadway crossings, create broad gaps in the pedestrian network and prevent residents from choosing to walk downtown or elsewhere.

As shown in **Figure 3**, notable major streets with sections of narrow or missing sidewalks include, but are not limited to:

- North Avenue
- Patterson Road
- 24 Road (over US 50/US 6)
- 28 Road
- 9th Street (south of downtown)
- Several key connections in the Orchard Mesa Neighborhood, such as US 50, B ½ Road, 27 Road, and 28 ½ Road.

Many comments received from the public reflect a desire to improve pedestrian and bicycle crossings of the Colorado River, US 50, and the railroad tracks. These features represent significant barriers for people walking and biking between neighborhoods on either side, especially for people connecting from the Redlands, Orchard Mesa, and the Riverfront Trail to Downtown, Colorado Mesa University (CMU), and Mesa Mall. As shown in **Figure 3**, this is amplified by the fact that there are only a few streets or paths that connect across the river and railroad, including:

- Redlands Parkway/24 Road
- Broadway
- 5th Street (US 50)
- 7th Street/9th Street/the multi-use trail bridge at Eagle Rim Park
- 29 Road

Of these crossings, 24 Road and 9th Street lack sidewalks and bicycle facilities. Numerous commenters suggested the opportunity and value of installing new connections that would provide greater redundancy in the active transportation network and improve access across these barriers. These include 12th Street, 28 Road, and 2nd Street from downtown to Dos Rios.

Grand Junction
PEDESTRIAN & BICYCLE PLAN

LEGEND	Major Street with Narrow or Missing Sidewalks	River, Railroad, or Highway Crossing
Urban Development Boundary	Existing Pedestrian Facilities	Street Classification
Unincorporated Mesa County	Detached Sidewalk	Local
Parks	Attached Sidewalk	Collector
Railroads	Missing Sidewalk	Arterial
Planned Active Transportation Corridors	Trail	Highway
Schools		




FIGURE 3: EXISTING PEDESTRIAN NETWORK

Existing Bicycle Network

The current bicycle network in Grand Junction consists of shared streets that are signed bike routes, striped bike lanes (including two streets with buffered bike lanes – 1st Street and East Main Street), and trails. Figure 4 shows examples in Grand Junction of each of these facility types and a map of the existing bike network is provided in Figure 5.



FIGURE 4: EXISTING BICYCLE FACILITY TYPES IN GRAND JUNCTION


One of the city’s most used facilities and a key asset for bicycle mobility across the city is the Riverfront Trail that parallels the Colorado River, generally running east–west. Most of the existing bike facilities overlap with the city’s designated Active Transportation Corridors. However, the existing bike network is disconnected in many places. Most of the Active Transportation Corridors currently lack bike facilities, and in many parts of the city multi-use trails, bike lanes and bike routes on low volume streets end abruptly. Key gaps in the bike network include, but are not limited to, sections of: 7th Street and 12th Street, North Avenue, Patterson Road, 24 Road, and Orchard Avenue.

Additionally, some locations with existing bike facilities are not sufficient to provide a comfortable experience for cyclists given the characteristics of the street. Generally, the highest-comfort facilities for people biking are detached trails and buffered or protected bike lanes. Like attached sidewalks, the comfort of striped bike lanes depends on street characteristics including roadway width, speed, and volume. Since they provide minimal space between someone biking and vehicle traffic, this type of facility can be adequate on a low-volume neighborhood street, but is less comfortable on a major arterial. Many of the streets in Grand Junction with existing bike lanes are not wide enough or do not provide enough separation from traffic to provide a comfortable experience for bicyclists given the volume and speed of traffic. Notable examples include Patterson Road, 12th Street, 28 ¼ Road, and parts of 29 Road and D Road. Signed bike routes are useful

wayfinding for people biking and signal the presence of cyclists to people driving, but depending on the volume and speed of traffic and treatments at major crossing, signed facilities alone may not provide a comfortable facility for bicyclists.

Like the pedestrian network, many comments from the public reflect a desire to improve major crossings of the Colorado River, US 50, and the railroad tracks. Access to the Riverfront Trail emerged as an important value to the community for bicyclists and can be difficult to get to by bike from the north, including from downtown/CMU, and the Mesa Mall due to the limited number of crossings. Of the five crossings identified in the Pedestrian Section, 24 Road, 5th Street¹, and 9th Street lack bicycle facilities, and 29 Road crossings does not provide a high comfort facility.

¹ Along the 5th Street crossing, the sidewalk narrows to 6' places, and because a sidewalk must be at least 8' wide (and ideally 10' to 12') to be considered a multiuse trail, the 5th Street overpass is not considered an existing bicycle facility.



Grand Junction
PEDESTRIAN & BICYCLE PLAN

LEGEND

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Urban Development Boundary □ Unincorporated Mesa County ■ Parks — Railroads — Planned Active Transportation Corridors ● Schools 	<p>Existing Bicycle Facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Signed Bike Route — Striped Bike Lane — Buffered Bike Lane — Trail 	<p>Street Classification</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Local — Collector — Arterial — Highway
--	---	---

FIGURE 5: EXISTING BICYCLE NETWORK

Level of Traffic Stress

What is Level of Traffic Stress (LTS)?

Walking and biking comfort along roadways in the City of Grand Junction was measured using a modified version of the Level of Traffic Stress (LTS) criteria and scoring system developed by Mekuria, Furth, and Nixon (2012) in *Low Stress Cycling and Network Connectivity*.²



FIGURE 6: BICYCLE LTS

The LTS system assigns a street a score from 1 to 4 based on a combination of factors. An LTS of 1 indicates the most comfortable, least stressful facility that accommodates people of all ages and abilities – one which a child could comfortably walk or bike, for example (Figure 6). An LTS of 4 indicates the least comfortable, most stressful facility that most people would avoid using – one in which only a very “strong and fearless” cyclist would ride (less than 1% of the population). An LTS 2 facility is also relatively low stress and accommodating, while a facility with an LTS of 3 would be an environment that those familiar with biking and willing to accept a slightly more stressful environment might choose. LTS 3 facilities cater to “enthused and confident” cyclists, roughly 7% of the population, while LTS 2 facilities cater to “interested but concerned” riders, roughly 60% of the population.³

² Mekuria, M., Furth, P., & Nixon, H. (2012). *Low Stress Cycling and Network Connectivity*. *Mineta Transportation Institute*. Retrieved from <https://peterfurth.sites.northeastern.edu/2014/05/21/criteria-for-level-of-traffic-stress/>.

³ Geller R. (2006). *Four Types of Cyclists*. *Portland Bureau of Transportation*. Retrieved from <http://www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation/article/264746>.




FIGURE 7: PEDESTRIAN LTS

Similar to the Bicycle LTS, the Pedestrian LTS system also ranks pedestrian facilities on a scale from 1 to 4, with LTS 1 representing the most comfortable, least stressful facility that accommodates children, older adults, people with mobility challenges, parents with strollers, and everyone between; while LTS 4 facilities may only be used by the most fearless walkers (Figure 7).

Methodology

Bicycle LTS

The LTS methodology considers the type of bicycle facility, presence of a parking lane, travel lane width, traffic speed, number of lanes, and traffic volumes on a roadway segment to score bike paths, bike lanes with and without buffers, and bike routes. Intersection crossings are not factored into the analysis due to data availability. The criteria shown in Table 1 through Table 3 simplifies the latest 2022 LTS tables to account for available data in Grand Junction (data on presence of a parking lane and travel lane widths are unavailable). Data for each of these attributes was collected and coded for each roadway segment in the city, then the LTS was calculated in GIS.

Using the LTS methodology, multi-use paths and trails, raised cycle tracks, and protected bike lanes are automatically given a score of 1.

For bike lanes and other types of facilities, scores depend on the number of lanes, posted speed limits, and average daily traffic (ADT), as shown in Table 1 through Table 3.

TABLE 1: BUFFERED BIKE LANES

	25	30	35	40	45	50
5-6 lanes	LTS 3	LTS 3	LTS 3	LTS 4	LTS 4	LTS 4
3-4 lanes	LTS 2	LTS 2	LTS 2	LTS 3	LTS 3	LTS 3
1-2 lanes	LTS 1	LTS 1	LTS 2	LTS 3	LTS 3	LTS 3

TABLE 2: STRIPED BIKE LANES

		25	30	35	40	45	50
5-6 lanes		LTS 3	LTS 3	LTS 3	LTS 4	LTS 4	LTS 4
3-4 lanes		LTS 2	LTS 3	LTS 3	LTS 3	LTS 4	LTS 4
1-2 lanes	ADT >1000	LTS 2	LTS 2	LTS 2	LTS 3	LTS 3	LTS 4
	ADT ≤1000	LTS 1	LTS 2	LTS 2	LTS 3	LTS 3	LTS 4

TABLE 3: SIGNED BIKE ROUTES/NO FACILITY/MIXED TRAFFIC

	ADT	20	25	30	35	40	45
5-6 lanes	Any	LTS 3	LTS 3	LTS 4	LTS 4	LTS 4	LTS 4
3-4 lanes	>8000	LTS 3	LTS 3	LTS 4	LTS 4	LTS 4	LTS 4
	≤8000	LTS 3	LTS 3	LTS 3	LTS 3	LTS 4	LTS 4
1-2 lanes	>3000	LTS 2	LTS 2	LTS 3	LTS 3	LTS 4	LTS 4
	1001-3000	LTS 2	LTS 2	LTS 2	LTS 3	LTS 3	LTS 4
	≤1000	LTS 1	LTS 1	LTS 2	LTS 2	LTS 3	LTS 3

A few streets in the network were also manually rescored based on local understanding of roadway conditions, such as frequent curb cuts and driveways, or other uncomfortable features, as shown in Figure 8. These manual reclassifications include Pitkin Avenue (LTS 4), Ute Avenue (LTS 4), and parts of North Avenue (LTS 4).



FIGURE 8: CURB CUTS AND SIDEWALK CONDITIONS ON NORTH AVENUE

Pedestrian LTS

The Pedestrian LTS methodology used in Grand Junction is a modified version of the criteria used in StreetScore+, a tool developed by Fehr & Peers to assess people’s comfort walking and biking along a street. StreetScore+ is a streamlined method for assessing Level of Traffic Stress for people walking and biking and includes more factors than a traditional LTS analysis (such as sidewalk width, sidewalk quality, buffer width, and other factors). Unfortunately, the city’s sidewalk data was limited, but the Grand Junction Safe Routes to School program already developed a sidewalk layer that considers whether sidewalks are detached, attached, or missing.

The pedestrian LTS methodology shown in **Table 4** and

Table 5 considers sidewalk type, number of lanes, and posted speed limits. Data for each of these attributes was collected and coded for each roadway segment in the city, then the LTS was calculated in GIS.

Using the LTS methodology, multi-use paths and trails are automatically given a score of 1.

TABLE 4: DETACHED SIDEWALKS

	LTS 1	LTS 2	LTS 3	LTS 4
Lanes	2-3		4-5	6
Speed limit	25	30	35	40+

TABLE 5: ATTACHED SIDEWALKS

	LTS 1	LTS 2	LTS 3	LTS 4
Lanes	2-3		4-5	6
Speed limit	20	25	30	35+


When applying the standard LTS methodology, streets with missing sidewalks would typically be classified as LTS 4. The methodology was modified for Grand Junction based on input from city staff and members of the Steering Committee, to reflect that narrow, low speed, low traffic volume neighborhood streets are viewed as relatively comfortable spaces to walk, even in the street. Furthermore, in many of these locations there is not a desire by the residents of the community to add sidewalks to preserve the narrow, rural nature of the street.

Using the LTS methodology, streets with missing sidewalks are automatically given a score of 4 UNLESS 1-2 lanes, ADT ≤1000 and speed ≤25 mph – then scored LTS 2.

Bicycle LTS

Figure 9 and Figure 10 show the Grand Junction street network and trails classified by bicycle LTS. Active Transportation Corridors are shown with thicker lines on the map. Most local neighborhood streets are classified as LTS 1 facilities due to having fewer lanes and slower speeds. However, the Active Transportation Corridors, often score more poorly (LTS 3 or 4) where they lack adequate bicycle facilities. This is because

many of these corridors are higher speed, higher volume streets where bicyclists need more separation from traffic to have a low-stress experience.



LEGEND

- Urban Development Boundary
- Unincorporated Mesa County
- Parks
- Railroads
- Schools

- Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress
Active Transportation Corridors**
- LTS 1
 - LTS 2
 - LTS 3
 - LTS 4

- Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress
Street Network**
- LTS 1
 - LTS 2
 - LTS 3
 - LTS 4

FIGURE 9: BICYCLE LEVEL OF TRAFFIC STRESS DOWNTOWN

Grand Junction
PEDESTRIAN & BICYCLE PLAN

LEGEND

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▭ Urban Development Boundary ▭ Unincorporated Mesa County ▭ Parks — Railroads ● Schools 	<p>Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress Active Transportation Corridors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — LTS 1 — LTS 2 — LTS 3 — LTS 4 	<p>Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress Street Network</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — LTS 1 — LTS 2 — LTS 3 — LTS 4
---	--	---





FIGURE 10: BICYCLE LEVEL OF TRAFFIC STRESS, CITYWIDE

Pedestrian LTS


Figure 11 and Figure 12 show the Grand Junction street network and trails classified by Pedestrian LTS. Many local neighborhood streets lack sidewalks but are classified as LTS 2 facilities because they are low volume, low speed, narrow neighborhood streets. However, Active Transportation Corridors, many of which are higher speed, higher volume, wider arterials, score more poorly where they lack adequate pedestrian facilities, such as a sufficiently wide sidewalk with a buffer.



LEGEND

Urban Development Boundary	Pedestrian Level of Traffic Stress
Unincorporated Mesa County	LTS 1
Parks	LTS 2
Railroads	LTS 3
Schools	LTS 4

FIGURE 11: PEDESTRIAN LEVEL OF TRAFFIC STRESS, DOWNTOWN



Grand Junction
PEDESTRIAN & BICYCLE PLAN

LEGEND

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▭ Urban Development Boundary ▭ Unincorporated Mesa County ▭ Parks — Railroads ⊙ Schools 	<p>Pedestrian Level of Traffic Stress</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — LTS 1 — LTS 2 — LTS 3 — LTS 4
---	---

FIGURE 12: PEDESTRIAN LEVEL OF TRAFFIC STRESS, CITYWIDE

Active Transportation High Injury Network

What is a High Injury Network (HIN)?

A high injury network (HIN) is a network of streets in a community where the highest concentrations of fatal and severe injury traffic crashes have occurred. A HIN is created through the mapping of crash data to visually recognize spatial patterns. It is an important tool used in many Vision Zero plans to assist communities in prioritizing street safety projects that will have the greatest impact in improving traffic safety. Traditionally, HINs represent all crashes, and have been utilized in dozens of communities across the country and around the world to prioritize traffic safety improvements.

This effort developed an Active Transportation HIN map for Grand Junction to illustrate the streets where a disproportionately high number of citywide crashes involving people walking or biking have occurred. The Active Transportation HIN in Grand Junction will be used as one means to prioritize safety projects and buildout of the pedestrian and bike network.

Methodology

The Active Transportation HIN in the Grand was created using crash data from 2016 to 2020. During this time there were 347 reported crashes within Grand Junction involving a pedestrian or cyclist (**Figure 13**). The HIN was developed using an iterative process that started with developing a series of maps based on the crash data:

- A crash mode map, which distinguished the crashes between those involving a pedestrian and those involving a cyclist. In total, there were 125 crashes involving a pedestrian and 222 crashes involving a cyclist during the study period (**Figure 13**). Overall, this map visualizes the spatial distribution of each type of crash to ensure that the HIN represented both pedestrian and cyclist-involved crashes.
- A heat map that showed the concentration of individual crash points across Grand Junction. This map highlights specific nodes of crashes, such as the intersections near North Avenue with 12th Street and near Main Street with 5th Street.
- A heat map by road segment, which paired individual crashes with the existing road network to visualize a raw, data-driven high injury network. The result of pairing the crashes to the small road segments (about one block length) was a preliminary HIN.

Each map illustrated crash trends through a slightly different analytical perspective, which helped inform the HIN. The Active Transportation HIN was drawn based on this initial set of maps to represent the corridors with the highest concentration of pedestrian and cyclist-involved crashes.

Findings

Between 2016 and 2020 there were 347 crashes in Grand Junction involving a person walking or biking, an average of one every 5 – 6 days, including 222 cyclist-involved crashes and 125 pedestrian-involved crashes. Forty-two of these crashes (about 13%) resulted in severe bodily injury or death (Figure 13).





FIGURE 13: PEDESTRIAN AND CYCLIST SAFETY FINDINGS

The Active Transportation HIN map is shown in Figure 14, and represents streets where a disproportionately high number of citywide crashes involving people walking or biking have occurred.

About 84% of all pedestrian and cyclist-involved crashes occurred on just 5% of city streets, which are identified as part of the Active Transportation High Injury Network.

In addition to the Active Transportation HIN, this map also illustrates the location where all 347 pedestrian and cyclist-involved crashes occurred in the city between 2016 and 2020.



Grand Junction
PEDESTRIAN & BICYCLE PLAN

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Urban Development Boundary □ Unincorporated Mesa County ■ Parks — Railroads — High Injury Network ● Schools 	<p>Bicycle and Pedestrian Crashes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 1 Crash ● 2 Crashes ● 3 Crashes ● 4 Crashes ● 5 Crashes 	<p>Street Classification</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Local — Collector — Arterial — Highway
--	--	---

FIGURE 14: ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION HIGH INJURY NETWORK (2016-2020)

Pedestrian & Bicycle Demand

This section summarizes analysis of existing pedestrian and bicycle activity and demand in Grand Junction. Existing demand was estimated using two sources of data:

- Input from the community through the online interactive map (which included over 1,000 comments) and the community open house (which drew about 80 attendees).
- From Big Data sources through Strava, which is a mobile app used by people walking, running, and biking.

Community Input

For a summary of community input on areas of significant pedestrian and bicycle demand, refer to Community Engagement Findings: Geographic Input.

Strava Heatmap

Strava is a mobile app that enables users to track physical exercise including biking, running, hiking, and walking using GPS. The platform records these trips and allows users to share their activities. Users of the platform track recreational activities, but a growing share of users are tagging their activity as commutes. In many cities commutes are the primary activity recorded on Strava.

Through all of these public recordings, Strava collects data on origin-destination patterns and popular routes and corridors, aggregating and deidentifying unique users. They publish a publicly-available Global Heatmap similar to the images shown in **Figure 15** through **Figure 18**, and share some additional data with transportation planning firms by request through an application for Strava Metro access. The data in the maps in **Figure 15** through **Figure 18** cannot be downloaded, but readers interested in exploring the data in greater detail can do so at <https://Strava.com/heatmap>.

Transportation planners recognize the value of this anonymized data to better understand pedestrian and bicycle demand in a transportation network. It should be acknowledged that there is an inherent bias in the data as it represents primarily recreational trips and all trips represented were made by users of the app, which is a small percentage of all walk and bike trips. However, the data is still useful as it can offer a proxy for larger active transportation patterns. For example, people walking and biking for recreation often choose routes along streets that feel more comfortable and safe, in a way similar to people walking and biking for utilitarian reasons.

The data shows that bicycle demand by Strava users is concentrated along key regional and recreational connections including Monument Road, the Riverfront Trail, C1/2 Road, K Road, I Road, and H Road (Figure 15).




FIGURE 15: STRAVA HEATMAP OF BICYCLE DEMAND, CITYWIDE (DEC 2021-NOV 2022)

In the core of the city the data shows that bicycle demand by Strava users is noticeable at key river and railroad crossings like Broadway/CO-340, 25 Road, 29 Road, 7th Street, and 9th Street. These crossings are key connections to access the Riverfront Trail and the downtown core. This data shows that people biking choose to avoid the 5th Street crossing, instead opting for Broadway, the multi-use trail bridge at West Main Street, 7th Street, and 9th Street to cross the railroad tracks, and Broadway and the multi-use trail bridge at Eagle Rim Park to cross the Colorado River.

Popular north-south corridors include 25 Road, 25 ½ Road, 1st Street, 7th Street, 10th Street, 15th Street (north of Patterson Road), and 29 Road (Figure 16). Frequent east-west corridors include Orchard Avenue, Elm Avenue, Gunnison Avenue, Grand Avenue, Main Street, Riverside Parkway, and C ½ Road. Bicycle activity by Strava users is conspicuously absent from the heatmap on Patterson Road and North Avenue. This may be due to the high bicycle Level of Traffic Stress on these roads, influenced by the number of lanes, higher speeds, and higher volumes on these roads, with relatively narrow sidewalks, directly attached in many places to the roadway.




FIGURE 16: STRAVA HEATMAP OF BICYCLE DEMAND, CITY CORE (DEC 2021-NOV 2022)

Citywide pedestrian demand by Strava users is concentrated along key regional and recreational connections including Monument Road, the Riverfront Trail, C 1/2 Road, K Road, I Road, and H Road (Figure 17).




FIGURE 17: STRAVA HEATMAP OF PEDESTRIAN DEMAND, CITYWIDE (DEC 2021-NOV 2022)

In the core of the city, pedestrian demand by Strava users is concentrated at key river and railroad crossings like Broadway, 25 Road, 7th Street, and 9th Street (Figure 18). These crossings are key connections to access the Riverfront Trail and the downtown core. This data shows that people walking choose to avoid the 5th Street and 29 Road crossing as compared to the other crossings, particularly 7th Street, the most popular route across the railroad tracks for pedestrians.

Popular north-south corridors include 7th Street, 10th Street, and 12th Street. Common east-west corridors for pedestrians include Orchard Avenue, Elm Avenue, Gunnison Avenue, Main Street, Riverside Parkway, and C ½ Road.




FIGURE 18: STRAVA HEATMAP OF PEDESTRIAN DEMAND, CITY CORE (OCT 2021-SEPT 2022)

Community Engagement Findings

Introduction

The following sections summarize input gathered through the project's first round of community engagement. The public submitted input during the first round over a two-month period in September and October 2022 through an online survey and interactive map, an in-person open house, a 17-member project Steering Committee of Grand Junction residents, through nine different focus groups, at several intercept events throughout the community, and from comments received on the project website. All input tied to specific locations is summarized in the Geographic Input section. **Figure 20** provides a summary of all community engagement and participation, which resulted in over 2,000 touch points with the community combined.



FIGURE 19: EXAMPLES OF COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT FOR THE PEDESTRIAN & BICYCLE PLAN




FIGURE 20: SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

Survey Results

The city opened the online survey for two months, from the end of August to end of October, and advertised it to the entire community. It offered an option for respondents to take the survey in Spanish. A total of 669 members of the community participated in the survey, including four in Spanish. The survey results are summarized below.

Demographic Characteristics

Survey respondents skewed toward the older side of the spectrum, with 38% identifying as 55 years or older and 9% as 25 or younger (Figure 21). The majority of respondents (53%) fell somewhere between 26 and 54. The age breakdown of survey respondents generally reflected the population of Grand Junction, with a slight bias toward people aged 36-55 and slight underrepresentation of people under 26 (acknowledging that young children are not going to be represented by themselves in this survey).




FIGURE 21: RESPONDENT AGE

Figure 22 shows that respondents were almost evenly divided between male (47%) and female (53%).




FIGURE 22: RESPONDENT GENDER

Almost all respondents live in Grand Junction (92%), with 44% also going to work or school in the city, and 19% visiting the city for shopping, services, or recreation (Figure 23). Notably, local business owners are well-represented, with almost one-tenth of all respondents owning a business in Grand Junction (9%).

Primary Respondent Association with Grand Junction




FIGURE 23: PRIMARY RESPONDENT ASSOCIATION WITH GRAND JUNCTION

Overall Findings

When asked about their primary mode of transportation, almost three-quarters of respondents drive (72%), and almost one-quarter of respondents bike or e-bike (23%). It should be noted that this question allowed survey respondents to select just one mode of transportation, so Figure 24 does not reflect secondary and tertiary mode choices.

What mode of transportation do you typically take when travelling in Grand Junction?




FIGURE 24: TYPICAL MODE OF TRANSPORTATION

One survey question asked about the types of trips that respondents currently complete by walking/rolling or biking and whether they would like to be able to complete these trips if they do not currently.

Currently, the top three trip types in Grand Junction completed by active transportation are trips for recreation and leisure, to the park or recreation destinations, and to restaurants and/or bars (Figure 25). People generally choose active transportation for recreational trips, and less commonly choose to walk or bike to work and school.

Respondents are most interested in choosing to walk/roll or bike to restaurants and/or bars, and for trips to the grocery store, shopping, and other errands. Desired walk and bike trip types exceed current trips in all cases other than trips for recreation/leisure, likely because most people already choose active transportation in those instances. This shows an unmet demand in the community to be able to walk/roll and bike to more places, particularly utilitarian trips like shopping, to work/school, out to eat, and other errands.




FIGURE 25: CURRENT AND DESIRED WALK AND BIKE TRIP TYPES

Reinforcing the findings of the previous question, 95% of respondents would like to be able to walk/roll and bike more often or for more types of trips than they do currently (Figure 26). The following questions explore some of the barriers to respondents choosing active transportation.

Would you like to be able to walk/roll and bike more often or for more types of trips than you do currently?




FIGURE 26: DESIRE TO WALK AND BIKE

The survey asked respondents to identify the biggest challenges to walking/rolling in one question, and to biking in another. Respondents were able to select an unlimited number of options.

The top barriers respondents identified to walking/rolling were nonexistent or insufficient sidewalks (67%), uncomfortable or unsafe streets (59%), and nonexistent or insufficient crossings (51%), as shown in Figure 27.

The biggest challenge(s) associated with walking/rolling in Grand Junction is/are... (select all that apply)




FIGURE 27: CHALLENGES WALKING AND ROLLING

The top barriers respondents identified to biking were uncomfortable or unsafe streets (77%), lack of paths or trails (63%), and feeling unsafe crossing major streets (57%), as shown in **Figure 28**.

The similarity in factors between these two questions indicate the greatest barriers to address are:

- Missing active transportation infrastructure, including gaps in the pedestrian and bicycle network
- Perceived uncomfortable or unsafe streets
- Perceived unsafe crossings at major streets

The biggest challenge(s) associated with biking in Grand Junction is/are... (select all that apply)




FIGURE 28: CHALLENGES BIKING

Figure 29 shows a word cloud of the most common answers when asked to describe the vision for the future of walking and biking in Grand Junction using three words. Safety was the most common response, followed by access, biking, and connected. Other common themes, such as sidewalks, comfortable, convenient, and maintenance also emerged as important components of the community's vision for walking and biking in Grand Junction.

The survey asked additional questions of respondents who answered that they are currently a student or have a student in their household (30% of respondents). Of these individuals, 51% travel to school by personal vehicle, 25% by bike or e-bike, 12% by foot, and 9% by school bus (Figure 31).

By what mode do you or the student in your household typically travel to school?




FIGURE 31: STUDENT TRANSPORTATION CHOICES

Of those who walk or bike, 45% travel on a street with no bike lane, 33% travel on a sidewalk or bicycle-pedestrian path, and 15% travel using an on-street bike lane (Figure 32). Answers to this question demonstrate there may be critical corridors on school routes missing pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure.

To walk or bike, your route to school consists primarily of the following type?




FIGURE 32: INFRASTRUCTURE ON ROUTE TO SCHOOL

The following question asked respondents to rank the considerations that most affect their decision to walk or bike to school. By final weighted score, the top issues are safety of intersections and crossings, amount of traffic along route, and speed of traffic along route. Notably, as compared to the other options, these are all elements this plan can address.

Which of the following issues affect your decision or the decision made by the student in your household to walk or bike to and from school? (Weighted Score of Ranking)




FIGURE 33: TOP CONSIDERATIONS IN STUDENT MODE CHOICE

Key Themes of General Comments

A total of 593 general comments were received from the public through the online survey, at the open house, and through the city's website. The comments were organized by theme, and the frequency of each theme is summarized in **Figure 34** (note some comments covered more than one theme). The full list of comments is provided in the Appendix. The most common comment, representing 147 of the general comments, wished for more bike and trail infrastructure, followed by a desire for more connectivity in the pedestrian and bike network (112 comments), and then higher quality protected bike facilities (i.e., bikeways separated from traffic by a barrier or curb). Other common themes included wanting more education and awareness of people walking and biking (particularly among drivers), more/improved sidewalks, better maintenance of sidewalks and bikeways, and improvement of crossings across major streets, rivers, highways, and the railroad tracks.




FIGURE 34: MOST FREQUENT THEME OF GENERAL COMMENTS

Several specific comments that were repeated by the public most frequently are summarized below:

- Would like to use the canals for trails
- Lots of people bike on sidewalk along busy streets
- There is an unfriendly bike culture/aggressive drivers, including window tinting making it difficult to see drivers
- Bike lanes are too narrow
- Bike lanes end abruptly
- Would like to extend Lunch Loops Trails
- More signs for wayfinding and regarding share-the-road laws
- More shade trees and better lighting at night for pedestrians
- Desire for a car-free Main Street

Steering Committee

The city formed a project Steering Committee of residents to provide input and guidance on recommendations throughout the process. Members of the Steering Committee play a critical role supporting the completion of the plan, serving as a critical sounding board, discussing overall plan direction, reviewing project deliverables, vet ideas, and promoting greater community involvement. Most importantly, the Steering Committee will help ensure the final plan is inclusive, focuses on equitable distribution of resources, and reflects a diverse set of perspectives.

The city put out a call for applications to the broader community to solicit candidates interested in serving on the Steering Committee at the beginning of the project, and received a total of 72 applications. City staff whittled these applicants down to 17 members through a vetting process that evaluated them based on criteria to reflect the everyday user of the city's active transportation system, with members demonstrating a broad community interest in safe and accessible multimodal transportation. Other criteria used to select

members from the pool of applicants included ensuring that the committee was geographically diverse, and inclusive of different age groups and professions, who were part of a target demographic or who may through their employment represent vulnerable or underrepresented users, such as individuals with disabilities, youth, low-income populations, and service industry workers.

The City Council approved members chosen to participate on the Steering Committee, who were comprised of people that geographically represent all “Planning Areas” within the city and who utilize walking or biking as their preferred mode of transportation. The committee is nearly equally split between male and female, with nine men and seven women. The group has representation from every major age group, including students, young professionals, and seniors. Member also represents a variety of interests and life experiences that can provide relevant and diverse perspectives throughout the process. Additionally, the Steering Committee includes representatives from major institutions in Grand Junction who were identified as critical influences of land use and transportation patterns, including CMU and the Veteran’s Administration Hospital.

The Steering Committee will meet six times over the course of the project at key milestones in the project. The first meeting occurred on September 12th to orient the group to the project and collect input on issues, concerns, and a vision for improving walking and biking in Grand Junction. Key outcomes of that first meeting are summarized below.

Key Themes

The first Steering Committee meeting included an overview of the project and solicited input on the major barriers to walking and biking in Grand Junction as well as identifying important connections for active transportation users. A summary of the key themes that emerged from that first meeting are summarized below:

- **Safety** – A desire to make the city safer for people walking/rolling and biking ranked as the most important issue among the Steering Committee members.
- **Connections** – Several key connections were identified by the group, with the following notable corridors: C ½ Road/D Road, Broadway, crossings of the railroad tracks, Orchard Avenue, and crossing North Avenue.
- **Important Destinations** – The Steering Committee identified the following key destinations for active transportation users in the Grand Junction: Main Street, Riverfront Trail, Las Colonias Park, CMU, Mesa Mall, and Human Service Providers (particularly on North Ave and around downtown).
- **Signage** – There was a consistent theme of needing better signage to direct people walking and biking.
- **More Facilities** – Overall, there was a theme of needing more sidewalks and bike lanes to fill missing gaps in the network and to allow people to get around by walking/rolling and biking.
- **Education** – The Steering Committee recognized that there should be more education for cyclists and drivers on sharing the road, how to ride safely, and how to drive safely when pedestrians and bicyclists are present.

Focus Groups

The project team facilitated nine focus groups in September and October 2022 to solicit community input from targeted group to guide recommendations in the *Pedestrian & Bicycle Plan*. The focus groups provided an opportunity for more in-depth conversations between community members and the project team and were important to gathering diverse perspectives on the issues, opportunities, and vision of the city's existing and future pedestrian and bike network. The focus groups were selected in order to attain a broader cross-section of the population with a focus on groups or individuals that may be hard to reach by other means and for whom walking/rolling and biking are of particular importance.

The focus groups interviewed as part of this plan included:

1. CMU students
2. K – 12 students
3. Steering Committee candidates (those who applied for the Steering Committee, but were not selected)
4. Representatives of Latinx organizations in Grand Junction
5. Housing providers
6. The Urban Trails Committee and the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board
7. Human services and homeless providers
8. Public health/senior agencies
9. Representative from Colorado Discover Ability

Key Themes

The outcomes of the focus groups are summarized into the following key themes that were repeated among the various groups. Meeting notes from each focus group are provided in the Appendix.

- **Safety** – Participants of nearly every focus group expressed that they and others in the community would like to walk and bike more but don't always feel safe because of traffic speed, volume, and lack of separated facilities on many streets in Grand Junction.
- **Plan for All Ages** – Multiple focus groups repeated a desire for it to be easier/safer for kids to walk and bike to school. This was stressed as a high priority.
- **Missing Connections** – Missing connections in the pedestrian and bicycle network was repeated as a key concern. Several important missing or poor connections were repeated among the focus groups, in particular: to downtown, CMU, the Riverfront Trail, and connections across the railroad tracks, highways (US 50 and I-70B), and Colorado River.
- **Barriers** – The theme of major barriers in the city that are difficult to cross by foot or bike also emerged as a common theme. US 50 was repeatedly identified as a major barrier in Orchard Mesa neighborhood. Patterson Road and North Ave were also repeatedly identified as both an important destination/corridor for people walking and biking and as a barrier for people walking and biking due to the speed and volume of traffic and lack of adequate facilities for active transportation users, including safe crossings.

Intercept Events

City staff attended 12 community events across the city in September and October (see **Table 6**) to distribute information about the project, solicit input, and direct people to the website and online survey. During these events the city engaged with over 300 people from the community.

TABLE 6: INTERCEPT EVENTS

Date	Event	Location
3-Sep-22	Carmillia Fest	Lincoln Park
7-Sep-22	CMU Mesa Fest	CMU Campus
8-Sep-22	Market on Main	Main and 6th
22-Sep-22	Coffee with the City Manager	
24-Sep-22	Walk to End Alzheimer's	Lincoln Park
25-Sep-22	Mayor's Engagement Event	Long's Park
6-Oct-22	Downtown Library 11:00 am - 1:00 pm	5th and Grand
11-Oct-22	CMU Hispanic Engineers Club - 7:00 pm	CMU Campus
19-Oct-22	Young Professional Network Lunch and Learn - 12:00 Noon	City Hall Auditorium
20-Oct-22	Downtown Library 11:00 am - 1:00 pm	5th and Grand
26-Oct-22	CMU Real Estate Class	Dominguez Hall Rm 315
27-Oct-22	Get to Know Your City - 5:30 pm	Lincoln Park Stadium Hospitality Suite



FIGURE 35: INTERCEPT EVENT AT CMU MESA FEST

Key Themes

Participants at the intercept events were directed to provide input via the project website and online survey. City staff solicited direct feedback at the events. Key themes from those events are summarized below:

- Safety Concerns – Many participants noted a need for improved safety for people walking and biking, specifically noting drivers turning not yielding to pedestrians at busy intersections, and for kids to be able to walk and bike more around town.
- Missing Connections – The community repeatedly highlighted important connections for walking and biking that they would like to see improved, including:
 - F ½ Road
 - 7th Street
 - 9th Street through downtown
 - Crossing 12th Street near CMU
 - To/from Las Colonias Park
 - Patterson Road
 - North Avenue intersections

Walk and Bike Audits

The project team hosted a walk audit and bike audit with city staff, stakeholders, and members of the Steering Committee. The purpose of the walk and bike audit was to get a better understanding of the experience of someone walking/rolling or biking on various streets in Grand Junction as well as provide an opportunity for participants to share with the project team pedestrian and bicycle design features they like and don't like. The audits were also used to calibrate and verify the LTS methodology that will be used to inform recommendations in the plan.



FIGURE 36: BIKE AUDIT AND WALK AUDIT

The walk audit followed 7th Street from Grand Avenue to Wellington Avenue, which provided a variety of design contexts through a key pedestrian corridor in Grand Junction. The bike audit followed a loop starting at 5th Street and White Avenue and traveling along Grand Avenue, 10th Street, through CMU Campus, Orchard Avenue, 28 ¼ Road, Hawthorne Ave, 28 Road, Ridge Drive, 27 ½ Road/15th Street, Elm Street, 12th Street, North Avenue, 10th Street, and Main Street. The route provided a variety of streets of different volumes and lanes and bike facilities ranging from shared streets, bike lanes, trails, and a raised cycle track covering streets with all four bicycle LTS levels.

Key Outcomes

Some conclusions drawn from the walk audit included:

- Desire for more separation (buffer) from traffic
- Need for wider sidewalks
- Accessibility concerns (such as length of crossing time, ability to reach the push button, and audible crossing)
- Slowing turning vehicle traffic to make it more comfortable at intersections
- Shade trees

Some conclusions drawn from the bike audit included:

- Bike lanes were nice and participants would like them wider on busier streets or where there are parked vehicles
- Trails are the most comfortable as are low volume, low speed streets
- The cycle track on 12th Street is nice, but obstacles and driveways add stress
- Crossing of busier streets can be stressful, especially when the bike lane ends before the intersection
- At some busy street crossings cyclists have to ride on the sidewalk to the pedestrian push button in order to get a green signal

Geographic Input

Geolocated input received during the public engagement process includes comments received on the interactive online map and in person at the open house, Steering Committee meetings, and intercept events. People submitted comments at these in person events by drawing and placing sticky notes and dots on printed maps.

This section summarizes both forms of geographic input.

Interactive Online Map

The survey was paired with an interactive online map that allowed users to place markers on a map of Grand Junction. 734 unique stakeholders visited the survey and/or the interactive online map. The map received 1,098 individual comments.

Map markers also allowed users to enter a more detailed comment and were as follows:

- I walk/roll and/or bike here
- I'd like to walk/roll and/or bike here
- I don't feel safe walking/rolling here
- I don't feel safe biking here
- Other comment

This section summarizes the overarching concerns by marker type.

I walk/roll and/or bike here

Respondents most commonly walk and/or bike in the downtown core of Grand Junction, as shown in **Figure 37**. Specifically, current active transportation hotspots are in the neighborhood southeast of Lincoln Park, along Main Street, and where Broadway crosses the railroad (**Figure 38**).

The top 10 locations cited by respondents include, in no particular order:

- **Main Street:** People love walking here and say it feels safe for people biking. Several comments in this marker type and others expressed an interest in closing the street to vehicle traffic.
- **Sherwood Park:** People opt to go around the park even though it may be less direct because it's so pleasant, but say it would benefit from traffic calming nearby.
- **1st Street:** Several respondents noted their appreciation of the buffered bike lanes on this corridor next to Sherwood Park.
- **Orchard Avenue:** Many people walk and bike along the corridor, but say it needs better signage and maintenance.
- **C ½ Road:** Numerous respondents bike along this corridor, but say it would benefit from better signage, bike lanes, and traffic calming.
- **Elm Avenue:** People walk and bike here due to the lower traffic volumes.
- **Neighborhood around Chipeta Elementary School:** Many people walk and bike here, especially as a school route.
- **North Avenue & 10th Street:** Many people walking and biking use this intersection to safely cross North Avenue.
- **River Crossing between Eagle Rim Park and Las Colonias Park:** Several people noted their appreciation of this crossing and use it as connection from Orchard Mesa to downtown.
- **Broadway/Pedestrian Bike Bridge Crossing of Railroad:** Numerous respondents rely on this area to cross the railroad from the Redlands to downtown.




FIGURE 37: HEATMAP OF CURRENT WALKING AND BIKING LOCATIONS, CITYWIDE



FIGURE 38: HEATMAP OF CURRENT WALKING AND BIKING LOCATIONS, DOWNTOWN

I'd like to walk/roll and/or bike here

This marker allowed respondents to specify locations they wish to walk and bike. Respondents most commonly noted locations in the downtown core of Grand Junction and along Patterson Road and North Avenue, as shown in **Figure 39** and **Figure 40**.

The top 10 locations cited by respondents include, in no particular order:

- **Patterson Road:** At several locations along Patterson Road, people commented that they would like to use active transportation to access the mall, hospital, and other major destinations, but that better bike infrastructure, maintenance, and traffic calming would be needed for them to feel comfortable. One respondent also noted that it provides a key connection from Clifton to Grand Junction.
- **North Avenue:** Several commenters noted that for them to feel comfortable using North Avenue, the corridor needs safer crossings, a complete sidewalk and bike network, traffic calming, and a lower speed limit.
- **12th Street:** A few commenters would like to walk and bike along 12th Street, but that it needs more frequent and comfortable crossings. They also pointed out that active transportation facilities would improve food access by connecting users to shopping, and that they would like a new crossing to connect to Riverside Parkway across the railroad tracks.
- **5th Street:** Comments indicated support of wider bike lanes and better bikeway maintenance, as well as improved crossings at Colorado Avenue and Grand Avenue.
- **Mesa Mall:** Respondents stated that the area around the Mesa Mall feels inaccessible by bike. They would like to see traffic calming and an improved crossing(s) of Patterson Road so people don't have to drive across to visit the shopping center on the north side of the roadway.
- **Riverside Parkway/D Road:** Users would feel more comfortable using this corridor with more comfortable and complete sidewalks and bike lanes, better maintenance, better lighting, and traffic calming. They also support better connections across the railroad to connect to the Riverfront Trail.
- **29 ½ Road:** This roadway currently feels unsafe for people walking and biking. Respondents requested better, more accessible sidewalks.
- **Canals:** Numerous comments requested that the city complete the trail network along the canals and create a new bicycle/pedestrian connection where it intersects 28 ½ Road.
- **9th Street:** Commenters would like to use 9th Street more often and requested a better crossing and bike lane connection from the Riverfront Trail through Las Colonias Park to downtown.
- **Redlands Parkway/24 Road:** Multiple comments in this marker type and others pointed out the dangerous crossing of US-50 along this roadway due to high speeds, poor roadway maintenance, the blind hill/hill grade, and lack of bike lane. It is also a key connection to the Mesa Mall from the south and the only crossing of US-50 in the area.




FIGURE 39: HEATMAP OF DESIRED WALKING AND BIKING LOCATIONS, CITYWIDE




FIGURE 40: HEATMAP OF DESIRED WALKING AND BIKING LOCATIONS, DOWNTOWN

I don't feel safe walking/rolling here

Respondents feel most unsafe walking and rolling in the downtown core of Grand Junction, as shown in **Figure 41** and **Figure 42**. Specifically, the top 10 most commonly cited unsafe locations by respondents include, in no particular order:

- **Broadway:** Commenters noted the sidewalk on Broadway is too narrow in many locations and that the corridor needs better signage alerting drivers to the presence of active transportation users. They also pointed out the need for a separate protected bike lane to create unique spaces for people walking/rolling and for people biking.
- **Monument Road:** Multiple respondents noted the challenges of walking and rolling on this roadway, due to missing sidewalks, speeding drivers, and lack of crosswalks to access trailheads and climbing areas along the corridor. At the north end, people noted concerns about the poor crossing of Broadway to access Safeway. Separately, people also commented on the chip seal roadway surface making it difficult to bike.
- **Main Street West of 1st Street:** Several comments pointed out challenges walking on Main Street west of 1st Street due to the poor roadway surface condition, inconsistently marked bike and roadway lanes, and uncomfortable crossings. One stated the interchange at Main Street and 1st Street needed design improvements, particularly to lengthen crossing times. Another pointed out issues with pedestrian-vehicle conflicts at the crossing at Spruce Street and Main Street.
- **1st Street & Grand Avenue:** Commenters remarked that this is a dangerous intersection, especially due to the lack of pedestrian refuge islands.
- **12th Street:** Numerous respondents felt unsafe walking along this corridor due to narrow sidewalks and poor crossings (especially of North Avenue). They also noted aggressive, speeding drivers who did not adhere to RRFBs installed in the area. They thought better signage and additional traffic calming could make the corridor safer, especially around the nearby elementary school.
- **Patterson Road & 28 1/4 Road:** Multiple comments indicated concerns about drivers running this light and turning against walk signals without checking for or noticing pedestrians.
- **7th Street:** Concerns noted along 7th Street include those about speeding drivers, lack of crossings apart from that at Gunnison Avenue, and poor intersection visibility due to parked vehicles and foliage.
- **G Road:** Comments noted that G Road feels unsafe to walk or bike due to the lack of bike infrastructure and poor crossings.
- **24 1/2 Road:** Respondents feel unsafe walking on 24 1/2 Road due to missing sidewalks and the need for additional pedestrian crossings between business areas and new neighborhoods.
- **Las Colonias Park:** People expressed concerns about late-night activity in the park and the need for better lighting and police enforcement. The pedestrian and bicycle traffic flow on the Riverfront Trail is a concern, with people not staying to one side, no enforcement of the dog leash law, and users frequently blocking the entire trail, especially in the Las Colonias Park area.



FIGURE 41: HEATMAP OF LOCATIONS RESPONDENTS FEEL UNSAFE WALKING/ROLLING, CITYWIDE




FIGURE 42: HEATMAP OF LOCATIONS RESPONDENTS FEEL UNSAFE WALKING/ROLLING, DOWNTOWN

I don't feel safe biking here

Respondents feel most unsafe biking in the Grand Junction downtown core and northwest area of the city, as shown in **Figure 43** and **Figure 44**. Specifically, the top 10 most commonly cited unsafe locations by respondents include, in no particular order:

- **Redlands Parkway & Broadway:** Commenters indicated that this intersection is uncomfortable if walking or biking due to speeding drivers, inadequate crossing times, and issues with glare. Comments nearby on Broadway noted missing sidewalks and bike infrastructure, and the lack of bike infrastructure on Redlands Parkway.
- **Redlands Parkway/24 Road:** Multiple comments in this marker type and others pointed out the dangerous crossing of US-50 along this roadway due to high speeds, poor roadway maintenance, the blind hill/hill grade, and lack of bike lane. It is also a key connection to the Mesa Mall from the south and the only crossing of US-50 in the area.
- **Riverside Parkway/25 Road:** Numerous comments in this area south of US-50 remarked on safety issues, including poor bikeway maintenance, dangerous right-turning traffic and red light running, the bike lane crossing high speed/high volume traffic, poor lighting and signage, inadequate pedestrian crossing times, and poor visibility. This is a key connection to the Riverfront Trail.
- **25 Road:** North of the US-50 crossing, respondents had concerns about the 25 Road corridor lacking sidewalks and bike infrastructure, on a roadway with high traffic volumes and speeds.
- **Main Street:** driver-bike conflicts at 7th & Main roundabout, bike lane inconsistent, drivers do not see or yield to bike traffic, desire to close street to vehicle traffic
- **Riverside Parkway & 9th Street:** Comments expressed concerns about this being an unsafe crossing.
- **12th Street:** People noted concerns about this corridor, which has no bike lanes, but high traffic volumes and speeds, limited visibility, and uncomfortable crossings, particularly at Patterson Road and North Avenue. Commenters have seen people running lights on the corridor.
- **29 Road:** Respondents indicated concerns about high traffic speeds and unsafe crossings on this roadway, particularly at the 29 Road and C ½ intersection that people use to access the Riverfront Trail. They note the bridge crossing over I-70 business loop feeling dangerous, and poor bikeway maintenance (where they exist). One commenter was hit by a driver while biking on this roadway.
- **Orchard Avenue:** Many comments expressed issues with this corridor, including inconsistent bike facilities (especially near schools), aggressive drivers, illegal parking in the bike lane, people riding on the sidewalk, and frequent curb cuts/driveways. People feel unsafe at many crossings, especially at 28 Road, 15th Street, and 7th Street.
- **7th Street:** Respondents noted poor maintenance, missing bike lanes, aggressive drivers, and infrequent and poor crossings (especially at Main Street, North Avenue, Orchard Avenue, Horizon Drive, Patterson Road, and between CMU and GJHS).



FIGURE 43: HEATMAP OF LOCATIONS RESPONDENTS FEEL UNSAFE BIKING, CITYWIDE



FIGURE 44: HEATMAP OF LOCATIONS RESPONDENTS FEEL UNSAFE BIKING, DOWNTOWN

Open House Geographic Comments

The community open house on September 14th also provided an opportunity through a floor map exercise for the community to identify locations throughout Grand Junction where they currently walk and bike, where they would like to walk and bike and where they don't feel comfortable walking and biking due to the infrastructure (see Figure 45).



FIGURE 45: FLOOR MAP EXERCISE AT THE COMMUNITY OPEN HOUSE

Comments received in person at the community open house flagged many of the same challenges as those received on the online interactive map (Figure 46). A large share of concerns concentrated on safety issues at major crossings of the railroad and highway, again highlighting the areas around Redlands Parkway/24 Road, Broadway, and Riverside Parkway. 7th Street, 12th Street, Orchard Avenue, North Avenue, and 7th/Main Street in the core of the city were also highlighted as important corridors for walking and biking and/or places people currently don't feel comfortable walking and biking.




FIGURE 46: IN PERSON COMMENT MAP

Summary

This report provided an assessment of the existing conditions and needs of the pedestrian and bicycle network in Grand Junction and key findings of the first round of community engagement for the *Pedestrian & Bicycle Plan* that occurred in September and October of 2022. Key findings from these two major analytical elements of the active transportation system in Grand Junction are summarized below and will be used to inform recommendations in the city's *Pedestrian & Bicycle Plan*.

Existing Conditions Assessment

- **Relevant Plans** – The document provides a summary of key outcomes of existing relevant plans and documents, including the *One Grand Junction Comprehensive Plan*, the *Grand Junction Circulation Plan*, the *Grand Valley Regional Transportation Plan*, Grand Junction's *Complete Streets Policy*, the Fire Code, and the Zoning and Development Code. The Active Transportation Corridors will be updated as part of the *Pedestrian & Bicycle Plan* and will become the vision for the future bike network and key pedestrian corridors in Grand Junction.
- **Existing Pedestrian Network** – Maps illustrate the existing pedestrian network in Grand Junction, including which streets have attached sidewalks, detached sidewalks, or no sidewalks. The map identifies key missing gaps in the pedestrian network in the city. Of particular importance are streets with missing or inadequate sidewalks along the Active Transportation Corridors, collector and arterial streets, and at major crossings of the Colorado River, railroad tracks, and highways.
- **Existing Bicycle Network** – Maps illustrate the existing bicycle network in Grand Junction, including where there are existing multi-use trails, streets with bike lanes, and signed bike routes. Of particular importance are streets with missing or inadequate bike facilities along the Active Transportation Corridors, at major crossings of the Colorado River, railroad tracks, and highways, and where there are missing links in the network.
- **Level of Traffic Stress Maps** – The report develops a methodology and maps showing the Level of Traffic Stress (LTS) on a scale of 1 to 4 for both pedestrians and bicyclists on all streets in Grand Junction. Streets with LTS 1 and 2 are considered low stress, while streets with LTS 3 or 4 are considered higher stress for people walking and biking. The LTS maps will be a critical component in developing recommendations for the active transportation network and street design as part of the *Pedestrian & Bicycle Plan*.
- **Active Transportation High Injury Network** – An Active Transportation High Injury Network (HIN) Map was developed representing the streets with the highest concentration of pedestrian and bicycle involved crashes in the city. The HIN map shows that over 80% of pedestrian and bicycle crashes occur on just 5% of city streets. Focusing resources and investment on upgrading active transportation facilities and making safety improvements on these streets will have the greatest impact on improving bicycle and pedestrian safety in Grand Junction. The HIN is an important evaluation tool for project prioritization.
- **Pedestrian and Bicycle Demand** – In addition to community input which helped reveal important corridors for people walking and biking (discussed in the Community Engagement Findings section), Strava (a Big Data provider) highlighted important corridors in the city for people walking and biking. This showed key corridors through downtown as well as popular routes used to cross the Colorado

River and railroad tracks that should be considered as part of planning the future pedestrian and bicycle network.

Community Engagement Findings

The city conducted comprehensive community engagement as part of the planning process to solicit input to inform recommendations in the *Pedestrian & Bicycle Plan*. Engagement included an online survey with an interactive webmap, an in-person community open house, nine focus group meetings, a dozen intercept events across the city, and formation of a 17-person resident Steering Committee that will guide the direction of the project. In all, over 2,000 touch points were made with the community through this process including over 660 survey responses, and over 1,000 comments on the interactive webmap.

This report provides a summary of the feedback received from the community through this engagement process. A brief summary of key highlights is provided below:

- **Improve Traffic Safety** – Safety emerged from the visioning process at the open house and online survey as a top theme, as well as the focus groups and initial meeting with the Steering Committee. A lot of people would like to walk and bike more and would like kids to be able to walk and bike more in Grand Junction, but don't feel safe doing so in many areas of the city.
- **Improve Active Transportation Infrastructure** – The community consistently reiterated their desire for more sidewalks, wider sidewalks, more bike trails, more bike lanes, wider bike lanes, and more facilities separated from traffic on busy, higher-speed streets.
- **Missing Connections** – The public acknowledged many great existing walk and bike facilities in Grand Junction, including the Riverfront Trail, but because there are missing connections in the network, and due to difficulty crossing major streets, many people are not able to or do not feel comfortable walking and biking places.
- **Key Destinations** – Several important destinations were reiterated by the community, including downtown, the Riverfront Trail, CMU, Mesa Mall, K-12 schools, and medical clinics and businesses, particularly along North Avenue and Patterson Road.
- **Key Connections Across Barriers** – A common theme emerged in discussion and feedback received by the community is that there are a limited number of ways to cross the Colorado River, railroad tracks, and highways (including US 50 and I-70B) and many of the existing corridors across these barriers do not adequately support people walking/rolling and biking. These connections are critical for people to connect from downtown, CMU, and the Mesa Mall on the north side of the city to the Riverfront Trail, the Redlands, and Orchard Mesa on the south side of the city.
- **Riverfront Trail** – The Riverfront Trail is a key east-west connection for both recreational and utilitarian active transportation in Grand Junction and connecting to/from the Riverfront Trail should be an important aspect of the future pedestrian and bicycle network.
- **Unmet Demand** – The community would like to be able to walk and bike more frequently and to more places in Grand Junction, but are not comfortable doing so due to inadequate infrastructure and key missing connections in the pedestrian and bicycle network. 95% of survey respondents said they would like to be able to walk and bike more in Grand Junction.



PEDESTRIAN & BICYCLE PLAN

EXISTING CONDITIONS & NEEDS ASSESSMENT

APPENDIX A: PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED

Appendix A: Public Comments Received

The table below lists all general written comments received from the public that were submitted as part of the online survey or through the GJ Speaks platform on the project website in September and October 2022 for the Grand Junction Pedestrian & Bicycle Plan. Handwritten comments provided by participants of the community open house held on September 14th, 2022 are also attached to the end of this document.

#	Comment
1	Along with more infrastructure, there needs to be more education and awareness surrounding walking/biking in Grand Junction. Many people ignore bikes or are not aware of their presence. There should be a campaign around improving bike culture within the city.
2	I'd love to see more bike paths and sidewalk routes around Grand Junction! Or better maintenance on the ones that we do have so I don't have to worry about popping a tire. Coming from Fort Collins where biking is easy to get anywhere and everywhere, it would great to see Grand Junction become more accessible in that way.
3	C 1/2 Road is part of the Colorado Riverfront Trail route and it NEEDS to be maintained and is GREATLY in NEED of a bike lane or detached bike path. Also, with the new construction at Eddy Apartments, there is a lot more traffic going down the road, and people leaving the Eddy parking lot DO NOT LOOK before they leave, cyclists have to really be paying attention.
4	More public education concerning safe riding such as the danger of riding against traffic and riding on sidewalks.
5	Do not feel safe biking along C 1/2 Road between 29 and 27 1/2 Roads. No shoulder and lots of people drive over speed limit on that road.
6	I hope this plan includes a lot of bollards and separated paths! Painted bike lanes provide no added safety for riders OR drivers!
7	More trail corridors/multi use paths not attached to roads. Turn Main Street into a walking mall.
8	North Ave should be 30mph with posted shared lanes each direction... definitely within 3 miles CMU. As well as 12th street
9	I'm able to complete a lot of bike trips currently, but I'd love to see the 'barrier to entry' to lowered for more people. Bike/ped are the cheapest form of mobility for the individual, we'd be well served by giving them greater priority in the transportation investment.
10	The bike and pedestrian plan, and the related steering committee, scans as a tool to give the illusion of progress while stalling development of any meaningful infrastructure or change — a busy box for local activists. Public Works already knows where the paths need to go and City Council could tomorrow fund those and ban right-turns on red if they wanted. Forming a committee and developing a plan serves only to obfuscate the issue.

#	Comment
11	I would like to see bike paths and pedestrian routes prioritized over cars. I know it is tough to do with existing infrastructure, but it can be done. It requires an understanding of what kinds of trails people will use, being safe, comfortable and more convenient than driving. If you build it people will use it. There is science to back that up. If you want this to become a bike and walk kind of city, you need to make it more enjoyable than driving.
12	It is terrifying to bike to work if work is on Patterson or North Ave
13	Would love for some of the businesses off of 50 to be more bike accessible and a way to get to OM that isn't 29rd.
14	Connecting downtown,north neighborhoods, Redlands, the hospital, CMU and business loop by a separate, connected bike path loop would significantly impact the # of ppl who commute! I know many ppl who would commute on bikes if our bike lanes were more distinctly separated by curbs/islands. As someone who works at the hospital, seeing the "bike vs.car" outcomes the biker or pedestrian usually comes out on the bottom. Thank you!
15	the river front and areas between the river and downtown are pretty good and get used a lot. there are a lot of big pick-up trucks in town that make it hard to share the road. if we had some separation or curb between the traffic lane and bike lane, it would be much more enticing to ride instead of drive.
16	Need to have some kind of pedestrian or bicycle lane across HWY 6&50 to cross at Redlands PWKY / 24 RD area ultimately to access mall/parks/health care facilities. Currently no safe way to cross at all.
17	North-south bike access is dangerous and a disincentive to taking alternate transportation modes. In the last three years, there have been two "white bikes" along Seventh Street alone.

#	Comment
18	<p>The City seems to excessively focus on big projects, such as redesigning 4th and 5th Streets (if and when that happens), while neglecting small, relatively low cost improvements that would make a huge difference by making an entire route immediately viable. For example, the traffic light at 5th Street and North Avenue does not detect bicycles, which reduces the usefulness of 5th Street as a bicycle corridor. This problem was pointed out to the City over a decade ago, yet the City is waiting to do a 'big project' to fix this problem. Another such location is G Road, where the shoulder disappears and reappears. I understand that the City has long range plans for this road that include bike lanes, but in the meantime this is a badly needed bicycle corridor that is too dangerous to ride. The Redlands Parkway overpass is another one that the City has talked about making bicycle friendly but keeps delaying.</p> <p>I'd like for the City to fix such small problems so that these corridors are useful now while going through the 20 year process of designing and funding 'big project'. If the City ends up tearing up that road with the 'new' improvements, so be it because that's years or decades of use of a corridor that we don't have now.</p> <p>Speaking more broadly, I'd like for the City of GJ to give non-motorized transportation a level of priority equal to that of motorized transportation. The City would never tolerate a traffic light that doesn't detect cars to go unaddressed for even weeks, yet we've been waiting over a decade for the light on 5th Street to be fixed.</p>
19	<p>Be fearless and do the right thing for the future of mobility in our city. Consider starting around schools where school buses don't run and linking up major destinations with bike routes where cyclists do not need to ride in a lane or barely existing shoulder. Motorists here are commonly on their phones while driving, so we have to do more than placing bikes next to cars on busy streets. Painting a shoulder doesn't necessarily make it safe.</p>
20	<p>I'm glad there is renewed focus on this improvement for our community.</p>
21	<p>I like to ride my bike everywhere when it's safe. It'd be nice to have a bike lane on places frequented by road bikes, like K, 24, etc....</p>
22	<p>I believe it would be excellent if the tri city area (palisade, clifton, grand junction were connected via bicycle path. That the gaps in the current paths were utilized for further expansion, connecting the already existing paths that run all the way to Fruita. This would be ecologically beneficial, encouraging alternative means of travel, expand traveling opportunities and thus life opportunities to the disenfranchised. Interconnection would boost tourism and ensure the safety of visitors and locals alike.q</p>
23	<p>I would love to see a trail system valley wide, in multiple locations to enable people from all walks and locations to access and use it. If you look at some of the mountain towns, there are incredible trail systems that network throughout the community, providing opportunities for use and healthy lifestyle for everyone.</p>
24	<p>More community spaces in NE GJ</p>

#	Comment
25	Downtown is a great example of what more of the city should be like - slower vehicle speed limits and lots of options to cross at. It would be great if there were dedicated routes to get you to main areas of town (i.e. from downtown to the mall to the lunch loops, etc). Salt Lake City has specific roads with slow speed limits where bike traffic is able to use the entire lane that get you across town comfortably and safely, and they publish a map of those roads for bikers. I would love to see that implemented in Grand Junction, so that I would actually be comfortable commuting and running errands by bike.
26	Need awareness that drivers of autos/trucks need to slow down and especially that bikes can take the whole lane if needed. maybe the big flashing signs all over to remind drivers to slow the heck down and watch out for bikers.
27	At this point, I am primarily concerned about unleashed dogs chasing and attacking me, E-Bikes riding at unsafe speeds on paths and the lack of places to secure bicycles without them being stolen or vandalized. There seems to only be reactive enforcement about these issues rather than proactive enforcement of existent codes. There also are very long spans along the trail system without bathroom facilities or even trash cans which lead to a very unkempt "trashy" trail system. That and all of the dog excrement every 10 feet.
28	Grand Junction and the whole Grand Valley is an idealic setting for a beautiful trail system to safely move active and engaged citizens around the area. The more connected and well thought out it is, all the better, and will increase usage. Thank you for working this plan! Very exciting! One more thing:. With the speeds of e-bikes, I think they need to be separated from pedestrian/and self powered bikes.
29	I would like a better North/South bike route through town. I would like improvements to the riverfront trail, especially the poor asphalt section. I believe the Connected Lakes section could be wonderful if the heaved asphalt was replaced. I would like a bike connector to Whitewater. We need more weed-mowing and spraying along the Riverfront trail to make it safer and more appealing.
30	Bike access at first and Broadway, along Grand.
31	G road is in serious need of bike lane improvements. West bound has a wide lane all the way to 24 road but riding east bound is a harrowing experience with no lane or even a shoulder.
32	it would be nice to have a safe way to cross Patterson and North. I've tried the 15th st route but it went to the college. This might not be the best place to have to ride through with events a people driving carts all over.
33	I'm not sure if they could at all be addressed, but one of the main reasons I stopped biking was harassment from drivers, rolling down their windows and yelling slurs and making other weird comments.

#	Comment
34	Why are some new housing developments required to have sidewalks and others don't. For example the new subdivision on F 1/2 road between 25 rd and 24 1/2. If all new builds were required to have sidewalks it would be so much better. It doesn't make sense to require one but not the other to have sidewalks on Main roads so these developments could "attach to each other" to promote walking and biking
35	especially need a safe way from the area north of 25 & patterson via bike to downtown area. NO good way exists at this point. Would like to throw out the old addage about there being a couple of traffic free trans valley routes on the canal right of ways which are underutilized.
36	<p>Improving Pedestrian Infrastructure isn't as simple as bicycle lanes (or even bike roads). Current zoning codes, even in GJ where they're relatively good, don't allow simple small family businesses to be built in residential areas. The corner store where kids spent spare change on Coca-Cola can't be built on my street. These zoning issues will always make traveling to say, get bread and milk, or a dentist appointment nearly impossible for most people.</p> <p>Other than zoning issues, bicycle lanes and a sidewalk next to the road isn't as effective as it could be. Cars are loud and dangerous, and being forced to ride or walk right next to them with no physical separation and/or protection will always make people on a bike or on foot uncomfortable and unsafe.</p>
37	Would love, love to be able to bike or walk more places in Grand Junction.
38	I'd like to see some future proof planning when building new trails. Unlike several sections of riverfront trail that are constantly underwater. When it's been washed out, the city wasted money rebuilding it-in the same spot where it will be washed out again. Ice rink area comes to mind. I want my tax dollars spent wisely, not willy nilly just to get something done.
39	The ditch roads seem like good avenues for biking, running, walking. I see people using them all the time though they are trespassing. Where is the discussion with the water people. Can you put up a fence or something?
40	Biking in Grand Junction needs to have major paths and thoroughfares in order safe traveling
41	The riverfront trail provides an excellent east/west connector but there are too few north south connectors to that trail system.
42	The biggest hurdle I see to this plan is the lack of police traffic enforcement. I used to ride more, to the library, grocery store and for recreation but no longer feel safe doing so. It was an enjoyable activity that I miss.
43	GET it DONE!

#	Comment
44	1) Most traffic lights around town require pedestrians to tap the walk sign. Please set them to light up automatically. Cars seem to take this as a reason not to stop for pedestrians in the crosswalk. 2) More crosswalks with signage are needed to allow for safe passage. 3) Greater publication is needed that it is Colorado law to stop for those in a crosswalk.
45	This is not Boulder.
46	We need established bike lanes, but we also need some good PR and community awareness. People are reckless drivers and bikers ride two-by and make people mad.
47	I would like to be able to bike to work, but there are some spots on my route where I do not feel comfortable riding on the street (e.g. 12th St), especially if taking my toddler to daycare in the trailer. There are also some places marked as bike friendly, but then they have so many cars parked on the side that you end up biking in the middle of the road (e.g. parts of Gunnison).
48	Underserved areas need to be a priority for new and improved infrastructure, e.g., Orchard Mesa.
49	I cycle mainly for recreation. I'm anxious to see the RFT finished from Colonias to 29 rd.
50	Education for bikers. They need to follow the rules of the road. Ride with in bike lanes and ride single file.
51	The city needs to open up less traveled roadways to electric golf carts
52	Right now, riding/walking within individual areas of town is adequate, but this city needs better non-motorized transportation corridors between areas of town. Riding on streets like North Ave, Patterson, 7th, 12th, and other major corridors is unsafe but is necessary to get between major areas of the city.
53	Well marked continuous bikelanes from neighborhoods to downtown, recreational areas, libraries and school zones will encourage a happy healthy community.
54	More bike trails similar to connector trail from the monument.
55	Please include bike lanes in future road plans. Also, please complete river front trail from palisade to grand junction
56	Please address the 25 Road corridor. There are bike lanes in both directions connecting 25 Road to riverfront bike trails via the Riverside Parkway viaduct. However, the bike lanes terminate on the north end at Patterson Road. From that point 25 Road has no bike lanes, no shoulders, and no sidewalks and high-volume traffic. It is dangerous to bike to or from Western Colorado Community College, businesses in Foresight Park, and residences along 25 Road. Ideally, the bike path would continue to a terminus at Canyon View Park.

#	Comment
57	<p>Please improve F 1/2 Road between 26rd and Trails End Ct. This is a major route for children traveling to and from West and Pomona. I've seen several close calls on the blind corner because there is no bike lane, no shoulder and the road is too narrow. People drive too fast in that section as well.</p> <p>Better crossings on Patterson for students.</p>
58	<p>For years I have been trying to get the city to recognize the problem of decaying asphalt on bike/walking paths on the Redlands along South Camp and Redlands Parkway. I even sent photos. I was always told there is no monies to replace them.Beginning at Rimrock Rd. off of South Camp to Wingate School and from the P</p>
59	<p>Granddaughter unable to get around in hey power wheelchair due to sidewalks non existent or do not connect. She had to roll in the STREET. She is NOT SAFE.</p>
60	<p>This survey inadequately addresses the questions, concerns, comments and needs that pedestrians and cyclists may have.</p>
61	<p>The pedestrian bridge adjacent to Broadway over the railroad tracks ends abruptly at the back of the jail on the North side. There is no clear path or route into downtown. Also there is very little signage directing you to either end of the bridge. It is kind of a bridge to nowhere currently. I think there is potential for this bridge but it is rarely used as far as I can tell.</p>

#	Comment
62	<p>1. Too much pavement and wide sweeping turns with large intersections -- encourages cars to go fast and non-cars to be un-safe.</p> <p>2. Intersections should favor pedestrians FAR more -- if the intersection size can't be reduced from reduced lanes, there should at least be pedestrian islands. Most intersections make pedestrians wait a LONG time to cross, which does not encourage more walking. Neckdowns, reduced wait time should be the norm, and pedestrian signals should occur at every iteration of the cycle, not just when the button is pressed.</p> <p>3. Signaled pedestrian crossings to break up large stretches of road (at least the button/flashing yellow lights if not a full signal), and converting unnecessary/low volume road stoplights to stop signs</p> <p>4. Innovative parking lot crossing for pedestrians -- businesses should have ways to get from where they are coming from to the business door without having to dodge and weave between distracted drivers (this could also be used to increase the safety and comfort of people walking from their cars). Could be raised sidewalks, cones, give pedestrians the most direct route and force cars to slow down.</p> <p>5. General sidewalk and bike lane connectivity -- identify gaps in the network, or areas where a pedestrian or cyclist would have to take a much longer way around compared to a car (usually they don't take the longer way around and just cross anyways or travel along a sketchy path).</p> <p>6. Reduce driveway cutouts in sidewalks -- the sidewalk should be safe, and it is not when there are many chances for cars to zip in and out right across. The norm shouldn't be the pedestrian waiting for cars, but the other way around.</p> <p>*Downtown/Main street is doing great with walkability! -- just maybe stop signs instead of signals, and the one way roads are not conducive to good walkability and connectivity*</p> <p>Walkable City Rules by Jeff Speck is an excellent book to start identifying and implementing some best practices around this plan, if you haven't read it already</p>
63	<p>It is scary for both bikers and drivers. I am a biker and was appalled to see two bikers riding next to each other on 6 and 50. It forced me to stop as I could not safely pass with oncoming traffic. Our river bike path is in such disrepair in many places. The bike lanes on the street need to be wider.</p>
64	<p>Thanks for reaching out and starting to think about these issues.</p>
65	<p>Theft proof bike parking downtown Grand Junction</p>
66	<p>With locating the new rec center outside of the accessible city center, people from every part of town should be able to get there on bike paths.</p>
67	<p>I'd love to see more GJ bike specific maps around town or available to the public of popular routes to get around. Even a PDF version I can print (maybe already available?) would be handy.</p>
68	<p>Get someone who does GIS to map out density of possibly routes from neighborhoods, work places, restaurants, bars, groceries, stores, etc. And all the possible best routes to find roads that would connect a large number of these combinations. Take the most used roads, give them divided shoulders if high speed roads, painted lanes if low speed, add new routes with bike infrastructure. Huge undertaking but glad to see it's being looked at.</p>

#	Comment
69	As I stated before, regular sweeping and maintenance of the existing bike lanes is lacking. Forces riders in to the traffic lanes. There needs to be a safe way to get across 6 and 50 and the railroad tracks. A lot of the Tour of the Moon Loop needs to have separate bike lanes. None exist now. This path is signed and the local tourism board encourages riders, yet there is no shoulder on much of this road, especially where the road makes sharp turns at blind corners.
70	I love the Riverfront paths but wish we had more bike paths running north and south through town. It is very dicey trying to ride from my home in north GJ to reach anything in the heart of downtown.
71	North avenue, I don't think there is a safe way to add bike lanes without going to single lane for cars. There is too much traffic to make the lanes thinner. I think using side streets that are marked with bike lanes and allow for residential parking would be the winner, assuming the neighborhoods don't lose parking.
72	There are insufficient safe crossings on Broadway west of Monument Rd. Many neighborhoods are disconnected from the existing safe paths.
73	We need more bike lanes, and possibly established places for riders that are training for competition, especially north of town, 1st street north of patterson.
74	Downtown streets are narrow; maybe turn outs to let traffic behind you pass by safely instead of holding them back. Theft a concern. My bike is cheap only paid \$730.00 for it ha ha. Don't know how to combat theft other than use multiple locks and hope for the best. This is always in the back of your mind, tho, makes you uncomfortable all the time can't enjoy the experience GJct has to offer.
75	Grand Junction is way behind in developing complete streets in association with current development. It is very difficult to walk or ride a bike from the north side of town to downtown. There is a lack of sidewalks and bike lanes for these north/south corridors like 7th and 12th Streets and it too dangerous to bike on Patterson or to walk or bike on G Road.
76	I live in Redlands and frequently take my child to elementary school on an ebike. However, commuting into town from Redlands is not ideal on a bicycle. The sidewalk along Broadway is functional, but makes for a bumpy and unsteady ride. It would be ideal to ride along the roadway instead of on a sidewalk, but the roadway does not feel safe for a cyclist. Between aggressive drivers and limited space on the shoulder, especially crossing bridges, the road is dangerous. I'd like to see any new/redesigned roadways in the city include safe bicycle infrastructure and space. Thanks.
77	Get the bicycles off the dang roads and highways
78	We need to catch up with the promotion, acceptance and ability to use a bicycle to get around town.
79	Thank you for taking the time to receive input.

#	Comment
80	There is a serious lack of connectedness of the business districts to more residential areas. The paths that do exist need to be better maintained and widened for two way bike traffic. I'd like to see main through ways like Broadway and Redlands Parkway have fully developed bike infrastructure that doesn't require a cyclist to use the sidewalk since this is unsafe for pedestrians.
81	I'm just really glad you're taking a look at this. Riding/running/walking on the roads in this town is scarier than anywhere else I've ever been (and I lived in Rio!). I was told by a sheriff's deputy that he intentionally drives toward bicyclists when they're on the road to scare them (he told me this in a social setting, not as a rep of MCSO). I've experienced drivers doing this far too many times, and it's absolutely absurd that law enforcement is doing it. To me, that means it's <i>*imperative*</i> that there are alternative routes for bikes and pedestrians. (Side note, I'd love it if you had better inclusivity in regard to gender on this survey. I'm non binary and have many clients who are as well.)
82	It would be nice if the general driving public would be more respectful of bikers. I have faced hostile drivers and I have seen many drivers not provide the minimum 3-foot space required by law.
83	Safe access to RFT from all parts of town. Every park should have good and safe access. Safe bike paths across RR tracks - especially the ones that are at angles to the street.
84	We have a ready made system of right-of-ways that could be turned into multi-use paths connecting virtually every area of Grand Junction with our canal system. Canal trails would be the fastest way to build a safe off-street network.
85	width of bike lanes is often inadequate. I'd like to see separate green/red lights for bicycles in bike lanes allowing them to advance and / or stop ahead of vehicles on the main roadways. Smallish circular rideable paved sections rising up to a overhead bridge for crossing spans that are wide and unsafe for cyclists. I'd like to see the city engage with the county to complete bike lanes on roads outside of city limits. (eg) Southcamp Rd.
86	A sidewalk needs to be installed from 30 Rd/F 1/2 toward Thunder Mountain Elementary School. Speed limits are unenforced on F 1/2 Rd especially through the school zone. Riding along Patterson Rd would be incredibly unsafe.
87	I would like to see connections from the river trail to the mall and other shopping areas. I would also like to more easily access downtown from the river trail via bike.

#	Comment
88	If bicycle lanes on city streets are to be created/maintained, there needs to be a specific tax (bike registrations) and they need to abide by the same rules as regular traffic, otherwise they create a hazard to the normal flow of traffic.
89	I truly wish Grand Junction was more bike friendly. Imagine if the irrigation water channels were covered and converted to bike paths! I also think the culture of grand junction is against cyclist. As a small, young woman riding alone, I have had trucks roll coal on me and pass dangerously close. I would love to not ride in the lanes, but the shoulders have too much debris and there aren't enough bike lanes to stay on bike paths my entire route.
90	The homeless on the Riverfront trail keep me off of it 100%.
91	My opinion? Open the canal roads to pedestrian traffic. If you want to be the heroes now, we need to cultivate the canal roads to pedestrian traffic. It will be done. It is just a matter of time. They are literally right there. Growing up in the Valley, I am aware of personal property, irrigation and a whole bucket of legal issues needing to be addressed. However, the safety of our pedestrians is important and the limited amount of proper bike paths is disturbing. No worries though, if you chicken out now, others, who value safety and the beauty of our canal pathways will get it done. 👍
92	Obviously there are not enough bike lanes to be able to complete most trips. However, I think if you're going to ever focus on complete streets you also need to heavily focus on motorist behavior. I'm terrified to ride my bike down Patterson because of the potential for there to be a texting driver that swerves over into the bike lane, or someone who runs a red light, or someone who makes an illegal turn, etc. With no law enforcement traffic patrol, our streets are a lawless free-for-all. Anyone who says otherwise is in denial. It's a joke that we fill out the paperwork to receive a bike city designation.
93	I like to walk and frequently encounter bikes trying to use the same space. Need wide enough for both. I do miss the Midwest where there were numerous bike trails in shaded woods.
94	Please put a crossing light or tunnel on 29 and C 1/2 road. Would love if the river trails that are paved by connected lakes were redone, they are super cracked and lumpy. It would be great if the river trail connected to Palisade. Thanks.
95	Enforcement of illegally tinted windows on cars would help increase bicycle safety. Cannot tell if a driver sees you when windows are so dark. Additionally would increase police officers safety. Converting the irrigation roads to bike trails would also greatly improve biking in GJ.

#	Comment
96	GJ has fairly good North-South routes, if you don't mind a little vehicular cycling, but we need more viable cycling routes that go East-West, especially if you want to get out of the Northeast corner of GJ (e.g., Fruitvale). The bike lane along Patterson is just a cruel joke, that lane should either be removed, or made into a protected bike lane. It's current status along a 45 mph road, where many motorists are going 50+ is suicidal.
97	Opening the canal paths as trails would be a hugely beneficial to biking and walking in the valley!
98	At many intersections, a bicycle in a traffic lane will not 'trip' the sensor to activate the traffic light. I am therefore stuck either waiting through multiple light cycles, or running a red light, or having to go press the pedestrian crosswalk button. In many places, the crosswalk buttons are not in a place that can be reached by a cyclist, so I have to get off my bike, push it to the crosswalk button, turn it around, and then cross the street. I have had to do this many times while towing a child in a trailer, and maneuvering the bike and trailer in that fashion is very difficult. I would love to see more bike lanes and more traffic lights that are sensitive enough to be triggered by a bicycle in a bike line, or to have the crosswalk buttons more accessible.
99	I've done a lot of bike commuting and recreational jogging in this town in the past 5 years. I think that two things are needed: A) infrastructure improvements B) driver education/cultural changes. For A, we need more bike lanes and paths, better links between them, better shoulders, safer crossings. For B, we also need to somehow change the attitudes of drivers toward pedestrians and cyclists, especially outside the downtown area. I've never experienced the hostility toward pedestrians and cyclists anywhere that I have here, and it's really disappointing. I suspect that A will be easier to fix than B.
100	I love to bike and walk for low impact exercise. Living outside of the city limits makes my options for safe routes limited.
101	More needed for designated bike paths through city and connections to Palisade to Fruit. Safer bike paths little park road and monument
102	Bike lanes are too narrow and often filled with debris. Patterson is extremely unsafe.
103	I live in the Redlands and am able to easily access the Colorado Trail off Redlands Parkway which is great. However, it would be nice to have a pedestrian bridge over to City Mark (24 Road), the mall, etc. Another consideration is adding in a route to get to the Lunch Loops main parking lot. Right now there is a small section of S. Camp that has no sidewalk but then there is no sidewalk one you get to Monument Drive and turn Left back towards town.
104	I would like to be able to bike from my house to work (from downtown to the airport) but don't have a safe route and to Palisade without biking on the roads.

#	Comment
105	More bike paths would make me feel more safe. My path from home to school feels dangerous with the amount of cars. The community would benefit with a bike path that connects the riverfront trail to CMU campus and downtown.
106	Paint is not infrastructure. We need designated interconnected routes off of major roads. There's so much potential here! If the city is trying to attract high wage workers from the front range and grow economically this is a crucial investment!
107	Thank you for working on a master bicycle and pedestrian plan and continuing execution of long term vision to safely connect all parts of Grand Junction and the Grand Valley! I ride at least three times a week and my husband five times a week so we appreciate the bike infrastructure that is in place! In the short-term, immediate work is needed to repair the pavement on the bike trail along Camp Road and on the River Path just west of downtown. Those cracks will swallow your wheels.
108	Thank you for undertaking this effort.
109	Bikes are awesome! Thank you.
110	Currently, I road bike for recreation, 2.5-3.5 hours/3-4 times a week. often cycling the National Monument. The need for safe, clean paths, motorist education of how to pass a cyclist, slow down, 3 ft, no coal rolling and loud exhaust, and recognition of health benefits, cost savings and decreased traffic are priorities.
111	The east end of north avenue is not bike friendly.
112	The roads and lights are wonderful as they are!
113	Old asphalt trails with joints are bone jarring on a bicycle (like Blue Heron section). 5th street bridge crossing by bicycle to the US Department of Energy Office is very busy being next to the road. Would like to see the bridge over the Gunnison River come back.
114	We need an interconnected network of active transportation routes that people of any age or ability will feel safe using.
115	To make the valley attractive to tech with its younger work force, a state-of-the-art ped/bike grid would be invaluable. The Chamber of Commerce should recognize the potential of our insitu resources like the irrigation and drainage canals and support such development.
116	If you get kids to ride their bikes to school, they will continue as adults and be healthier!
117	Redlands loop pavement in very poor condition. Missing bike trail east of las Colima's to 29th. Challenging to cross 29th to river trail.

#	Comment
118	As a community it will be important to look forward to bike/e-bike communizing as a reality. This involves adding bike lanes or widening current bike lanes to streets. This also includes improving designated paved bike lanes to make accessing destinations easier. For example, the progress that was made on South Camp has been impressive. It has a designated walking trail for familiar to access he elementary school and also has a well designated bike lane. One idea would be to utilize the already existing canal maintenance roads.
119	Scooter share programs are not the answer. Limited bike share in downtown areas may work. Educational signage and safe/easy bike parking is necessary at grocery stores and other major shopping areas.
120	Would love a safer sidewalk connecting Wingate Elementary School to Broadway
121	The roundabout in Redlands is a terribly unsafe route for students biking to school. A route to work is impossible with Redlands parkway/24 rd and Patterson being the main artery. Lack of bike lanes and paths is a deal breaker. We need safer routes & crossings, especially for students that are out of bus service area.
122	The bike path the college has is great. It would be nice to expand it. I'd bike down to horizon and/or 12th to get to downtown from northern 27 rd if paths were available.
123	Make Orchard the east west route instead of Patterson, no cyclists wants the danger on patterson.
124	Eminent domain all irrigation canal roads and let us walk and bike away from vehicle traffic.
125	I ride my often through the valley, many comments/suggestions on the interactive map are spot on. Making roads more safe and accessible throughout the valley has been a need for a long time.
126	When is the city going to adopt a true system of trails like they have the roads to get me from my home to places like Fruits and Palisade.
127	North Avenue is difficult to cross or access on bike. It's unsafe and drivers are often seen using aggressive techniques threatening the safety of a cyclist. Broadway / Grand provides greater space to share the lanes where, even though it doesn't promote sharing the road, is easier to achieve. We don't want to be forced to ride to the riverfront in order to access our town.
128	Getting to the Riverfront trail requires me to use D Road. I don't feel safe riding along the road. There are no grocery stores on D road. Establish small neighborhoods grocery stores
129	great plan but safety should be #1...safe from homeless hanging out on trails, dogs needtohave poop picked up, and leashed dogs who do not push you off trail.

#	Comment
130	As someone who has lived in other cities, both bigger and smaller, it's unsafe biking and walking alongside roads. Adding a painted line is a cheap and quick way at solving nothing. We need more sidewalks across the valley and lightning. D Road is horrible for pedestrians. Completely horrible. Separated bike lanes with a barrier are needed anywhere there's currently a bike lane or needs to be. Walkers and bikers needing to commute need to feel safe. The traffic will only get worse if biking and traffic commutes for errands, work, leisure, school, etc will only get worse and dangerous for those who are trying to get around walking and biking. This could also be a huge selling point for GJ. We need more ways to move - cars shouldn't be the only option to get around town.
131	Our family have bikes and would love to go places in town. Currently we have to drive to a location and then bicycle and then drive back. It would be amazing to have our whole trip on bike. It's hard to believe with a college of birth that no one considered a bike lane. Really disappointed with that.
132	Any road construction project from here on out must include bike lanes in their model. Grand Junction is an outdoor rec Mecca and it is embarrassing how cyclists must get around town. There also must be a larger conversation and education with the community public on how to interact with cyclists on the road.
133	The Audubon Section and Blue Heron sections of the Riverfront Trail are in bad need of repair. I ride through the adjacent neighborhood to avoid the unsafe portions of the Audubon Trail - there are many eruptions in the trail and large gaps. I would also like to see a safe passage from Dos Rios and Los Colonias to downtown.
134	We live in the readlands, and south Broadway is a disaster for cyclists, too narrow and cars are too fast
135	The current bike trail system is awesome. It is well defined, safe, and maintained properly. Keep up the good work.
136	If you look to major cities, most of the walk/bike paths are incorporated into greenways and are off the streets. This allows for the safety, not only for the pedestrian but also for the drivers. Definitely we need ped paths to the new community center and to all our parks located in the city limits as a priority. Do not forget the Clifton and Orchard Mesa areas.
137	Model after Denver and take bike/walk paths away from traffic
138	Overall, GJ has made a great effort to have bike lanes and work towards safe traveling outside of motor vehicles. Please improve bike lanes, especially on G road which only has a west bound bike lane. Please also improve side walk access on 25 1/2 road connecting with G road. The 1/4 mile from Moonridge Drive to G road along 25 1/2 road is unsafe.
139	Walking is very unsafe. Sidewalks are uneven and bicyclists are always on the sidewalks. They yell at people and even push people off the sidewalks. Since bicyclists do not have to obey ANY laws, they can just do what they want. I will not go downtown for any reason, try to stay on the outer edges of GJ

#	Comment
140	separated bike lanes along major corridors are critical for safety - such as 7th street, Grand Avenue, North avenue, Ute/Pitkin, etc. putting people on the road surface in a striped, non-buffered lane is not safe nor comfortable.
141	It would be nice to have a bike path that felt safe to travel from Northern Grand Junction to the Riverfront trail/Las Colonias area.
142	<p>Right now there are a lot of areas where the sidewalks are too small and too close to the road. It is scary to walk or ride on the sidewalk when there is no room to pass another pedestrian or bike and you have cars going 40 mph inches away from you.</p> <p>There are some bike lanes but many are right next to street parking. I have heard stories of bicyclists riding down the bike lane and running into car doors that opened up without warning. I feel I have to be overly cautious whenever I am in a bike lane.</p> <p>There are also bike lines that are barely a lane. There isn't much room given to the bicyclist or to the cars trying to get by which can be frustrating for both parties.</p> <p>Thank you for being willing to work towards a better bike and pedestrian plan!</p>
143	We need more safe and accessible biking routes. The current bike paths need more maintenance. Lots of gravel and weeds
144	Make shoulders on roads wide enough to safely bike. Sweep shoulders on regular basis. Educate drivers about bicyclist.
145	Farfetched, but one-way monument travel with bike lanes would be amazing. or just a safer Crater of the Moons Loop. A safe way to get from the Redlands area to the fruta farm roads. Or a safe way to Palisade. Water fountains at Lunch Loops or James Robb State Park or Junior Service League Park. The Riverfront path is great, but biking fast on it is not safe for other users. Running on it is great, but there are little water stations and GJ is HOT HOT HOT. Las Colonias at Canyon view Park are amazing. Maybe a safe way to connect the two.
146	Bike paths are needed for everyone's safety.
147	I would like to bike more in this area but the dedicated paths (e.g. river front trail) don't really help if they dump me into city streets that are wholly unprepared for bikes and with drivers who clearly do not understand their obligations to share the road.
148	Thank you for doing this work! Improving Junction's biking/ walking routes can make this an even greater city and destination! I am especially interested in the connection between Fruta and downtown and the Monument.
149	We live on G road near 26 road. No safe walking sidewalk for walking for leisure or to get places. Kids can't safely ride bikes to school or for leisure. Would love sidewalk. Same for many main roads of the north/west area of GJ.

#	Comment
150	The overpasses north of canyon view park and 24 1/2rd and 25 road are in desperate need of a bike/ walking lane. Schools, parks and churches all around but everyone is put in danger trying to cross the narrow overpass'.
151	I have biked to work a few times, but I do not feel all that safe doing so, based on the lack of bike paths/lanes. I'm excited for the City to be developing a bicycle and pedestrian plan!
152	Ideas I have; Main Street become a pedestrian street. More places to lock up my bike, like Walmart. More side walks and easier access for d51 schools to have student ride bikes.
153	Grand junction needs more separation between cyclists and vehicles. We shouldn't have to breathe exhaust while commuting or exercising. The current painted bike gutters are laughable because of how dangerous they are. We can basically copy the Netherlands and their bicycle infrastructure. Please watch the you tube channel not just bikes, city nerd and city beautiful.
154	I would love to see more safety for our kids and those who use public transportation. I actually rode the GVT with my client to help her navigate it last week and there were so many places that we didn't feel safe. This is not ok.
155	Certain pathways can be sort of directional with arrows and things as to almost make them biking and walking highways. They have many of these in Fort Collins
156	Ride more..
157	Biggest thing is that these drivers need to learn about common courtesy, they are the people that make me hate riding on road!
158	Would love to see more lighting and sidewalks as well as more bike lanes.
159	Biking needs to be safer. Adding physical barriers for bike paths would go a long way.
160	Awesome job with the river front trail! The recent removal of the bumps and cracks are much appreciated. Would love for it to connect at C1/2 Rd. While the river front trail is nice, it would be good for the city to plan paths into new and or expanding neighborhoods and have alternative routes to the river front trail.
161	It would be great to somehow increase community education around biking etiquette and safety. I have seen so many families/kids/homeless people/college students do really unsafe things on bikes (like riding the wrong way, towards traffic, in a bike lane). And I think it gives the non-cycling community a bad taste in their mouths about cyclists, which in turn makes it less safe for anyone on a bike. Thanks for engaging in this topic! We are excited to see where it goes.

#	Comment
162	I am a CMU student who feels unsafe bicycling to campus so I walk which takes much longer. Even walking feels dangerous.
163	I'm not a biker -- it's not safe in this town. If you want to attract more bikers to this area, develop more bike lanes. Better and safer for the bikers and for the cars.
164	Some riders don't follow the sides of the road and get out on the streets where cars are
165	We need more dedicated bike lanes and we also need better citizen education. I've bike commuted for decades and one of the problems in Grand Junction is poor cyclist behavior. I frequently see E bikes traveling 20mph on sidewalks and bikes riding against traffic in the lane. I am a strong advocate for bikes but I also want to see cyclists behaving more like vehicles (following predictable traffic laws). I think better infrastructure would help with this. Riding your throttle assist Ebike on the sidewalk is less appealing if you have a well established bike lane.
166	Please consider the reality that not everyone has the skill or confidence to feel safe in a painted bike lane. Designing lanes that physically protect riders of all ages and abilities is the only way to make active transportation actually accessible to all ages and abilities.
167	Need more bike lines. Need more education to citizens about safety for bikers.
168	I bike to work M-F across Orchard. There is a painted bike lane part of the way, and only circular patches on the other part. In Honolulu, bike lanes have been improved by adding curbs instead of paint. I would encourage that here. More people biking means less fuel consumption, safer streets, quieter streets, and greater health in the community. Systemic and structural support will increase the number of riders.
169	Biking is a Hallmark feature of the grand valley. Improving our interconnectedness will improve traffic and create more character and personality for the valley.
170	I gave away my car so I do not contribute to traffic jams, or pollution. I ride defensively, and try to be an ambassador for cycling life, and commuting.
171	Not enough signage between lunch loops and Colorado river trail. I'm not even sure if it connects. So much so that I don't use the trails there to get to lunch loops.
172	It would be great if we had a plan to develop dedicated bike lines that are not with auto traffic. Exterior sidewalks should be part of every new development (eg Emerald Ridge should have been required to put sidewalks along 26 1/2 rd.)

#	Comment
173	the lack of sidewalks in city limits are horrendous. We walked to Tope from 1st St, down walnut, where the road is narrow and lacks property shoulders and no sidewalks. the rural roads should be wider for bike safety
174	I would love to see designated bike paths that are protected by a barrier from cars. Increase signage and awareness not to park in bike lanes. It would also be lovely to see Main Street become car free to increase the walkability and provide way more bike parking. I'd also like to voice that all neighborhoods deserve this access, not just wealthy areas of town. Biking should be a source of pride for our awesome city and I'd love to see us really own that. Thank you!
175	I find the biggest issue is motorists not heading to pedestrians. If this could be better enforced and more education given, it might not be quite so terrifying to walk around in this town.
176	A problem with the exercise/recreational trails is that they are used for transportation purposes by people in a hurry that do not have a device (bell) to warn that they are approaching at high speed. Mixing the two types of traffic is dangerous for the walking and riding public.
177	I have commuted by bike for 35 years in the city of Grand Junction. The city has made some slow but steady improvements for both pedestrians and bicyclists. Please keep with your trend and progress. I noted some concerns with roundabouts - I actually like them and I think they work well with biking. Key is riding defensive and always looking.
178	It's better than it was 20 years ago.
179	City needs much greater traffic control
180	We need auto speed enforcement on 5th and 7th. We need crosswalk enforcement all over. We need safe bike lanes so people don't ride on sidewalks and create problems for walkers; 12th through CMU is a good example of an area needing attention.
181	Another suggestion would be bike libraries that would provide marginalized communities with access to bikes.
182	we need the canal roads to be for public use.
183	wall off downtown and outlaw motorized travel. Everybody would feel safe and accidents eliminated.
184	your sidewalks need to be ADA compliant, they are not with the ramps that face the streets and not sidewalk to sidewalk. I can show you several examples.
185	Please consider protected bike lanes and bike paths throughout the city! This makes biking fun and accessible, especially for the youth in our community. We are a community that loves being outside and biking! There is so much potential to make a bike-friendly community here much in the way of Boulder or Fort Collins.
186	Please allow Orchard Ave to become a safe corridor for cycling

#	Comment
187	Vehicle Traffic routes through town should alternate some slower and Faster on designated routes
188	Grand Junction is not a big city and yet it is very difficult to get across North Avenue, get a cross or a long Patterson and get across 550 in town. There's a lot to be done to improve connectivity in a safe and accessible way. Please prioritize this to make Grand Junction much safer biking/walking/rolling community. As the city grows it would be great to minimize car use or at least provide an alternative to car use. This will be critical as we grow to reduce emissions and pollution especially in those cold inversion months. Additionally I want to make sure the city is prioritizing access to the rent new rec center for all types of transportation. Ideally we have a safe access for kids from all neighborhoods to reach the rec center. This encourages the use of the rec center and allows youth and families that may not have access to vehicles to have access to the rec center. This is critical to equitable access for all.
189	I'm hoping there are plans for protected bike lanes in the future.
190	Access along the river is fantastic, however, it is difficult to safely get from Horizon to the riverfront trail. I'd love to see detached bike paths that run north south from somewhere on Horizon to downtown. Probably like 7th street, but where riding along the busy road is not necessary. Even a 10ft bike path detached from the road by a couple feet would be amazing.
191	Grand Junction is a great city to live in and a great biking destination and would be made better with designated bike lanes and bike paths.
192	I basically shared my comments up above, but basically we need a network of dedicated trails and protected bike lanes throughout the city to safely connect the entire area. I have been riding my bike in GJ in the past and found that a bike lane ended on a major street and then there was significant overhanging brush pushing me even closer to traffic and there was no way to turn around and it was very unsafe and frightening. Cyclists can attempt to string together semi-safe roads for cycling using Google Maps and other software, but it's hard to do successfully without trial and error, which prevents the casual rider from even attempting it. Paved bike trails and protected bike lines allow families with children who are novices on a bicycle all the way to professional riders and everyone in between to enjoy the beautiful weather and sights that we have on the western slope. Without those things in place, I have significantly decreased my cycling since moving to the area from Aurora, CO because I just don't feel safe riding my bike to the paved trails from my house.
193	Turn Main Street into a pedestrian road
194	Mosquito control on the riverfront trail would be great!
195	Sadly, we live too far from most commercial enterprises for walking and biking to be very practical (North of I-70, and on another topic, can we get some shopping and services up there and not just houses!) But even when it could be, the streets don't have sidewalks or dedicated bike lanes. Lighting isn't consistently good, but there's still traffic, and frequently fast traffic.
196	Would love to see Main Street as a pedestrian only street!

#	Comment
197	I would like to be able to bicycle from my home to open space, nature trails, bike paths, shopping, etc. As an older citizen, acceptance of e-bikes on trails and fate times sidewalks is a must if we're to stay active and be safe.
198	Canal roads should NOT be opened up for pedestrian traffic. Canals are unsafe for children and pets they are not meant to be heavily accessed by the public. These roads and paths are meant for maintenance to the canal system
199	Bridges on Grand Ave have very narrow sidewalks. Broadway sidewalks from Safeway to the northwest are too narrow
200	Try to get Mesa County to add shoulders to their roads.
201	Large increase in biking and walking paths that connect parks with restaurants and shops. Larger shoulders and slower speed limits. It's a beautiful valley and getting around by bike and walking would be ideal.
202	Look at the cities that have excellent bike infrastructure and learn from them. Get help from Bicycle Colorado.
203	I don't think e-bikes/scooters should be on the bike paths. They are way to fast and generally very inconsiderate of bikers and walkers.
204	Please consider both city and county boundaries when adding bike paths. Our neighborhood in the Redlands is a patchwork of city/county property & it would be great to have consistent bike lanes regardless of whether it's on city or county roads
205	It would be nice to keep downtown Main Street for pedestrians only.
206	Broadway elementary could use additional access across Broadway, more flashing lights/crosswalks
207	We live in the north part of gj and it is very difficult to safely ride downtown or to the lunch loops trail system safely with kids. Drivers are unaware or unsafe, speeds are too high and there aren't any North South paths. GJ could be an incredible city for bikes if there were paths (not just bike lanes) because those are safe for kids.
208	Above
209	In general the path surfaces vary tremendously. They go from smooth concrete to bad ly cracked asphalt, to bumpy streets. If you ride from Corn lake to the Redlands Parkway boat ramp, you will experience all of these conditions. The the 29-27 section of C 1/2 Has really deteriorated over the last 5 years, The bad asphalt west of the ice rink to up to the the Redlands parkway needs to be replaced with concrete.
210	Thank you for working on this! More people outside their vehicles makes for a better community!

#	Comment
211	Add bike/walk trails along South Broadway in Redlands. Take some right of way if necessary. The current situation is a fatality waiting to happen.
212	Make Main Street a walking mall with a small bus service up and down the area for those that need it. We also need more free and designated parking areas please. Well lit and safe at night.
213	I hear people everyday say they would love to bike more often/ to more places but that they don't feel safe or comfortable biking in town.
214	I am hesitant to walk down North Ave as there is several "permanent " homeless persons. The trash and personal belongings scattered about is so disturbing.
215	I love the maps that are currently up on the bike routes. People park in the bike lanes on these routes. The sidewalks on North & Patterson are close and loud. I think coexistence is better than eliminating car use or parking, as being able to walk/ride a bike isn't something everyone can do. Having close parking and a way to drive close to shops is important for accessibility across a myriad disabilities.
216	Clean up homeless an drug use
217	I was at the "bicycles now" rally in Denver in 1968/69. The expanse of bike trails through out the front range can be attributed to the raised awareness of bicycle access these events created. We need more of this awareness on the west slope.
218	Would love to see C1/2 Road repaved between Las Colonias and 29 Road. As the connector between the downtown trail section and the section starting on 29 Road, this is ridden daily by many and it is horribly maintained ... bad surface for bikes!
219	Please keep in mind that not everyone lives in the Redlands or downtown. We would like to see paths, safe streets and clean sidewalks all over the city. PLEASE add bike lanes to the busier streets. It is hard to get most places if you can't safely ride on North, Orchard, Elm, Grand or Patterson. Also, the areas where the homeless congregate need more patrolling. Maybe by the bicycle cops? The east end of North Ave. near War-Mart is out of control as is the area around Lincoln Park and the VA Hospital.
220	Improve existing bike infrastructure. It is crumbling in many places. Connect more parts of GJ to existing infrastructure so biking/walking is an option. Better signage for cars to be on the lookout for other modes of transportation.

#	Comment
221	We need more stand-alone bike paths that are not along the shoulder of a road where you do not have to encounter car traffic. We also need more east-west and north-south corridors for bikes. It's hard to travel great distances around town as there are no extended bike paths other than the Riverfront trail. Also, pedestrian/bike bridges (no cars) need to be built over I-70 for those residents living north of I-70. The bridges at 26.5 and 27 roads are too narrow for bikes and walkers.
222	As noted, I would like to see development of key by-ways across GJ. Example: 7th street would be one lane for cars, one lane for bikes; The riverfront trail through town needs re-done; it is a main trail for any cyclist coming to town. We travel to other towns that celebrate/promote cycling within their cities; leads to tourist traffic
223	This is important! Thank you!
224	I would love to see more biker and walker friendly routes to get places like downtown!
225	Studies have show in street bike lane kill cyclists. They are extremely in safe with all the cell phone drivers. I have been push into the curb and side by vehicle. We have zero enforcement with traffic laws! Biking on the road is rolling the dice with your life, I know 8 people that have been hit by cars in the valley over the years. I would like to see pathways (systems/ corridors) like Denver Boulder, Fort Collins, salt lake area or other big city's with trails that connect the city. Off of the road system, using alleys, canals, or wider sidewalks. Riverfront trail in Grand Junction is C-. Between the homeless, thorns, debris , uneven surface, cracks, holes bumps it isn't safe. It's obvious the city employees/ management do not commute via bikes on the road or trail systems in town. We could do a ton better so fellow citizens don't get run over while commuting.
226	Existing paths could use maintenance or improvements and are overtaken by invasive trees.
227	I would suggest having bigger or more designated walking and biking paths. It's dangerous for both because of lack of this.
228	Increase signage and markings and education to make it clear what the traffic responsibilities are walkers, bikers, rollers and cars/trucks. Implement ways to enforce.
229	I love to see the improvements over time - bike lanes, signage, new routes, etc. There are certain pinch points that make it a little too risky for my kids, but hopefully that will change in time as well (and as they get older).
230	More city bike paths please.

#	Comment
231	<p>Open the canals. They are long tendrils of well-maintained paths that are relatively cooler than surrounding areas and don't contain hostile traffic.</p> <p>NIMBY folks living along canals have no expectation of ownership to what is ultimately a public utility- the irrigation canals running through the valley that everyone has an expectation to enjoy access to. Opening them up for traffic doesn't need means testing or prospective studies, it can be done in relatively short order compared to other means of trying to restructure things. Changing gate access so private locks and chains are no longer permitted is all it takes.</p> <p>Especially given how inexplicably slow the city has been even implementing equitable ebike access to trails (eg lunch loop), opening canal access would greatly enhance the navigability of the valley and riding options for all the people who have been buying out the ebikes in town.</p>
232	<p>I am really excited to hear these talk are happening, we have a huge biking community and it's important we make it safe for all commuters.</p>
233	<p>Sidewalks are not maintained - covered in weeds and sand from winter weather. Can't cross major roads like Patterson safely as cars are speeding, changing lanes at intersections and, turning against walk signs, running lights. Bikes ride on the sidewalk because the street is too dangerous. There will need to be traffic control before pedestrian and biking can be enjoyed or safe. We drive three blocks to get to a place to jog for five miles.</p>
234	<p>I hope you aren't planning to push for Main street to be closed to through traffic! I need to be able to park near where I am going to do business.</p>
235	<p>Please, please, please install sidewalks and bike lanes along F1/2 between 30 Rd and Thunder Mountain Elementary. The kids need a safe route to school and the neighborhood route is WAY out of the way because of dead ends and cul-de-sacs.</p>
236	<p>Improve safety for riding on the road by adding bike lanes and/or increasing shoulder widths. Make bikes routes more direct to popular locations. More signage asking motorists to share the road.</p>
237	<p>I find downtown and riding to downtown from the Redlands pretty good. Downtown is more pedestrian and bike friendly than most places. However, for those who cannot drive (or prefer not to own a car) getting to shopping areas by bicycle is another matter. These streets are only made for cars and negotiating the mall/shopping areas takes a great deal of urban riding skill and savvy, something the average casual cyclist will not be able to navigate. I hope Grand Junction is completely bicycle friendly in the next 5 yrs. or so. There is much potential here.</p>

#	Comment
238	<p>Biking and walking are great for people without disabilities, age-related or otherwise, but not for the rest of us. I have lived in Grand Junction all of my life. Please don't mess with main street. Main Street and down town are very walkable. Getting there from anywhere else generally requires a vehicle. Grand Junction was named a top place to retire. Please make sure it remains that way. Bicyclists need to be safe and need to be educated to follow the rules of the road. I have nothing against bicycles sharing the road. I have first degree relatives who are over-the-top cyclists. I have memories of dropping my then 90 year old Mother off at the door of Benges for her last shopping trip there. She wouldn't have been able to go if she would have had to walk more than a few yards. She had been shopping there for 67 years.</p>
239	<p>Make education a priority, conveying the need for safety and peaceful coexistence to all motorists, law enforcement personnel, pedestrians, cyclists and others. This can and should start before formal adoption of the plan.</p>
240	<p>I know a lot of bikers want Main Street closed to car access. That would limit its access to disabled people, those with mobility issues, vision issues ect. There's no enough parking to support that. Personally I very much enjoy driving down Main Street even when not shopping and can't walk it due to disability.</p>
241	<p>It's very hard to ride your bike down main street, aspen fought this in the beginning, but loved it afterwards.</p>
242	<p>The River Front Trail is a great artery through the valley. We need safer branches from the river front trail to encourage bike usage for shopping and commuting. There is not a safe way to access Western Colorado Community College from the River Front Trail, the bike lane stops at Patterson on 25 road, where it becomes a narrow two lane road and cars can not pass a bike safely without crossing over the center line of the road. There is a chronic problem with drivers (car) running red lights on a left turn signal. This is especially a concern at 25 rd and the 6/50 intersection. The roundabout on Redlands Parkway and Broadway pedestrian lights are inadequate, very difficult to see due to sun during peak times of traffic. We also need public education to inform drivers that cyclists had a right to be on the road.</p>
243	<p>We need to have more dedicated (i.e. physically separated) bike and walking paths to facilitate non-motorized transportation in the Grand Valley. Clashes with vehicular traffic and unnecessary dangers can be eliminated by not insisting on having bicyclists and pedestrians 'share the roads' with larger motorized vehicles.</p>
244	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Irrigation trails would be nice, but how can the City plan for and add these sorts of easements into master planning for future growth regardless of the irrigation component? 2. What adaptive / flexible infrastructure improvements could be added to encourage users in some sections? 3. what gaps exist in the urban trail network which could encourage better use?

#	Comment
245	Please ensure complete and accessible routes. Don't be afraid of using green pavement markings in bike/vehicle conflict zones. Please ensure safe access to locations such as grocery stores and community centers.
246	Why do you do these surveys? The leftist city council will approve what they want anyway.
247	I commute on Patterson daily for work. I would love to be able bike but there is no safe way to bike.
248	The number of bicyclists in the metro area is too large as it is. Bicycles endanger motorists, who might have to veer into oncoming traffic to avoid bicyclists (even if the motorist is going under or at the speed limit). There should be a designated cycling area *away* from streets to stop endangering motorists.
249	Need more bike paths, we have some that are nice and others that will randomly just disappear leaving the rider vulnerable.
250	It is very bad when a bike path on a street suddenly ends. Now you are forced to ride in automobile traffic.
251	Community buy-in and consideration of all stake-holders is key to success.
252	Rising from the Redlands neighborhood to areas like the mall are difficult and unsafe trying to get across the river and across 6&50. Riding even a short distance on 6&50 is dangerous.
253	A few specific issues to highlight: There are roads where the bike lane abruptly ends (for example, 15th) which makes for confusion and uneasy biking. While the underpass at 29rd is a big improvement, it would certainly be great to have a trail from Las Colonias to 29rd so that there were no bike/car interactions on that section.
254	Drivers will occasionally yell at pedestrians for them being too slow while they are crossing in designated crosswalks.
255	Need signage and improved infrastructure to cross over the railroad tracks by the jail. The bridge is fine but it is not well marked, difficult to cross the road by the jail to get over to the bike lane, etc. Multi-lane roads are challenging to ride along... fewer lanes, slower traffic make walking and riding more enjoyable. Vegetation and weed control along the Riverfront Trail is really important. Riverside Park and areas around news sections of the trail are great. Los Colonias to Dos Rios is challenging.
256	It seems to me that GJ has plenty of recreation trails, both walking and biking. What GJ needs is more facilities for commuting and shopping by bike. That means direct, safe, practical routes designed to take bikers to commercial and retail areas of the city.

#	Comment
257	I think that bike lockers would be a fix to the bike theft issue. We live in a place where a lot of people have expensive bikes, and bike lockers are reliable and easy. If there were some downtown, at CMU, near the mall, and a few other places, that would be great.
258	I would love to see continuous bike routes. For example, Orchard Ave has some parts with bike lanes (7th to 12th) but others without (7th to 1st). This is hard for cyclists and cars alike. This would be a great area for a bike lane given the schools in the area (West and GJHS). Too frequently bike lanes disappear.
259	Barriers that are more intense than bike lanes, such as bike lanes w buffers, buffers and flagging/conning, barriers, and bike paths, are needed to feel safe in the city. A real investment would allow grand junction, which is walkable and bikable all year round, to embrace this mode of transportation and provide safety and wellness to its citizens
260	Decreasing the speed of traffic (by making cars feel less comfortable driving faster through good road design) and making roads that don't have cars are big things. Also more crosswalks on major streets (eg. North, 12th, 7th, Grand) that blink at cars and give you right of way would be great.
261	Thank you for this!!
262	Elevated bike paths
263	While more routes can help, I feel that safer roads come from safer drivers. Distracted driving seems too common along with people who are not making full stops. Or phones, or flying to a stop when you are in the middle of an intersection.
264	Expand accessibility on the Grand bridge!!!!!!! Or build a dedicated pedestrian/bicycle bridge please!!
265	I would really like to see a safe routes across intersections and updated bridge pedestrian/bike paths.
266	Thank you for undertaking this effort.
267	Having bike/pedestrian bridge(s) or tunnels over/under 12th street at CMU campus pedestrian crossings would improve safety along 12th street
268	Look for best practices with bicycle education for both drivers and bicyclists.
269	Spend some time on your bicycle or running and see what you think. There's a lot of people here that would rather run you off the road than be delayed by a few seconds.

#	Comment
270	Make laws surround car and bicycles impacts change. Currently if no one is injured no citation is written. I have been hit four times riding my bicycles in GJ and not a single citation was written to the drivers.
271	<p>I'd like to see effort concentrated on the places that need bike infrastructure the most and prevent dead ends. For instance, no one uses the bike lanes on 27.5 rd because it dead ends at Patterson. The nice little bookcliff pedestrian bridge also dead ends at Patterson. There's places on north Ave without pavement in the sidewalk area, yet focus seems to be paid more to the outskirts of the range rather than the heart where it needs it the most.</p> <p>Also, bike routes deserve shorter trips, rather than diverting to 5th or 15th using a trip the same length or shorter than n/s 7th or 12th is best. Bike paths along or bypassing vehicle corridors is a big interest. East-west corridor, orchard and elm are great, but north and Patterson are a living hell.</p>
272	Redlands parkway to 24 road needs a safe bicycle option. This would help facilitate north and south travel, instead of only east and west on the riverside trail. Would also help encourage people to bike to canyonview park and city market.
273	I applaud what you are attempting.
274	It would be helpful if bike paths could hook up to the trail systems. For example I live off 29rd and like to bike on the river trail. But I do not feel safe biking from my house to the river trail so I drive there. That is due to traffic on 29rd and several major intersections such as North and 29. It would be great to be able to safely bike to the trail.
275	Continue to build safe bike lanes and trails and set an awareness that more older people are using e-bikes and for the public on roadways to be considerate.
276	<p>Recommend ansidewalk on 23 Rd in Redlands</p> <p>Difficult to walk my dog in neighborhood and scary to ride bike to get to bike path and open spaces</p>
277	Nice to have bike access to Mesa Mall from river trail. 3 foot shoulder along as much of the "Tour de Moon" rout as possible.
278	Bike paths do not connect especially on the north side of town. Crossing the bridges over I70 to go north is frightening (heighten the edge rails). When will there be a bike path passing community hospital from 24 to 23 road? Improve G road end to end. Great idea adding path at G and 24, keep it going.
279	A couple unsafe spots: crossing Colo River on narrow shoulder separated by cement from cars. Not wide enough for two way bike and pedestrian traffic. Entering Crosby Ave after crossing the rr tracks at the jail is unsafe with limited site distance.

#	Comment
280	I ride a lot around downtown & it feels ok -12th Street toward Patterson does not feel safe - hard to get to City Market
281	Grand Junction has a great infrastructure for expanding biking and walking accessibility: the canal system. If only the GV Irrigation Co. could see the possibilities, too! An even greater challenge than changing the beliefs of GVIC however is changing the perception that most Grand Junction drivers have toward cyclists—it spans from invisible to downright hostile. A citywide bicycle plan is a great first step to becoming a bicycle friendly community!
282	We need a safe Pky to funnel bikes and walking from 25 Rd., 26 Rd. North to South to catch the wonderful overpass and River road bike path. Needs maintenance for comfort and safety. Audoban path is very hard to ride on a bike. But stop is wonderful. South Camp road asphalt is in need of repair but it's a great path.
283	Accessibility hasn't gotten better since we moved here in 1998, but can still improve.
284	Clean up the bike lanes. They have glass and debris that puncture tires.
285	City needs to heavily invest in bike paths. A loop bike path needs to be priority connecting the north city area (airport) to the River Trail with a loop bike path starting on the River Trail going from east to west looping up north around city limits back to the west joining again at the River Trail.
286	Live in Fruita but would like to be able to bike around grand junction safely especially to hospitals and parks.
287	Riverfront trail is fabulous; however, segment for about one mile starting at Redlands boat launch to Banana's fun park needs new surface. The poor pavement discourages riding a bicycle encouraging alternate less safe route selection. The 29 road crossing to get to and from Corn Lake is dangerous.
288	We need more north south bike routes. We need safe and reliable access from the Redlands across 24 road. We need safe and reliable east west access along main thoroughfares (G, Patterson, North, Grand)
289	I really love what the accessibility ramps have done to improve biking on the sidewalks where the streets are too dangerous for bikes. But the existing bike lanes need to be swept way more often to be of value to people on bikes. Otherwise all we have is narrower lanes if people on bikes have to ride in the vehicle lane.

#	Comment
290	There is not good side walk access to the mall. I have to travel on the street to access the mall. There are not wheel chair ramps on the northside of the mall from the sidewalk to the parking lot. Like at 24 1/2 and Patterson the side walk ends when you cross the street. I can not get off the sidewalk to get to the mall. I have to ride in my electric wheelchair in the busy streets. I live near the mall and travel the area on a regular basis. Thank you for conducting this survey and look forward to many new changes to our paths.
291	Walking/bike trails increase property values and make communities desirable places to live. Healthy lifestyles are supported and encouraged with sufficient trails. I would ride more to work and the grocery store if safe trails were available.
292	There is virtually no safe route from the Redlands to the mall or Canyon View Park when traveling on the Redlands Parkway. The overpass over the rail road and Business 70 is very unsafe. The bike path along the Blue Heron trail has numerous expansion cuts in the asphalt which are very jarring and unpleasant to ride over. Why can't that route be all concrete?
293	Work with Colorado Monument to build more trails into the Monument Extend Lunch Time Loop Trails
294	I love to bike the River Park Trail, but certain spots are rough both the trail and other people using it. Also, sometimes, there are riders there that are traveling way too fast for safety. And no....these are not ebikes.....young men and women out biking at top speeds.
295	Active seniors would like to be able to continue to be active, with out the convenience or access to a car.
296	We have seen in other places, on biking and walking trails a line separating the walking side from the bikers, well marked. Bells, etc. are fine but the hiker doesn't know where the biker is and has to figure how to avoid a collision. By simply separating the two, it solves the issue for all. Many bikers demand recognition and consideration from drivers, but don't give that same consideration to pedestrians. Defining who should be where takes care of that.
297	Bicycle riders should never be on sidewalks unless they are walking the bike . When bike riders share roadways and streets with auto drivers they MUST obey all the traffic laws the same as auto drivers. Pedestrians are completely responsible for their own safety when crossing streets. Accidents caused by bike riders and pedestrians should have no special privileges. Remember - GJ has a high percentage of retired population and elderly drivers who can not see as clearly as younger drivers. There response time is a little slower - all the ENTITLEMENT that pedestrians and bikers assume means nothing.

#	Comment
298	Open canal roads for wheelchair access. Other communities allow access. Does the local irrigation district truly have legal grounds from stopping the city or county from using the roads as trails?
299	I wish there was a way we could open up the paths along the canals and pave them to be bike paths.
300	<p>I used to ride and walk all over the city and use the river trail system. No more! I've been solicited for sex and money by homeless men around the parks, at Walmart on North Avenue, and on the trails. I've had to ride my bike through groups of vagrants around the parks and river trails, and even had my bottom pinched by a guy who leaned out of a passing car as I rode my bike along 5th Street. Now I stick to my car for errands and transport. I just ride my bike around my neighborhood, where I hope I could get help if I needed it. How are your plans going to make it safer for vulnerable residents, including single women, to ride and walk more? If you can't make these activities safer, then you shouldn't be encouraging people to ride and walk.</p> <p>Also, I have e-bike riders nearly knock me down on trails, which I thought were restricted to non-motorized vehicles. What the H? They are a danger to pedestrians and regular bike riders on the trails. Keep e-bikes on the streets where they belong.</p>
301	<p>Tour of the Moon is famous and ideally would be able to be completed all the way with dedicated paths, or bike lanes, or wide shoulders. Likely not possible over the monument but the rest of it should be.</p> <p>Developing alternate routes (paths) to connect as much of the city as possible would be great.</p>
302	I would like to see bike trails along canals. 25 Rd and 29 1/2 Rd are examples of streets where sidewalks are spotty and I see pedestrians all the time walking along gravel and mud. I like new bike/pedestrian tunnel at G Rd and 24 Rd. Would like to see better connectivity from city to river trail. I appreciate being able to give my opinion
303	Love to see the bike path continue to Palisade past D1/2 Road. Maybe widening of the current path from 29 Road to D1/2 to accommodate more ebikes that speed.
304	I'm confused why class 3 e-bikes are not allowed on some trails. Have a speed limit for all trails and don't allow throttle use, if that is the concern.. Class 3 e-bikes are just as safe around pedestrians as class 1 or 2 or any bike—road bike or mountain bike.. I always use caution when pedestrians or dogs are on the trail and ride slowly past them. I warn pedestrians if I am passing and proceed slowly. I have seen many athletic bikers on road bikes who fly by pedestrians and around corners and are far more dangerous than a Class 3 e-bike. We purchased our bikes in order to not use our automobiles so often to save on gas and pollution.. It makes no sense at all that class 3 e-bikes are not allowed on some trails when there is little difference. How can we change this law? A number of people in GJ have class 3 e-bikes. We are able to exercise more if we are able to use our e-bikes safely. If we only can ride on the street with cars, trucks, etc, then our safety is endangered and we are less apt to bike.

#	Comment
305	River front is great for E/W travel on the S end of town. There are few safe options for traveling N/S.
306	Thanks for seeking community input and for helping to make our dreams a reality.
307	A few of the older bike trails are in bad shape. The one paraleling the Redlands Parkway on both sides of the Colo. River bridge to the Jr. Service League park has rough strips every 10-20 ft. The trail is wide enough just needs new asphalt and would be relatively cheaper to repair than many of the older bike trails. This trail receives a lot of use.
308	Need safe ways for bikes to cross busy intersections (US 6&50) , Redlands Parkway overpass
309	We need more designated bike lanes that are protected by a barrier from auto and truck traffic. Too many serious cyclists are hurt or killed by distracted drivers in too large of vehicles.
310	Vehicles frequently are Not driving at Posted Speed Limits. Law Enforcement need to display an obvious presence - monitor speed limits utilizing the posted speed/ "your speed" electronic monitors frequently placed on the shoulder of roads with officers openly issuing speeding tickets. Consider Photo Radar Enforcement to temper speeding and thus unsafe driving which is especially Unsafe for peds/pedalers and drivers of small to mid sized vehicles! To clarify, I am not a demanding , whiney senior. I have utilized bicycles for years and still mtb. I was a dedicated commuter in Philadelphia and understand bicycle safety as a rider. I am alert to vehicles and work to anticipate of their "intent". Thank you for convening an effort to improve the commuter/user process in GJ.
311	South Camp. My daughter either has to ride on the road at points on the west side of the road, or she has to cross southcamp and ride in the east side of the road. I would like to see a crosswalk/ pedestrian sign at the intersection of Avenal lane and southcamp
312	Dedicated bike/walking paths that aren't along a road. Small children shouldn't ride their bike next to fast moving cars, which forces them to the sidewalk which defeats the purpose of a bike lane if families are biking together.
313	26 RD from Patterson to I road should have wide lanes for either biking, walking or running. The CMU bike team often comes down 26 RD to access a route toward Fruits. Also the high school track team runs down 26 RD. There is very little walking along 26 RD due to the nature of the houses and the speed of the traffic.
314	There is a sign on 28 1/4 Rd. that there is a bike trail on Elm Ave to 28 Rd., but there are no sidewalks there and only gravel next to the 2-land street.
315	Bike lanes should not abruptly end when approaching intersections. For some egregious examples, see D and D.5 Roads, east of 29 rd. Bikes have nowhere to go, and drivers don't know what to expect.

#	Comment
316	Bike lanes will randomly end and it makes me feel very unsafe as it is hard to merge into traffic on a bike and as traffic increases it's not something which can wait. I also would like to discourage pedestrian bridges or anything that requires pedestrians and bikers to climb rather than cars, the things which climb easily and have motors.
317	<p>I love cycling as my primary mode of transportation to work, despite the long distance (around six miles) to get there. I can use the riverfront trail for 90% of my commute, and I wish we had more dedicated bike and pedestrian infrastructure like it. Good bike infra is physically separated from cars and connects to a lot of destinations. The riverfront trail only really succeeds at the former. I don't like to share the road with cars and drivers don't like it either. I also wish there were more places to go within a smaller radius of where I live. The nearest grocery store to me is two miles. There's too much exclusively single family home zoning around me for anything to be close or convenient. There are also some residential streets that are needlessly wide and with high speed limits, despite getting little through traffic. The street right outside my driveway has no sidewalk (28 Road).</p> <p>The riverfront trail can also feel scary for sections at night, where there isn't enough lighting, which is detrimental and causes me to commute by bike less during the winter months.</p> <p>I loved the farmer's markets on main street this summer, and wish they could have continued into the fall when the weather was a little cooler. Closing off main street to motor traffic made it very cozy and enjoyable. Main street is enjoyable even when cars are allowed thanks to the curvy narrow roads that calm traffic. I wish the downtown area around it conformed to the same standard of pedestrian friendliness. I also wish North Avenue was more comfortable to traverse on foot, the sidewalks there definitely feel like an afterthought, and I don't make any trips by bike to a location if it's on North.</p>
318	The Bike Lanes on 7th and 12th make no sense to me. Those are busy streets. Also, the signs for the different color-named routes are very hard to follow. Posted too high. Indistinct directional arrows. Lettering too small.
319	<p>I currently live on the front range, own land in GJ and plan to relocate there soon. I would like to see a more extensive rec path system similar to what we have in the Fort Collins/Loveland area. Both cities have a series of paths encircling cities with numerous side paths to neighborhoods and many of the city parks. Both of the systems are connected as well.</p> <p>https://www.lovgov.org/home/showpublisheddocument/56960/637843353329530000 https://www.fcgov.com/bicycling/files/21-23544-2021-fort-collins-bike-map-large-english-v7.pdf?1640787288</p>
320	Some of the bike paths need some repair as they are cracking and need to be widened so that in more congested areas people can walk and bike. Keep extending the bike path to the monument, this is a destination for people who cycling (think travel destination). Bigger shoulders and bike lanes on 340.
321	bridges, tunnels, paths, and overpasses as connectors.
322	Better connected bike trails

#	Comment
323	GJ has some great bike paths in place. It is a good start. However, there are a lot of areas of town that feel completely inaccessible by bicycle. Even with a bike lane busy roads can feel very dangerous in this area due to the way drivers treat (or ignore) cyclists. Riding on any major road in this town that doesn't have a bike lane feels like a death wish. I would like to see bike lanes be standard on all major roads AND see more development of separate bike paths.
324	Older retired folks enjoy biking and walking/running. I mostly see older folks on the existing bike trail, not younger people. Get out there and see who is using the existing trails. Signs asking for cyclists to call out their upcoming presence and signage for right of way priorities should be posted.
325	People are getting hit and killed by drivers who don't think they belong on the road. The mindset needs to change. New roads should include a big shoulder and not ending the pavement after the painted line. This gives bikers more room. Also, those streets should be cleaned, as all the debris doesn't make it safe to ride.
326	Keep the bike lanes free of gravel and debris. Maintain the river front trails - free of goat heads. When mowed the debris is not swept off the trail. When there is an accident the debris is often swept into the "shoulder" area which causes the bikes to go around and into traffic.
327	I am on Gunnison Avenue daily and the bike lanes there are not placed well. When parked cars open their doors to get out, it completely covers the bike lane and then I have to move over into car traffic to avoid them. A parked car may not see me coming due to other parked vehicles that are large, like UPS Delivery trucks.
328	Bridges to go across I-70 are too narrow for walking/biking alongside traffic. Wish they could be expanded to include safe lanes for walking/biking or add pedestrian bridges at crossings between 24 and 27 road.
329	Please add more places to practice for different types of riders. The city of Grand Junction has a generational opportunity to bring in world class tourism revenue if they can capitalize on the dirtbike and biking community.
330	More trails Make it safer to ride on city streets.
331	The only way to get from my house to CMU is to cross North or 70, neither of which are safe. There are no dedicated bike lanes or bike paths throughout the city. There is not a large number of people that regularly commute on their bikes, and the lack of bike culture in everyday commutes is a deterrent for me. Not only do we need more infrastructure, but there also needs to be more incentives to ride bikes instead of drive. Some possible solutions could include tax breaks for riding bikes, employee benefits at work, charging more for parking, raising the price of gas even more, or even just having social rides that bring people together.

#	Comment
332	Connecting Palisade to the riverfront trail would be great, should have happened before running it out to Loma in my opinion. Pedestrian/bicycle access from Redlands parkway over the 24 road bridge to the mall and the trail that runs to Canyon view park would be a great, well used asset (there is currently no safe way to do this).
333	I would love to bike more but there are stretches where I have to be on major roads and that is scary, unsafe, and not at all something I feel comfortable doing.
334	We need more sidewalks for children/people to safely ride and walk to and from school and parks! I live off of G road and 24.5 rd which has heavy traffic and many neighborhoods and schools in the area. Too often I see kids, and I have to walk/ride next to the road with no sidewalk or safe bike paths to use. It limits my motivation to bike to and from work and send my children to school and the park on their bikes or have them walk. This area is just going to get busier as there is homes being built all around this area. Please keep our children safe and add sidewalk and bike paths for them to use!
335	The other safety concerns is that there are not sidewalks along the entire route and the bikelanes don't feel comfortable at 7 in the morning with distracted traffic whizzing by. I wish there was a sidewalk along the South side of Patterson between 25 and 25.5 Road, along Pinyon Ave, and along 26 and 26.5 north of Patterson (for miles).
336	Making "hub" entrances to bike paths. Making paths everywhere is not possible but making major east west, north south paths that people can easily enter creates less hassle.
337	We need more PR to make the community more accepting of bicycling and walking in the city. Sometimes it is the attitude of people that make it difficult. Too many people in cars going too fast with no respect for walkers or bicycles.
338	I found no other place to leave just a comment. It would be nice to see Main street converted to a walking and biking district, from 7th street to 3rd street. Brick the road, tables and chairs, outdoor vendors and such.
339	There has to be a real presence of Security personnel; Police, Volunteers, Private, for there to be a sense of safety biking and walking in Grand Junction.
340	Link the bike path from 29 road to the river trail, so we don't have to cross 29 road and we don't have to ride on C road. Hook the east side of the path in to Riverbend Park in Palisade.
341	GJ is currently a very dangerous city in which to bike. The primary reasons are: lack of concern by motorists for bicyclists, traffic volume and high speed by motorists.
342	Don't take up space for cars to make bike lanes- they did this in LA and it was a nightmare.
343	No safe way to get from Redlands across 6&50 to the mall or up to G Road, North GJ, Community Hospital, etc. Same goes for East-West travel along Patterson, G road or North Ave.

#	Comment
344	distracted drivers are a big safety issue for bike riders
345	Need to widen the ped/bike section of the Broadway Bridge over the Colorado River. Need to improve bike path from Dike Road to the Broadway Bridge.
346	I would like to see direct connections via bike to the proposed Community Recreation Center (CRC) at Matchett park.
347	I ride my bike to work sometimes but the access along River Road is scary. There is not an adequate bicycle lane. River Road has a lot of commercial traffic (heavy trucks, trailers, etc.) The 0.6 miles from the overpass to the edge of City limits needs a separate path so that biking to work is safe. This will increase the usage of people being able to use a different mode of transportation to get to work.
348	The shoulder bike lane on River Road is extremely dangerous and insufficient because vehicles commonly exceed the 55 mph speed limit and the bike lane is very narrow and on the shoulder. There are 40 City employees at Persigo WWTP that do not feel safe riding a bike to work because the last 0.5 miles from railhead circle to the plant are along river road. This assumes you can ride the river front bike path all the way to railhead circle. If we add a bike path along river road from railhead circle to the Persigo plant, it would allow for a safe bike commute and connect the river front bike path to Persigo WWTP. I fear someone getting killed using the current bike lane on river road. I've has vehicles pass me within a foot while they are driving 55+ mph, its terrifying.
349	Should have biking to community hospital G road is unsafe.
350	I would walk/bike more if we had better connectivity and more separation from busy roadways.
351	Many hospital employees would ride bikes to work. Would be nice to see St. Marys and Community connected to major bike paths. Both hospitals have major roads and busy traffic surrounding them and very little bike path access.
352	29 1/2 road north of Patterson is unsafe. Not only is there no bike lane, but there is room on the paved road for a bike and automobile without crossing the center to avoid hitting a bicyclist/pedestrian
353	I find it odd that sidewalks are left out as one of the reasons why we don't walk or ride. Grand Junction and Mesa County need sidewalks and bike Lanes before bike signs thank you. Please remove the bike signs north of town along 26 Road until we have sidewalks and bike Lanes.

#	Comment
354	Hi! This is an excellent mission. Few thoughts: 1) Our main corridor to school and for biking is along Monument Road, which is filled with cars and bikes. For sake of safety, and to connect with the existing path on S. Camp, would LOVE to see a bike path put in on that highway. The existing near Lunch Loops is usually walkers, not bikers. I feel it's only a matter of time till one of the fast moving cars clips a biker in the narrow path/shoulder that exists. 2) I think ensuring safety from other humans on the bike paths - particularly around underpasses, near the Safeway on Broadway - is important for encouraging more to bike. 3) Ensuring bike paths are connected throughout town is key too. 4) if biking #s increase, need to make sure enough bike parking downtown.
355	Biking Routes North South through GJ are pretty good. Less east west options besides the riverfront trail.
356	I know sidewalk maintenance is attempted, but they could use more. There are sidewalks, but not bike paths. Biking along 12th is not safe. Downtown neighborhood streets need lighting badly, but please use lights that shine down only, not ones that cause light pollution. I hope there will be a safe way to walk and bike to Matchett when the community center is developed.
357	It's no wonder that biking seems unsafe when the City tries to force bicyclists to mix with motor vehicles. Bike lanes on higher speed streets (anything above 25) are a horrible idea. It's no small wonder that the more this is done, the more accidents occur. Keep bike's separate on their own paths.
358	24 road corridor from Redlands to Patterson could use to be bike friendly
359	We need a solid recreation corridor that has safe and convenient accesses business districts, schools and high density residential areas, not just the riverfront area.
360	Education for drivers is important. Also enforcement of traffic laws. There is a majority who do t understand how to respond to bikers/pedestrians
361	For bikes, the issues extend beyond the City of GJ into the county. I live out near 26 and I roads and ride these roads myself and I see lots of others, including the CMU Bike Team riding on these roads. But the roads have NO shoulder and really need to have a proper bike lane to the side. There needs to be coordination with the county for bike lanes in the county areas connecting to the City paths.
362	There is always room for improvement, but GJ is still the best place I've lived for walking & biking. In general, I can get most anywhere on foot (I don't bike much). Great strides have been made for pedestrians at the Horizon Drive/I-70 interchange, making the walk to the airport a snap compared to what it used to be. Would like to see wider pedestrian sidewalks across the bridges over the river. Quite scary at present.
363	I like how Fruita and Denver and salt lake city have it where there is side walks that are placed all throughout the city that don't follow the road system.

#	Comment
364	The current paths are very nice, yes. But on streets.....some don't have bike paths on both sides OR don't even exist.
365	A lot of the current problems with implementing non-vehicle transit in Grand Junction stem from an understandably passenger-vehicle-centric historic focus on transit planning. There is much work in the past decade that shows the impact this has on pedestrian/rider/driver safety. Grand Junction would serve future generations well by attempting to incorporate current transportation engineering standards now into planning and roadway improvement budgets and schedules.
366	Barriers between bikes or pedals and cars are key, especially when encouraging a wide variety of users, like kids and seniors. Paths, bikeways etc are great.
367	Would love to see the riverside trail completed to go through las colonias to 29 rd. would also love to see a safer passage through the middle of town with safer bike infrastructure being built on streets like Orchard Ave
368	Currently the bike path system is fractured and not well marked. Despite a large volume of cyclists in the area and world class road/mountain biking the street route are poorly marked and unsafe. Protected bicycle lanes and integrated bike paths for commuting would be a wonderful addition to the city.
369	again, the Mesa Mall is a dangerous place for bikes and needs to be rethought as there is no safe bike path or pedestrian path
370	Love that we are doing this!!!
371	Lot's and lot's of potential. If the city is sincere, bike and pedestrian planning will be taken just a seriously as planning for the automobile. But sadly, with most development, it seems to be an afterthought at best. I challenge developers and engineers to consider the needs of bikes and peds as the FIRST step in the design process, not the last.
372	I went to school in Oregon. They have a regulation that a bike lane is required to be considered with every road project. It would be so nice to have foresight with ALL road projects to consider alternative transportation and how they can adjust the project to accommodate those utilizing these methods of transport. I watched sadly as the wide sidewalk on Broadway was out in and I realized that the nice bridge was not easily accessible if you were using the bike lane. Instead you have to have a lot of foresight to get off the road early and use a driveway to access the sidewalk prior to the bridge. Soft shoulders are key to allow bicycle commuters to use the bike lane when safe but easily transition the the path when the bike lane punches off to nothing or there are obstacles in the road.
373	I think we should pave the canal roads as connecting bike paths. The bike path is great, but is out of the way for most commuters.

#	Comment
374	In previous cities, I have enjoyed bike commuting for most of my transportation needs. In Grand Junction, 2 major reasons that prevent me from biking commuting very often are: 1. aggressive behaviors towards bikers from other community members (would love to see a major culture shift in this area) 2. lack of bike trails, the need to cross busy streets, and a lack of safe bike route options.
375	More bike lanes please, and on streets where the speed limit is greater than 35 mph I would love to see dedicated bike lanes
376	<p>There are some great resources with the Strong Towns nonprofit that relate to making more profitable and pedestrian friendly cities. Many infrastructure and zoning changes to make our city more economical seem counter-intuitive but the data back them up. Making streets feel less safe for drivers (making them narrower, etc.), actually makes them safer for pedestrians because drivers naturally slow down. This kind of thinking could have been applied to the First and Grand intersection, which was "improved" by designing faster car throughput, which makes it significantly less safe for pedestrians and cyclists. For all of the work that was put into designing this intersection, I feel it is just as inconvenient as a bike as before.</p> <p>More pedestrians and cyclists is financially beneficial for our city. Less need for vehicles frees up resources for low income to spend on other basic needs. Less infrastructure wear and tear. More dense shopping and more taxes collected from buildings that were once on parking lots. Less money spent on healthcare as folks are healthier from not having to sit in a car, and the list goes on. I am very excited that GJ has this initiative and am ready to volunteer my time to improve our great city!</p>
377	Variable feeders into major East-west and north-south core paths. RFT is excellent example of core AST-West rout. Look to north-south streams & washes as well as East-West canal routs for most pleasant and safe routes with fewest intersections.
378	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bike routes and bike/walk trails often abruptly end when approaching busy intersections, which is where they're needed most. - Lack of sidewalks along many roads in growing areas around Grand Junction (like 26 Road and 27 Road). Housing and population growth outpace the development of such sidewalks and bike routes. - Need more and better bike parking areas around town. It can be hard to bike to destinations due to lack of secure and adequate bike parking. - Too many bike thieves in this town.
379	I appreciate that this is getting attention, because I would love to see the investment in safe and affordable means of transportation. Bike lanes and walking passways are inclusive, essential, and usually quite beautiful. Encouraging this time outside when commuting to work, school, errands, whatever, is a fantastic reflection of the values we have as Grand Junction residents.
380	I'm especially interested in being able to bike to Canyon View Park along G Road. Not possible for me now.
381	From a drivers perspective bicyclists are unsafe. Widen the roads to make it safer for them.

#	Comment
382	We can be doing so much more to invite an alternative to our commute whether it is for work or errands. We have an automotive infrastructure in place, but now we need to be more aware that there are a lot of Grand Junction residents that would like a better walking/rolling/bicycling infrastructure that is often seen for the citizens of some better run 1st world countries. This can be for health reasons, gas reasons or to not be so dependent on a car/car costs.
383	Que los carriles para bicicleta sean conectados
384	Es necesario tener mmas senderos para bicicletas, Especialmente espacio para bicicletas donde hay protección de la calle y los autos, como mas espacio entre los carros y los senderos para bicicletas, o espacio con césped or otras platas para proteger las bicicletas de los carros. Y tambien es necesario tener mas iluminación para viajar seguramente por la noche.
385	If we were to facility somehow the rental of bicycles, E bikes, scooters such as Lime or Bird, perhaps more people would go and hang out downtown Grand Junction and or would not use a car or a bigger vehicle to go from point A to point B in the valley.
386	disconnected trails
387	12th street feels very dangerous x2
388	developed tree canopy wuld help during summer for shade
389	Lack of safe connected /continuous bicycle infrastructure. Narrow multi surface bike lanes that have chuck holes, uneven surfacing, debris, manhole covers and drains that must be negotiated, and that randomly begin and end. Difficult crossings of multilane streets with lights that are too short, and inadequate and dangerous places to wait t to cross.
390	There is a need for more SAFE places to lock your bike. Las Colonias is one place in particular, MANY people use a bike for their river shuttle and there is no place to lock bikes. Several stores do not have proper bike parking. The downtown area could use more bike parking, especially for special events, which would encourage more people to bike downtown for events like the market, Rides & Vibes, Beer Fest, etc.
391	Some corridors have no connectivity by bike without going way out of the way
392	Lack of bike lanes or shared lanes on primary roads like North Avenue. Inefficient bicycle routes that treat bicycle use as a second rate mode of transportation for daily living.... Efficient access to work, school, businesses.
393	The drivers around here are afflicted with some sort of mania. Warrants further study.
394	gravel in bike lanes, especially 7th st. , too many big trucks you have to share traffic with.
395	Some areas need safe crossings or even small shoulders
396	The sidewalks, where present, are often too narrow.

#	Comment
397	Your bike lanes usually do not extend through intersections! New intersection on 1st and grand did not follow your complete streets policy of implementing bicycle infrastructure within intersections - no bike lanes!! Sorry but sidewalks don't count for those who commute every day to work by bike.
398	This is not a safe way to commute from palisade to grand junction via bicycle.
399	It is unsafe to leave your bike anywhere because it will likely be stolen, or parts off your bike will be stolen even when chained up or using a cable lock.
400	A beautifully connected trail system would be so fun! Riding and walking alongside vehicle traffic one feels vulnerable, exposed, and uncomfortable.
401	Concrete and asphalt cracking cause uncomfortable riding.
402	No bike lanes and even if there were the traffic speed is too fast. Much of it exceeds the speed limit.
403	Too many entitled people on bikes.
404	E bikes present a danger to pedestrians and regular bikes because they go much faster
405	In many cases I need to go further when walking, or walk across busy streets or parking lots with no pedestrian amenities, than I would by car -- due to lack of crosswalks and super round about intersections or bridges **specifically the ridiculously long round-a-bout way to get from Redlands to Downtown GJ via Broadway, and to get across Monument road from where people live/eat to where people recreate (lunch loops & the bike path)
406	Sidewalks that abut the street are very dangerous. The safer ones are separated from the street by a grassy area.
407	Hills, but I am trying to figure a way around that.
408	Homeless people under bridges are using the sidewalk as a bathroom!
409	Nearest grocery store is five miles away so biking to and from the store with a load of groceries is not practical.
410	Cyclists need to stay on the bike path and show curtesy to vehicles. They are rude both on the road and on the trail. They clog the roads and try to run people over on bike trails. They honestly not welcome.
411	Not enough separated multi-use trails and/or connections from those trails to where I want to go.
412	not enough bike trails/paths
413	The behavior and attitudes of vehicle drivers to pedestrians (at least outside of the downtown area, where drivers tend to expect pedestrians and are better). I go jogging a lot in the neighborhoods near Canyon View and often cars won't even stop for me in the roundabouts.

#	Comment
414	PATHS NEEDED ALONG CANALS AND DRAINAGE DITCHES CREATING CITY-WIDE GRID REMOVING PED/BIKE TRAFFIC FROM BUSY STREETS. NEEDS DONE!
415	We need connecting routes so we can commute by bike, or do longer trips. Now you have to wander around and it's not safe due to traffic.
416	the biggest challenge is for the cars because the bicycles should be on the sidewalk, now north avenue is more dangerous than ever who ever engineered the mess they are doing right now should be fired!
417	City center/University area in general is perfect for bike and scooter travel being that is not hilly. And yet the bike lane and shared bikes lane infrastructure is non existent along some the most key roads like North Ave, 12th and 7th. Areas full of people living and shopping...thousand of residence and students along with shops and resturants, with room to grow even further, with high density apartments or town homes...and yet the all we see from the city is expanding the width of sidewalks, which was not needed on Norht Ave, the problem is traffic...and the city double downs with bus pull out lanes which further increases traffic speeds as car proceed unrestricted as buses pick up passengers and the bus schedules will fail in the future as traffic density will not allow the bus to merge back into the moving traffic. The city has spent millions destroying the bus experience with removal of benches and shelters..... and further destroyed accessability on Norht ave for left turning people in the name of safety...with out simply lowering the speed to 30. You cant fix the incompetence and the mindset. At one point I called the city to inquire on why the bike lanes were not installed during phase 1 of livable neighborhoods...which voted on and plans drawn up to include bike lanes. That never happened...and the city told me to just ride your bike on the sidewalk.... which is the most backward ass thinking possible. You cant even argue with that level of incompetence in my opinion. Then I heard talk of multimodial trails next to Norht Ave...that is why the sidewalk is so wide now...but studies show over and over again...you never put multimodial trails next to major roadways especially when they are lined with businesses and driveways. The level of incompetence with city planning is maddening.
418	Drivers in this area are completely unaware of cyclist rights and laws protecting them (bikes can take whole lane, must give bikes 3ft, etc)
419	There is very little regulation on poor driving and speeding in Grand Junction, so drivers drive fast and carelessly.
420	No separation from the crazy drivers and diesel DB's who make me fear for my life and breath exhaust.
421	Since there is a lack of bike lanes - bikers ride on the sidewalk and make it feel unsafe for pedestrians. Could change this by having a safe bike lane.
422	The existing bike lane network is very disconnected and doesn't actually connect me with where I want to go. I would like to see short, safe, and connected routes be prioritized in the design of our bike network.

#	Comment
423	Crosswalks are not properly marked on both sides and vehicles rarely stop
424	Streets without any bike lane, or streets that have a bike lane for only part of the way (e.g. Gunnison or 15th). Busy streets with nothing at all - most of the East/West corridors.
425	Bike lanes are inadequate or non-existent for a large portion of the roads I frequently use.
426	Some roads have no sidewalks at all.
427	Trails are nice when you get to them, but riding a bike on Patterson is not a good option for getting to a paved trail. The sidewalks are narrow and bumpy, and even if you go south on 1st street where there is eventually a bike lane, it's still only a painted line and not a protected bike lane and I don't feel very safe. All of this significantly impacts how much I ride my bike. In Aurora, CO I had excellent access to paved trails near my house and I could go anywhere in the Denver Metro area safely by bike and it was fantastic.
428	We need more shoulders and the bike routes we have need better continuity.
429	There's no safe crossing by bike from Redlands over the Redlands parkway (to City Market, Patterson, Canyon View Park, Starbucks, etc). The hill takes time to climb, and the vehicles move very quickly. There's no bike lane, and it takes a lot of effort to go around that area using the bike trail. Also, 25 Road feels unsafe to bike on to work.
430	Homeless in areas very unsafe And unsanitary
431	Homeless population has taken over. I walked to work once and there were men in sleeping bags on the sidewalks along North Ave. They hang out in most of the parks now. I feel for them but it makes it feel dirty and unsafe.
432	GJ lacks safe by-ways across town; This is improving but still inadequate; key would be safe north to south route
433	Limited safe corridors to travel in the valley (River front trail)
434	people who drive fail to maintain the posted speed limit.
435	People driving cars can be aggressive to bikers
436	Lack of traffic control - speeding, lane changes at intersections, yellow and red light running, loud cars with no mufflers
437	Areas to nearby shopping centers not safely rideable for bicyclists - lack of shoulder, bikelanes, etc.
438	The best routes are often not well published or known for people.
439	We moved downtown for the walk ability to the pharmacy, library, post office, and grocery. In the past five years, the grocery and pharmacy have closed and now we drive to get our food/meds. We live in a food desert now.

#	Comment
440	Safely traveling from one area to the next. Transition zones.
441	There is just so much traffic that it makes it unpleasant to bike. But if GJ was in Europe, most people would bike in such size of a city, fairly flat and with great weather!
442	Homeless sleeping at every park with a public bathroom. Tents and hammocks set up at bus stations. Businesses with overhangs have homeless just sleeping under them.
443	Drivers attitudes towards cyclists in GJ is toxic. I have been hit 4 times on my bicycle by a car. Not a single situation was written. Once I was accused of staging the accident by the police.
444	pedestrian lights change too quickly.
445	Homeless groups on river trails and at park toilets
446	Clothes required when I get there
447	No safe bike path to get from north area to River Trail
448	Personal; not enough time.
449	Competition between walkers and bikers for space.
450	Roads are not wide enough to safely allow safe passing of bicycles.
451	Along Independent Avenue, the gravel & mud run off after a rain onto the sidewalk makes it hard to navigate — seems like the property owner should contain the gravel & mud. Also, some of the property owners let mulberries cover the sidewalk, making it difficult to navigate a wheelchair. Lastly, at least one property owner on Poplar allows their hedge to grow onto the sidewalk, again making it difficult or impossible for a wheelchair to navigate.
452	The paths frequently do not lead to anywhere meaningful, i.e. to a store/park/hospital, or there are no safe ways of getting to said locations as there are no paths.
453	Walking in many areas is difficult. Trails are not connected. also speed of traffic on 26 RD where I live makes it difficult.
454	Inconsiderate users on bikes/ebikes not announcing or riding too fast. Too many homeless people.
455	Bike lanes are not wide enough to feel safe in traffic
456	There should be more trails and spots to practice dirtbiking.
457	No trees to shade in the summer
458	Not enough bike paths/lanes
459	Safety concerns walking alone with many area of homeless camps.
460	No sidewalks, if you build it they will come
461	The preserve walking park on the Redlands is not safe for a woman walking by herself. No bike lanes on S. Broadway - dangerous for bicycalists.
462	Dangerous drivers and no enforcement of traffic laws

#	Comment
463	Could we move more towards Night Sky Friendly lighting?
464	Buying uncooked food is only possible at large stores centered in concentrated, vehicle focused shopping centers, not close to where most people need to use uncooked food.
465	The Mesa Mall has no bike path and my daughter took her life into her hands trying to get to the mall, this needs to be corrected so that kids and adults can safely travel to and from the mall
466	Busy doing other things.
467	Homeless??? Asking for money, or acting in a threatening manner. Dogs running without being on leashes. Drivers who look left and go and run into those who are coming from the right. Drivers who think a STOP sign means slow down, then continue.
468	I don't feel safe walking places like the Riverfront trail specifically under the many dark bridges. There is overgrown onto many sidewalks. I understand main arteries being fast like Patterson, North and 12th, so I avoid them. I don't understand when people speed on Main or 5th. It feels unsafe to cross, and even makes the most leisurely time downtown feel like a task.
469	more bike paths x2
470	disconnected routes x2
471	speeding cars
472	not safe for children
473	right hand turn lanes feel unsafe for bicyclist
474	Drivers' lack of patience and understanding with bikers
475	Some streets with wide shoulders or bike lanes, often have cars parked in the way, weeds, or other debris.
476	Unprotected bike lanes make major routes too dangerous to bike!
477	Lack of efficient bike lanes along major city center corridors... North Ave, CMU, city center. Bikes on sidewalk as a primary path for bikes is ignorance...
478	Again, the Mesa County Motorist Madness. These drivers need to be examined by a professional.
479	Poor connectivity. Examples: bike lanes that just end at mid block (e.g. 12th Street); traffic lights that don't change, making the whole route inconvenient (e.g. 5th Street); inconsistent shoulder width from one block to the next (e.g. Orchard Avenue).
480	Thier are spaces between bike paths that are not accessible/safe for bicycles, thus it is impossible to use these paths to get from one location to another.
481	Cars/trucks biggest fear

#	Comment
482	Dogs off leash along trails; broken glass lack of clarity about motorized E-bikes and pedal assisted bikes speeding down the trail and striking pedestrians or traditional cyclists; no apparent speed limit for E-Bikes
483	Biggest issue is having to ride alongside all vehicle traffic almost anywhere you want to go in the Grand Valley.
484	Right-wing anti- environmental zealots trying to terrorize cyclists, an uneducated percentage of car drivers who don't understand the law, let alone recent changes to said laws, road hazards such as goatheads.
485	Streets are designed for cars, not bikes. Biking is often unsafe, especially as there is very little biking culture.
486	Railroad crossings--have to walk the bike
487	Too many entitled and inconsiderate peopleA on bikes
488	Lack of connectivity
489	Cars often do not stop at stop signs: 1) roll through the stop sign and 2) stop after the stop sign into the crossing
490	Bike lanes abruptly end with no shoulder available. Vehicles taunting bicyclers. .
491	bike lanes terminate before reaching destination
492	The design speed is just too high on most roads in Grand Junction to Safely/Comfortably accommodate bikes, and often alternative bike paths go under bridges and to other less "sticky" (interaction with surroundings) and therefore usually less safe or comfortable areas.
493	People are using their cell phones every second their behind the wheel!
494	I bike many places in grand junction regularly and there is a lot of road in Junction that is truly unsafe for bikes. Often there is no route that makes it safe unless I want to add 3-5 minutes to my ride, which is already longer than driving, making biking even less desirable. Safety and direct efficient routes are two most important things for getting people to bike commute. With safety being a big big number one. A lot of the shoulders are filled with debris, meaning I risk a flat tire, or ride right on the line. Often, junction has these huge terrible shoulder less roads that there is literally no other option but to take, and cars go 45-50 mph on. I try hard to find safe efficient routes and there are a few no doubt but they are few and far between. Lived and biked in a few other places and glad this survey is happening because bike ability of junction has a lot of room for improvement.
495	I frequently ride the bike lanes on Monument Road and along the Riverside Parkway. They need to be swept of debris much more often. I frequently have to travel in the traffic lane because of all the rocks, gravel, and broken glass that is in the bike lanes. A bridge for bike riders and pedestrians over 6 and 50 would be good. Perhaps one near 24 road and another one near the Amtrak Station.

#	Comment
496	It is difficult to transition to the north valley from the bike path at the Blue Heron boat put in bike path across the bridge to 24 road. There is very little room across the bridge over Hwy 6/50 to the intersection of 24 road and Patterson.
497	hostile drivers
498	driver/biker interactions can be very hostile
499	Lack of bike lanes
500	The behavior and attitudes of vehicle drivers toward cyclists, which range from obliviousness to outright hostility and aggression. I moved here from the Front Range and have been shocked and disappointed at how hard it is to bike commute in this town. Pre-COVID, I biked to work every day from 25 and G Road to my office downtown. So many bad incidents. Drivers here at best simply don't expect to see cyclists, at worst, they are downright mean spirited. They don't stop when it's my right of way, they cut me off at crossings, they roll coal in my face. It's really disheartening. Also, many (maybe most) businesses here don't even have bike racks out front, so I end up finding a tree to lock my bike to. It's so different from the Front Range, where it's standard for businesses to have racks.
501	Feel unsafe biking where there are no bike paths present
502	Drivers are inconsiderate of bicyclists
503	COLORADO LOTTERY GRANTS NECESSARY TO PAY FOR CANAL BIKE PATH INSURANCE AND TO ADDRESS OTHER OBSTACLES ENCOUNTERED.
504	No connecting through routes. It does no good if you have to get off your bike, detour, etc. Bike commuting needs to be designed just like car commuting - direct and fast.
505	Link up bike paths create east west through bike routes.
506	There are NO bike lanes along busy areas like North avenue. This is incredibly dangerous to ride in the road as well as on the sidewalk.
507	Infrastructure is currently insufficient to connect different parts of the city.
508	designated bike streets do not have sufficient room for bike lane, especially G road only has a bike lane for west bound traffic and non at all for east bound
509	The whole town caters to bicycles and now you have totally screwed up North Avenue.
510	nice list of nothing youve provided. The biggest challenges is that major retail and neighborhoods are not connected with a cohesive network of bike lanes or shared lanes....and streets with bike friendly speed limits... 30mph in high traffic areas.
511	Bad or little bike lanes... examples: Broadway, South Broadway, Interstate 70 Frontage Rd, River Road, Rim Rock Road, Little Park Road, 24 rd from Redlands pkwy to Canyon View Park, route from GJ to Palisade.

#	Comment
512	many bike lanes are full of goat heads or broken glass etc. and flat tires are a big problem
513	See above
514	There is not enough separation from traffic
515	Bike lanes should have physical separation to prevent vehicles crossing. Bike crossing lanes are needed at street lights. Citizens need more respect for bikers/pedestrians
516	Bike lanes end abruptly on main thru ways (for example 12th Ave when it crosses Gunnison). So it is not safe to bike to the grocery store - or to other errands because bike lanes end and are non existent for much of our town. We would LOVE to bike to these places if there were a safe route.
517	No bike lane or even a shoulder on some streets.
518	Some portions of the City do not have any safe bike lane corridor. For example trying to get from city center out West towards the Mall takes some very creative riding through back streets and use of a map app.
519	Car/truck drivers being disrespectful of cyclists
520	Ideally I would like to ride my bike to work more but my husband can't drive right now so I need to take a car to run errands or pick him up.
521	Horrid and uneducated drivers who are not always held accountable when bikes or peds are involved
522	The homeless issue along the bike path makes me feel unsafe so I avoid it more than enjoy it.
523	***creating safe bike lanes on North/South in town routes. ie: 7th street to downtown. creating safe routes on East /west roads such as Orchard (Orchard runs a long distance east to west and several areas there was a designated bike lane then it is not on the other side of street. why does it just disappear.?
524	Both sides of Orchard should have proper bike lanes for both East and West bound cyclists
525	Create bike lanes on streets that are not busy. For example there's no reason for a bike lane on main with all the cars. Put the bike lane 1 street over until you hit downtown.
526	Shoulders need to be swept more often and we need more of them.
527	Where there are bike lanes, they are often covered with rocks and debris. In contrast, the roads are kept clean.
528	Big trucks could benefit from biker education. Many people have been harassed or run off the road by vehicles that don't respect bikers. More and wider bike lanes are needed for safety.

#	Comment
529	Hostile drivers and drivers that are unaware. Additionally speeds that are too high. For example g road could be a decent route but speeds are too high.
530	1) Bike lanes are frequently blocked by parked vehicles including City of GJ Parks&Rec maintenance vehicles/trailers forcing bikers into the street into the path of unexpected motorists. 2) Bike lanes and road shoulders are rough, poorly maintained.
531	Bike lanes begin/end with no warning, or run parallel to paths that can't be accessed safely. See Redlands Parkway.
532	Vagrants obstructing paths or making travel uncomfortable
533	Cars are aggressive to people on bikes, I take back roads because main roads are not safe, I have been hit on my bike and the person did not stop, she totaled my bike
534	Lack of traffic control - speeding, lane changes at intersections, yellow and red light running, loud cars with no mufflers
535	There are a lot of seniors in Grand Junction. Leave Main Street as is, as many of us won't be able to get to downtown shopping if you block it off.
536	I'm not aware of any protected bike lanes. Narrow lanes with only paint indicating they are for bicycles are not sufficient.
537	Safely traveling from one area to the next. Transition zones.
538	fairly
539	There are sections of streets with insufficient or no shoulders for biking.
540	Few bike lanes. No protected bike lanes. Few traffic controlled bike crossings. Few safe, direct routes to shopping centers and grocery stores. Existing bike lanes end at intersections or are inexplicably discontinued. Bike lanes are too narrow.
541	Would appreciate measures to desuade cars from driving fast (ex: trees growing close to road) and also would love more bike/multiuse paths that are completely detached from car roads. Main being completely car-free would be great.
542	Ebikes are super dangerous on sidewalks and paths. Some people are safe with them but others drive them like the motorcycles they are with no regard for anyone moving slower than them. Motorized travel should be prohibited wherever children and the elderly are. Also the Homeless have taken over the river front trails. They just use the paths as place to go to the bathroom.
543	Police do not treat cyclists the same as drivers. We are second class to them in GJ
544	I don't bicycle at this time.

#	Comment
545	Not enough bike lanes on roads!! Especially G road not safe. Need safe places to cross busy roads from the river front trail. Highway 6 & 50
546	Not enough bike/walking trails in North GJ
547	I think that the City did a great job at increasing bike lanes and making sidewalks easy to ride on. However, the bike lanes are not cleaned enough.
548	29 bridge bike lanes are too narrow for safety
549	Other than the River Front Trail(which has several poorly maintained sections), there are multiple places where the bike lanes abruptly end with no shoulder to ride on. The system is patchy one could say. Also, it seems no one in town knows what the rules are on our streets and sidewalks for traffic in general. I work around the area of 1st and North and own 3 bikes. On 1st Street between North and Broadway people use the sidewalks as bike paths. Many are traveling over 15 mph(some of the e bikes are running much faster) creating danger to both pedestrians and bikers. Some people are riding their bikes the wrong way in the bike lanes too. Not all cars and trucks yield to pedestrians in marked crosswalks. There is confusion about the rules of bikes in crosswalks too. Before more people get killed maybe a comprehensive publication and listing of the laws/rules would help some, along with signage in trouble spots.
550	People in trucks. Distracted drivers usually holding a smart phone in one hand.
551	There are gaps in bike lanes to shopping areas from the Redlands.
552	More bike lanes are needed, bigger shoulders for cycling and keep extending the bike paths. More people are using them and will come to GJ for recreation.
553	Inconsiderate users on bikes/ebikes not announcing or riding too fast. Too many homeless people.
554	This is the best place in the country for all types of riders. We should embrace this and become a destination for people across the world to come to and ride; like Moab.
555	I get harassed by cars when I'm on my bike, and I fear I will get hit by someone on purpose because people in cars hate cyclists.
556	Not enough bike lanes so bicyclist end up impeding traffic on main roads.
557	26 Road north of town is dangerous because of all the new bike signs and bikers out here you should remove those signs and quit encouraging people to ride their bikes where there is no shoulder and there's heavy traffic. You're going to get somebody injured or worse. I find it odd that when new subdivisions go up north to town it's not required for them to put a sidewalk in along the major roads???
558	Dangerous drivers and no enforcement of traffic laws

#	Comment
559	The bike paths along roads are dirty, with dirt, small rocks, general debris and even stickers (goat head) that flatten tires. The adjacent road is much cleaner as cars tend to push the debris to the sides, and thus into the bike lanes. I would use the bike lanes more if they were kept clean with proper street sweeping.
560	i don't bike
561	Hostile Drivers! Rolling Coal, Speeding, not giving enough room to pass, distracted driving, etc.
562	Having to share busy roads without dedicated bike lanes
563	My bicycles need service.
564	Drivers who don't see us (bike riders).
565	If there is a bike lane, it is typically either too narrow to feel safe (Ridges Blvd for example) or at such a slant it feels unsteady (like from the riverside parkway bridge to downtown as one example) I'm a short person, around 5'2" and I have to duck constantly to avoid hitting branches and leaves when riding my bike. (Example: eastbound, on the right side "bike path" down Broadway)
566	Insufficient bike lanes that stop abruptly and force bikes onto sidewalks to be safe. The signage for cross-walks also do not indicate that bikers should also given right of way when in a cross-walk. I have been beeped at because I was crossing the street in a cross-walk and the driver thought they had the right of way. In addition at the same time, the left turn lane driver was across the lines in the cross-walk which forced me into the street to cross.
Comments Received on the project website via GJ Speaks	
567	A fundamental change needs to take place..... placing more focus on Bike/Pedestrian access as it relates to business city center..... For example, North Ave is lined with business, neighborhoods, Lincoln park and a university. Yet the city still treats the traffic flow on North Ave as a priority. The priority needs to be pedestrian and bike access to the thousands of people that live city center...alongside North Ave and the businesses and university. It should be more efficient for pedestrians and bikes to access this corridor. Bike Lanes on North Ave, 30 MPH speed limit and the addition of multiple cross walks should be added. You want to create access and efficiency between the people and businesses they visit. Instead what we have seen is the push to increase the flow of traffic....and restrict access and efficiency by elimination left turns onto north and installing bus turn outs that insure that the pace of traffic is sped up..... see the focus of public trans port was relegated to second place in an effort to keep the cars moving..... Thats not what you want to do in high density city centers full of businesses like found along north ave. Will traffic be slower and congested...yes, with the area thrive and grow...yes.
568	There are some great resources with the Strong Towns nonprofit that relate to making more profitable and pedestrian friendly cities. Many changes to make our city more economical seem counter-intuitive to standard infrastructure improvement practices, but the data back them up. For example, making streets feel less safe for drivers (making them narrower, adding trees to the sides, etc.), actually makes them safer for pedestrians because drivers naturally slow down. This kind of thinking could have been applied to the First and Grand intersection, which was "improved" by designing faster car throughput, which makes it significantly less safe for pedestrians and cyclists. More pedestrians and cyclists is financially beneficial for our city. Less need for vehicles frees up resources for low income to spend on other basic needs. Less infrastructure wear and tear. More dense shopping and more taxes collected from

#	Comment
	buildings that were once on parking lots. Less money spent on healthcare as folks are healthier from not having to sit in a car, and the list goes on. Denser downtowns produce more tax \$ per acre and require less infrastructure maintenance. We (GJ) could go so far as to hire Urban3 to do a fiscal analysis, but only need to look at their hundreds of existing analysis' to see these trends. I am very excited that GJ has this initiative and am ready to volunteer my time to improve our great city to this initiative! Sources (I would be ecstatic if someone reads these): https://www.strongtowns.org/journal/2021/8/6/the-key-to-slowing-traffic-is-street-design-not-speed-limits https://www.strongtowns.org/journal/2018/1/16/why-walkable-streets-are-more-economically-productive-3bzig5 Urban3: https://www.urbanthree.com/
569	The Lincoln Park event was very poorly promoted. Disappointing to read a cover story in the Sentinel after the fact instead of before the event.
570	The Northeast corner of Orchard/28 1/4 RD is unsafe for wheelchair users. The slope of the wheelchair ramps are extreme when rounding the corner on the sidewalk, causing my chair to tip sideways. The bike lane coming down 28 1/4 Rd. suddenly jumps over a lane when crossing Orchard, and is also unsafe.
571	I would love to see a pedestrian and cycling overpass/underpass across 12th to CMU. It's such a congested area with a history of accidents, it could be a practical and potentially beautiful solution to this problem!
572	On Redlands, South Broadway has no shoulder. Bicyclists are allowed to use a full lane. The law requires a 3' buffer. How does someone driving a full sized pickup or SUV leave a 3' space if cyclists are using a full lane? Do the math.
573	As a firefighter for the city it would be great to see improvements made to result in lowering our call volume of avoidable accidents. My wife works at SMH and is also currently attending CMU, both of which are popular places for these accidents to occur. Getting a call at either location always makes me nervous that she is potentially who was hit. I believe that raised crosswalks similar to 1st St would prevent these accidents from being as frequent. 7th St from Patterson to Bookcliff, and 12th St from Orchard to North Ave I believe are the worst and would benefit from these.

Public Comments on GJSpeaks.org – February 2023 – Draft Plan

All bike and walking planning should include the new electric skateboards, bikes, hoverboards and the rest in the planning. In many places I visit, and in GJ as well, people are zooming by on sidewalks and walking paths on these newer electric powered devices, which may soon dominate the future of transportation. Some agency (the city, developers, builders ?) should improve the needed transportation issues much earlier than is currently the practice. Right now builders are constructing over 100 new homes, duplexes, apartments, a new Mormon Temple, and new business in the vicinity of Horizon Drive, 27 Road, and G Road. There are also plans for landscaping Horizon Park off of 27 Road north of G Road. Currently to walk or ride a bicycle anywhere in this area requires use of very busy and narrow roads with cars going 35 mph or faster. Kids and adults in these new subdivisions could not safely walk along or cross Horizon Drive, 27 Road (12th Street north of the roundabout), or G Road. There are no crosswalks or sidewalks along 27 Road or G Road. Solutions are needed now and should be built now!

Feb 26, 2023 · 1:36pm

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the Grand Junction Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan. 1. Tenth Street should be a Bicycle Boulevard from Belford to Main Street. This route is heavily used by cyclists and pedestrians, and vehicle use is less than 1000 per day. If it was a Bicycle Boulevard the route could be made safer with enhancements such as refuge medians on Grand and Gunnison, which would also discourage driving on Tenth Street. This half-mile route provides access to two schools and CMU. Alternative routes are available on 9th and 11th Streets. 2. page 47. The 24 Road/Redlands Parkway overpass should be a high priority for a trail, cycle track, or protected bike lane, instead of low priority as currently shown in the draft Plan. The current route is not safe for cyclists and pedestrians accessing Mesa Mall, Community Hospital, Canyon View Park and other important destinations in this area. 3. page 31. For buffered bike lanes, cross hatching should be required even if the buffer is less than 3 feet wide. The City has done this in the past and it clearly highlights the buffer, so it should be included in the Plan. 4. The Plan should recommend use of automated counters for bike and pedestrian use so that changes in active transportation use can be measured as the Plan is implemented.

Feb 26, 2023 · 11:59am

720 Ivanhoe Way
Grand Junction, Co, 81506

Feb 23, 2023 · 12:49pm

I was at your open house last night but didn't have time to leave comments so here are some I would like to add to the list: 1. broaden the concept/name to a wider range of non-auto users - walkers, runners, stridor bikes, strollers, bikes, trikes, ebikes, scooters, escooters, skateboards, eskateboards, hoverboards, etrikes and who knows what else will come. 2 add a soft path either adjacent or better detached along as much of the riverfront trail as possible, esp as new areas get built or changed from asphalt to concrete. We need to accommodate not only more users but a much wider range of speeds. 3 consider an underpass beneath Patterson Rd to access Matchett Park/CRC (I understand 28 1/2 Rd or Indian

Wash could be options) 3 make bike/pedestrian signal buttons more convenient when they are far from the actual crossing (N. Ave and 10th, where many CMU students, etc cross) is one example. (some newer intersections have done that). 4 Improve wayfinding signs by moving the map lower (many signs have an upper green sign showing distances to various points and right below it a map - the sign is easy to read but the map is too small and high to be easily read - this would be an easy fix. 5 consider opening the Highline Canal ditch bank along Matchett Park to the public, if the city has that ownership or easement - is high enough for great views and could help break the canal bank barrier. 6 complete the detached path along the north side of S. Camp - that will help complete the Redlands Loop without crossing S. Camp once the Monument II trail is built. 7 Make sure new subdivisions have as many connecting paths between homes as possible to kids can easily visit friends without having to navigate busy streets. Also continue adding paths to canal banks wherever possible to play for future canal bank trails.(this already done in many places I am aware of) 8 try to keep bike lanes as clean as possible. In particular, Monument Rd heading down is often so full of sand and gravel its hard not to swerve out onto the road, at least on a road bike (Monument II will help correct this). I greatly appreciate this effort and all the other ideas I saw last night and think this will go a long way towards making GJ and better place to travel car-free for pleasure, shopping and work.

██████████
· Feb 21, 2023 · 12:33pm

Can you give us more information on the Shared Micromobility? Selected companies, exact launch date?

██████████
· Feb 10, 2023 · 10:25am

This is a great thing for Grand Junction and I applaud the foresight for bringing this forward. The one thing I see as a vital piece missing is the utilization of the canal system. While I understand these are corporately owned parcels and cause a lot of stir when brought into this conversation, they are existing natural pathway that cross through the entire city. The views are great from many sections and the grades are relatively flat. They are a pedestrian/bicycle superhighway that already intersects a vast majority of the city. The cost saving and safety improvements from incorporating these into a master plan would be great. The irrigation companies need to be brought on board with the fact that the utilization of these pathway is for public benefit. There are plenty of city's that have symbiotic relationships with their irrigation districts for the utilization of their Maintance roads.



· Feb 5, 2023 · 4:17pm

The rough draft of this plan looks incredibly well thought out from a layperson's perspective. I have to commend the team working on this. I hope that momentum is able to continue so that we can have a profitable and healthy city.

Public Comments on GJSpeaks.org – September - October 2022 – Existing Conditions

[REDACTED]
· Sep 15, 2022 · 8:29pm

As a firefighter for the city it would be great to see improvements made to result in lowering our call volume of avoidable accidents. My wife works at SMH and is also currently attending CMU, both of which are popular places for these accidents to occur. Getting a call at either location always makes me nervous that she is potentially who was hit. I believe that raised crosswalks similar to 1st St would prevent these accidents from being as frequent. 7th St from Patterson to Bookcliff, and 12th St from Orchard to North Ave I believe are the worst and would benefit from these.

[REDACTED]
· Sep 16, 2022 · 9:15am

On Redlands, South Broadway has no shoulder. Bicyclists are allowed to use a full lane. The law requires a 3' buffer. How does someone driving a full sized pickup or SUV leave a 3' space if cyclists are using a full lane? Do the math.

[REDACTED]
· Sep 16, 2022 · 11:51am

I would love to see a pedestrian and cycling overpass/underpass across 12th to CMU. It's such a congested area with a history of accidents, it could be a practical and potentially beautiful solution to this problem!

[REDACTED]
· Sep 17, 2022 · 1:27pm

The Northeast corner of Orchard/28 1/4 RD is unsafe for wheelchair users. The slope of the wheelchair ramps are extreme when rounding the corner on the sidewalk, causing my chair to tip sideways. The bike lane coming down 28 1/4 Rd. suddenly jumps over a lane when crossing Orchard, and is also unsafe.

[REDACTED]
· Oct 19, 2022 · 9:20am

There are some great resources with the Strong Towns nonprofit that relate to making more profitable and pedestrian friendly cities. Many changes to make our city more economical seem counter-intuitive to standard infrastructure improvement practices, but the data back them up. For example, making streets feel less safe for drivers (making them narrower, adding trees to the sides, etc.),

actually makes them safer for pedestrians because drivers naturally slow down. This kind of thinking could have been applied to the First and Grand intersection, which was "improved" by designing faster car throughput, which makes it significantly less safe for pedestrians and cyclists. More pedestrians and cyclists is financially beneficial for our city. Less need for vehicles frees up resources for low income to spend on other basic needs. Less infrastructure wear and tear. More dense shopping and more taxes collected from buildings that were once on parking lots. Less money spent on healthcare as folks are healthier from not having to sit in a car, and the list goes on. Denser downtowns produce more tax \$ per acre and require less infrastructure maintenance. We (GJ) could go so far as to hire Urban3 to do a fiscal analysis, but only need to look at their hundreds of existing analysis' to see these trends. I am very excited that GJ has this initiative and am ready to volunteer my time to improve our great city to this initiative! Sources (I would be ecstatic if someone reads these):
<https://www.strongtowns.org/journal/2021/8/6/the-key-to-slowing-traffic-is-street-design-not-speed-limits>
<https://www.strongtowns.org/journal/2018/1/16/why-walkable-streets-are-more-economically-productive-3bzig5> Urban3: <https://www.urbanthree.com/>

[REDACTED]

· Oct 21, 2022 · 12:27pm

A fundamental change needs to take place..... placing more focus on Bike/Pedestrian access as it relates to business city center..... For example, North Ave is lined with business, neighborhoods, lincoln park and a university. Yet the city still treats the traffic flow on North Ave as a priority. The priority needs to be pedestrian and bike access to the thousands of people that live city center...alongside North Ave and the businesses and university. It should be more efficient for pedestrians and bikes to access this corridor. Bike Lanes on North Ave, 30 MPH speed limit and the addition of multiple cross walks should be added. You want to create access and efficiency between the people and businesses they visit. Instead what we have seen is the push to increase the flow of traffic....and restrict access and efficiency by elimination left turns onto north and installing bus turn outs that insure that the pace of traffic is sped up..... see the focus of public trans port was relegated to second place in an effort to keep the cars moving..... Thats not what you want to do in high density city centers full of businesses like found along north ave. Will traffic be slower and congested...yes, with the area thrive and grow....yes.



PEDESTRIAN & BICYCLE PLAN

COMMENT FORM

Name:



Address/Area:

6th + Teller, Downtown

Comments:

12th Street, North of CMU campus (to Air House/City Market, Spoons, Horizon Drive) is super sketchy w/ broken sidewalks, fast, distracted traffic. ~~Also~~ Also, I love this event today and how it is organized = to give voice to all.



PEDESTRIAN & BICYCLE PLAN

COMMENT FORM

Name: _____

Address/Area: _____

Rosevale Rd (Redlands)

Comments: _____

I am happy to see GJ prioritizing bike/ped visibility + infrastructure! It is needed + appreciated. I hope that major educational shifts are in place for motorists...
Thank you!



PEDESTRIAN & BICYCLE PLAN

COMMENT FORM

Name:



Address/Area:

Downtown - Teller + 5th

Comments:

Towns designed for cars make it harder for people with low incomes who cant afford cars to commute to work. Creating a negative feed back loop of people in need of money having less access to jobs, a problem for both local economy and community. Bike infrastructure in low income areas of town Benefits all of GJ.



PEDESTRIAN & BICYCLE PLAN

COMMENT FORM

Name: [REDACTED] _____

Address/Area: 20th & orchard _____

Comments: Final recommendations absolutely need to consider the most vulnerable road users (kids & seniors). Independent mobility is absolutely essential for these groups, yet their safety is compromised by current road design.



PEDESTRIAN & BICYCLE PLAN

COMMENT FORM

Name:



Address/Area:

2601 MESA AVE GJT CO 81501

Comments:

hopefully improve safety @ 4 way stops for bikers who yield to "no cars" @ the sign just feel cars to blow them, or other cars not making full stops & looking both ways for bikers, not just a car on the road, or a pedestrian on the side walk. too many cars are texting and feel like even the safer routes are only as safe as the vehicle operators are.



PEDESTRIAN & BICYCLE PLAN

COMMENT FORM

Name: [REDACTED]

Address/Area: 427 Pleasant Hollow Ct / Redlands

Bicyclist

Comments: better access across 24 Rd / Redlands Pkwy Bridge to mall + around mall area. Wider lane on Broadway across the Bridge please. lights on the over passes for main from N. Riverside & under Broadway Bridge. Better ~~to~~ access along N. Ave 1st - 12th / 15th
It would be great to have color defined Bike lanes.
It would be great to have better enforcement of people parking in Bike lanes



PEDESTRIAN & BICYCLE PLAN

COMMENT FORM

Name: [REDACTED]

Address/Area: 1015 Hill Avenue; 10th and Hill near Lincoln park + CMV

Comments: GJ has potential to be very bikeable and walkable. Dedicated bike routes paralleling major thoroughfares w/ bike lanes and sidewalks that have barriers with visuals ~~space~~ (barriers like plastic ~~over~~ tall lane dividers, trees for sidewalks, concrete barriers) and physical distance (buffers that keep bike lanes and sidewalks farther away from roads and out of harm's way.)
with this GJ can attract to its economy, provide access for current residents to safety and recreation, and ~~attract~~ reduce fatalities and injury.



PEDESTRIAN & BICYCLE PLAN

COMMENT FORM

Name:



Address/Area:

495 Vallejo Dr Redlands

Comments:

Planning/Construction need to occur w. input from cyclists.
GJ slaps "Bike Route" signs on roads and thinks its a magic
wand to safety NOT



COMMENT FORM

Name:



Address/Area:

4224 Mesa Ave gl CO 81501

Comments:

It would be nice to see a network of elevated bike paths to have a physical separation between the car & bike."



PEDESTRIAN & BICYCLE PLAN

COMMENT FORM

Name: _____

Address/Area: Redlands

Comments: Continue to keep planning excellence.

C of GJ does a great job making

transportation enjoyable - cars, bus, & even biking.



**PEDESTRIAN &
BICYCLE PLAN**

COMMENT FORM

Name: [REDACTED]

Address/Area: Emerson Park / Lincoln Park

Comments: UNless Bike lanes are Protected they're NOT bike lanes, they're
Just more space for cars. Please make/install protected bike lanes.

Thanks!



PEDESTRIAN & BICYCLE PLAN

COMMENT FORM

Name:



Address/Area: 1505 Road Ave. / Emerson Park

Comments: would love to be able to get to the grocery store safely by bike.

My biggest concern is that we make access equitable for all residents or visitors to our community. Thank you!



PEDESTRIAN & BICYCLE PLAN

COMMENT FORM

Name: [REDACTED]

Address/Area: 2425 N 1st St

Comments: Need bike lane on Orchard. Add bike lane on new way to monument



PEDESTRIAN & BICYCLE PLAN

COMMENT FORM

Name: _____

Address/Area: _____

Comments: _____

859 Struthers Ave #403 Grand Junction
Close down Main street; open that puppy up to slow
cycling, handied, and blading. It feels like such a community
walking down the middle of the street during the farmers market!



PEDESTRIAN & BICYCLE PLAN

COMMENT FORM

Name: _____

Address/Area: _____

Downtown

Comments: _____

Would love to see easy connections to major parks +
downtown for all neighborhoods, especially the lower income parts
of town who are typically excluded from access to green space in the US.



PEDESTRIAN & BICYCLE PLAN

COMMENT FORM

Name: [REDACTED] _____

Address/Area: Redlands _____

Comments: Redlands Parkway / S. Rim Intersection needs Bikes should have the right of way in all directions. Nowhere else do bikes going straight have to yield to vehicles turning



PEDESTRIAN & BICYCLE PLAN

COMMENT FORM

Name:



Address/Area:

230 West Grand Ave

Comments:

How do the bike paths meet up that go to Glenwood Springs bike path, Moab bike path.



PEDESTRIAN & BICYCLE PLAN

COMMENT FORM

Name: [REDACTED]

Address/Area: 2121 BUFFALO DRIVE / RADLANDS

Comments: NEEDS:

- INFORM MOTORISTS OF CO REGS RE: 3' LAW, "IDAHO" STOPS, CYCLIST/PED RIGHTS
- CAMPAIGN INFORMING MOTORISTS OF RED LIGHT RUNNING DANGERS
- INCREASE AWARENESS/USE OF MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS



COMMENT FORM

Name:



Address/Area: 1505 Road Ave. / EMERSON PARK

Comments: would love to be able to get to the grocery store safely by bike.

My biggest concern is that we make access equitable for all residents or visitors to our community. Thank you!



PEDESTRIAN & BICYCLE PLAN

COMMENT FORM

Read
Other Side
→
→

Name:



Address/Area:

2000 N 4th St

Comments:

Paterson, North, 7th, 12th are dangerous + un-bikable! They need protected bike lanes + safe crosswalks. I would also like to see streets like Orchard + Gunnison gain protected bike lanes vs bike routes. We need to extend bike infrastructure outside of downtown into North GJ + Clifton so that low income people have safe + accessible commuting infrastructure. I would love to see downtown GJ evolve into a space built for people + not cars, turning main st into a car free zone would improve safety, happiness + sense of community

CMU has done a lot in attempts to keep students safe on campus but those efforts evaporate as soon as you cross North or 12th. At least 3 people I know get hit by cars or into serious bike accidents every year due to lack of bike infrastructure, crosswalks, or street lighting! People need to be able to get downtown, to school + to the grocery store safely and without a car. I also want to see better bike lanes and lower speed limits near schools! GJ High does not have bike lanes surrounding it and would benefit from like crosswalks. Public parks should also have better lighting surrounding them for people going home at dusk. I also want PROTECTED sidewalks on all major roads!! it is unsafe, uncomfortable, and prevents people from walking when they are right next to major traffic! Help stop hostile infrastructure! Make our community accessible, safe ~~and~~ equitable by investing in our connectedness. we can build a beautiful + safe home city. THANK YOU!!



PEDESTRIAN & BICYCLE PLAN

EXISTING CONDITIONS & NEEDS ASSESSMENT

APPENDIX B: FOCUS GROUP MEETING NOTES

Latino/LEP Spanish Speaking Focus Group

9/12/2022 @ 3:00 PM

Giselle; Hispanic Affairs Project – non-profit; main goal is to integrate immigrants into the community; low cost legal assistance; mesa county community; doesn't like driving, so biking and walking is most important to her; many immigrants do not have license to drive so need other ways to be safe and get around

How do you or people you work with travel in Grand Junction

- Work from home; try to drive least as possible
- Some clients come to her, or meet virtually, or take Sunshine rides (free taxi)
- Some clients travel to her office by bike
- Clients she works with – typically they have personal vehicles or ways of getting to her; if not, she goes to them
- Many aren't used to technology or google maps; many don't speak English

Where do you or people you serve most frequently walk or bike? Where would you like to walk or bike?

- Any place downtown
- North avenue is popular; right now a lot of construction so people don't feel comfortable driving or accessing north avenue
- North avenue – lots of CMU students on bikes
- Walking she felt safe on 12th avenue; PHB not a street light (confirm this)
- Couldn't walk to the library
- Distance is a larger barrier to chose walking
- Heat or weather is also a factor about walking or not
- Looking for regional transportation (i.e. medical appointments in Denver)
- Do not want to be out in the dark walking or biking

From the CMU perspective

- Her job and classes were on campus; relied on friends for rides
- Rite Aid – went for groceries or cleaning supplies

Any specific streets that are safety concerns

- Orchard and 12th intersection – people do not stop
- One-way streets downtown (both walking and driving)
- North Avenue
- Bike lane on Gunnison – people parallel park, but they park into the bike lane; concerned about dooring with bike lanes; avoid parallel parking because don't want to open door into bike lane
- Depending where people come from, roadways are very different here.
- Cars are necessary in many locations.
- Trying to get somewhere with high traffic, how do you walk and bike in those areas that are very high traffic?
- How do you get somewhere without using I70
- Getting more roundabouts – how do you walk or bike through a roundabout?
 - How do we design for roundabouts with the correct bike and ped infrastructure

- Drivers tests are now in Spanish too – how does that impact roadway signage around GJ? Can people read street signs? And way finding signs? How to identify what are the right routes? Wayfinding signage in infrastructure and Spanish? Infrastructure more intuitive even if you don't read?
- How do you funnel people to where people want to be crossing?
- Things like the walk sign and ped push buttons are new things for immigrants; many countries do not have that
- Need to make signs more universal
- More crosswalks in general would be nice; going to dinner is challenging for because she has to walk out of the way to use a push button and cross the street
 - Near Old Chicago on North Avenue (nothing between 1st Ave and 5th on North)
 - Trying to get across 1st is challenging
- Brighter colors for bike lanes
- Sometimes walking instead of biking because there is no bike rack or not a safe place to park bike; more general comment then specific location
- Apartment complex – where do you store your bike; does the city need policy around bike storage?
- E-scooters; will probably see in GJ in April 2023
- Biker education “on your left”
- Connectivity (Paterson – example st marys to hospital); beautiful bike lanes and then they end; many key destinations in this area

Steering Committee Candidates

9/12/2022 @ 5:30 PM

George W Manning – new board member for one riverfront; active in cycling; visiting and living here for last 40 years; interested cycling and walking for community health aspect and make it easier

David Lehmann – used to be on urban trails committee; does a lot of walking and cycling in town; feel pretty safe; even where there's bike lanes, it can be scary in when there's a lot of traffic; a lot of potential for active transportation; level and good weather

Bernie Smith – lived in GJ for over a year; moved from front range; cycling advocacy in Iowa and in Longmont; would like to see improvements for walking and rolling; down to one car; make it easier to get around without driving

What do you see as the biggest barriers to biking, for you/your group?

- Traffic hazards/ don't feel safe; don't have dedicated spaces
- Connectors within neighborhood aren't always called out on city map (might be grass or dirt paths); don't have enough connections; often these connect culdesacs or dead ends; G road in particular seems discontinuous
- D road – does not feel comfortable; traffic is fast; small shoulder; walking is also scary in addition to biking; speeds and volumes feel high; truck traffic feels high at certain times a day; street design to slow people down
- Would have biked, but there's a large gap along the river trail; would have had to think really hard
- Streets that should be connections – D road; slow down traffic, separate bike lane
- 29 road is also

- C ½ is not bad because there's not much traffic, but it would be nice to have the trail; however, people don't want to be on the road; however, this area is not walkable because there's no pedestrian infrastructure
- Recent deaths in town make people nervous
- Few people feel comfortable traveling between mall and riverfront trail along 24th road; need a connection over that barrier
- Wanting to connect more canals to bike paths; common thing that has come up; prioritize only the transportation NEEDS, not the recreation
- Add the extra wayfinding routes
- Guessing best route to go from river to downtown
- Railroad tracks provide a barrier
- US 50 provides a barrier
- If people don't want to go 24 road to river trail, go out of way to 20 road; 20 road feels safer, but
- Getting over to trail from north west sometimes challenging to river
- Riverfront trail is a main connector; pleasant, controlled environment (getting to it is the challenge)
- Connections to Riverfront trail and then connections from riverfront trail to downtown

What can the city do to improve conditions for biking and walking?

- Protected or separated bike lanes
- Intersection treatments
- Bike boulevards could be a tool (sort of like neighborhood bikeways) or shared streets?
- Urban trails survey – separated bike path/trails increase use; off-street trails are the attractor for people feeling comfortable; and if not off-street, separated
- 5th and 6th street planned to be separated bikeway
- Patterson bike lanes –
- More people riding e-bikes; make bike lanes wider so people can pass

Are there changes you think should be made to the active transportation corridors?

- Wayfinding routes; typically on local streets or collectors; look at this because this could be the backbone for bike boulevards/neighborhood bikeways
- 10th – crossing grand and Gunnison
- Research cedar rapids, Iowa

How to prioritize recommended projects

- Urban trails committee has about 55 projects/prioritizations- can be a starting point
- How does this affect the homeless population; check with soup kitchens to see homeless community since they use bicycle infrastructure often
- Focus on projects that benefit the most people (HIN); take care of the problem areas first
- Make improvements on parallel routes to get bikers off high traffic roadways; some people may not do that through because its not where the destinations are
- Find 3 or 4 things that would be a major change that would get people excited
- Interconnected system where any ages and abilities feel comfortable

Transportation and Housing Focus Group

September 13, 2022

Jodie Visconti – majority of clients are on foot, bike, walkers, or wheel chairs; number of very serious accidents involving bikes and pedestrians over the last few years so important to have safe environment for those folks

Jodie Deers (Colorado mesa) – Getting from D road to CMU is challenging; education around bike/vehicle interactions

Ashley Chambers – important for affordable housing; transportation tends to be 25-28% of household income, so would like to reduce those costs; children biking/walking independently can be scary for parents

Ann (americor housing fellow) – walking and biking to make GJ more affordable; important for sustainability reasons; living in more walkable areas create a tight knit community

Kevin Spur (grand junction housing authority) – a lot of clients using bikes; new locations isn't conducive for biking or walking; 25 road is not ideal; bus stop is also not ideal; no sidewalk connections from bus stops

Biggest barriers to walking and biking in GJ

- Biking feels unsafe; for someone who doesn't bike much, it feels unsafe throughout the city; if there was more infrastructure, would be more excited to
- Lack in density in parts of the city that would make sense for more people to walk or bike (things are too far apart)
- Safety on riverfront trail is ideal; this trail is really nice
- CMU students – city adopted 10th street and this has been a good pathway to the downtown, but once you get downtown there is no where to lock bikes. This prohibits students from locking bikes. 10th street has a lot of stop signs; students often ignore these stop signs; stop signs are an issues; hit stop sign every 2 intersections
- 12th street is scary
- Education piece is important
- Kids that don't drive – don't know rules of road; how do we have bike safety and education to all ages; also important for people driving and biking
- Under age 16 requires helmets, but enforcement is lacking;
- 25th is not ideal; avoid on bike
- 25 ½ isn't bad – bike lane is nice
- CMU students travel between WCCC and university; wccc is another campus (technical focus classes); not a CMU shuttle service
- Patterson is an issue – not an east/west corridor in this area; there's a lot of driveways and hard to bikeway (TEDS Manual – how you design a sidewalk over driveways so there's not sloping up and down) Orchard and paterson road on 1st Street – example of sidewalks jutting out
- North avenue – many locations without sidewalks
- 29th ½ road is high walk area (career center area)
- How do wheel chairs maneuver this area
- Radius for GJ high school is 3 miles (must walk or bike); most parents are driving their kids because they don't want their kids to walk or bike; go on north avenue because there's crossings across major intersection, but north avenue is not ideal. But side streets don't have crossings across major streets
- Disconnect – d road to downtown
- Looking at upcoming development, specifically affordable development; 2814 patterson road – not ideal for biking or walking
- By community hospital (south of 70)
 - We have this mapped somewhere – double check affordable housing development in GIS layer
 - Mobile home or Manufactured housing subdivisions – also pull where these occur and see how that relates to access
 - School age kid should be priority to get to school (3 miles feels like a far distance)
- Access to public transportation is important

- Does housing authority have good data about where people who have vouchers where they live – could this be a priority? Figure out where the clusters are focused (limited set of land lords accepting vouchers, so likely clustered); ashley will ask for this
- Access to grocery stores; several housing downtown (st. martin shuttle help get residents to Walmart for grocery shopping on Thursdays); a lot of people are shopping at convenience stores because it's the closest locations (not healthy and expensive)
- How to immerse CMU students with the downtown and around town
- Safe routes to school – there's currently an app and not well broadcasted

What can the city do:

- More multi-use paths – split bikes from traffic
- Potential underpass at Patterson and 24
- Wayfinding signage will help (for example, riverfront trail connections to key destinations)
- Signage or paint on C ½
- C ½ good for bikes but not walking
- Lights or established pedestrian crossings around schools
- 1st turns into south – this area is really unsafe
- Better signage for one ways

Parks and Trails Focus Group (Urban Trails Committee; Parks and Recreation Advisory Board; One Riverfront)

9/13/2022 at 5:30 PM

Andy kingrich (transit planner, utc member, regional transportation planner) – try to improve non-automobile travel; cars are expensive

Ian Thomas (UTC); organize GJ bike night; a lot of folks could benefit from a safe easy way to get to work

Mike Holt (UTC); biked to work over the years; safety is key component; make safer for older community

Diana rooney (chair of UTC); went away from street cars and went backwards; need to find a way to make a more connected transportation system

Gabe Herman (Council Liaison to UTC); biking is fun; equity, sustainability to growth; access to jobs and schools is important to growing system

Greg (UTC); preferred methods of getting around town;

Greg; Littleton – extensive trails and wishes GJ was the same

Bill finley (Riverfront foundation); used to ride bike or walk; want to have a place that's safe for kids to ride to friends, school, recreation

Orvin Zyvan (finished 6 years from UTC); building community and engaging with people;

Steve Myer (UTC); commuted 20-30% of time by bike; health benefits, sustainability, economic benefits, social equity;

Jason (on phone); (UTC); that children can go to school safely

Subgroup A Notes

- Incorporate wayfinding routes
- More or more people are getting motorized scooters, skateboards, E-bikes
- Creating a functional class for bike network; bike highway versus feeder connections (wouldn't match the automobiles)
- Active transportation corridor comment – a lot of white spaces on the perimeters; planning other greenways; there's a lot of open space for trails; lots of trails with no connectivity
- Redlands by south camp road – lots of trail segments but don't connect
- Redlands 360 that is planning (Southwest part of the city) – there plans are recreation/trails, not connectivity
- South camp road – lots of houses with trails but nothing ties together in a cohesive manner
- Adjusting vehicle capacity and car side of things aka road diets; we can identify specific corridors for this (i.e. overbuilt for cars to fit bikeway)
- How do you make compromises? If there are constrained environments
- Some type of metrics for metrics around travel time, parking, etc that to balance trade offs with
 - Establishing policies for implementation
- Barriers – connectivity
- Look at GJ website for wayfinding
- Intersections – many are challenging to get through (Orchard and 12th, specifically) especially challenging
- We don't ask cars to go around; directness is part of connectivity
- Where can we capture
- Parallel facilities
- Elm – particular
- Crossing the river is challenging – Redlands to downtown; likely location for new bridge crossing
- Good crossings north and south of the river
- West of 1st street or 26th; east/west movement
- Downtown best place to be a pedestrian; grid, smaller blocks,
- Patterson
- Identify canal routes; Patterson stretch on canal (covered anyways)
- Bring in canal districts
- Orchard mesa district – trail here
- Future recreation center; through the park; north part of town along G road to other park (northern east/west route)
- 28 ¼ and 29 road to the community center when orchard has bike facility
- 29 road potential access to 70
- Separate path into fruita (detached path) to connect the end of the trail
- Eastern end, lower income area and could benefit from ; not very connected over here
- F and a half connection on the east side; it ends east of the rec center; would be a good alternative to Patterson
- G road through park and to rec center would be a good connection; parallel for patterson; G road is currently unsafe to ride on
- East/west off-road trail; high line cana;
- Easements for trails around different areas in city
- Urban Trails project list
- Eagle rim park – steep, surface quality,
- 5th street bridge is also challenging (continue
- Overall struggle getting across river)
- University is not very permeable and golf course (12th and North)
 - Connection through golf course to get to 15th from 12th & north
- People getting to downtown from the northeast

- Avoid orchard and 15th
- 12th is a good candidate for a road diet or traffic calming around this area
- Cut through CMU parking lot to get to 10th
- Use 15th to city market; narrow bike lane; southbound (between parking and TL)
 - Is there opportunity for buffered bike lane
- Gunnison is good east/west downtown and extend that out
- Leading pedestrian intervals
- Speed humps over sidewalks?
- Bike detection
- Does 7th street have bike detection? Light flashing to alert bikes they are detected
- Employment at the mall and getting to the mall
- Long cycle lengths create pedestrian delays
- 24 road is challenging to get across at the riverside parkway
- 24 road design corridor standards; "need to provide off sight connections" but there's no lines on a map over here; overlay is good in spirit; put them in because they have to
- How do children get to school and parks and to their friends house a neighborhood away
- Oldest parts of the city are still the ones that work the best

Subgroup B Notes

1. What do you see as the biggest barriers to biking, for you/ your group?...to walking?

- Not acceptable level of stress for most people, particularly kids to bike (bike lanes are not sufficient)
- People would prefer separated path (buffered bike lanes)
- Protected bike lanes would work
- Need to make sure the intersections work for people to come through
- Challenges with parallel off-street trail with street crossings – almost feels more dangerous
- Are we prioritizing children versus adults
 - We should design for the most vulnerable users
- Are there policy directive we can employ to provide the best solutions (mirrors on buildings where there are blind spots, connections on cul-de-sacs, already have code requiring setback on policies)
- Bike parking at major employment centers (CMU, hospital)
- Areas far from the Riverfront trail don't have good connections – will ride where there are trails
- Do we need passing lanes given E-Bikes
- During construction make sure you accommodate pedestrians

2. What are key missing gaps in the on-street bicycle and pedestrian network that provide access to parks, open space, and recreation?

- UTC has a prioritized list of projects – we should incorporate that
- Overlay the wayfinding map
- Patterson is a big gap, 25 Road, Orchard is an opportunity
- Would like to better define the undeveloped areas network – can we provide direction on trail networks
 - i. This plan should show where the connections are in the undeveloped areas
- Need to communicate with Parks and Recreation
- Choke points
 - i. 24 Road connection over US 50
 - ii. Connecting Orchard Mesa over the River
 - iii. Connecting RiverFront Trail to downtown

- iv. E-W connections east of downtown
- v. Not enough sidewalks in Orchard Mesa (particularly US 50) – low income area
- vi. North Avenue
- vii. Connecting Redlands to Orchard Mesa

3. What changes do you think should be made to the Active Transportation Corridors?

- Look at undeveloped areas (Redlands is one example)
- Do we incorporate wayfinding network
- 5th Street by GJHS
- 9th Street south of downtown
- What about a bridge over the tracks on 12th Street
- 7th Street at Riverside is a big crossing and unsafe intersection for people walking and biking
- North South corridors have gaps

4. What type of facilities do people who currently bike in Grand Junction prefer? What type of facilities would accommodate the 'interested but concerned' bicyclist? What are your thoughts on separated paths vs neighborhood greenways (on local streets) vs protected bike lanes (on arterials)?

- People would prefer separated path (buffered bike lanes)
- Protected bike lanes would work

5. This plan will result in a list of projects, and the city has limited resources. What considerations should we make in prioritizing recommended projects?

- Grocery stores
- Sidewalks on busy roads

CMU Student Focus Group

September 20, 2022 @ 11 AM

1. How did you get to campus today?
 - 1 walk
 - 5 drove
 - 1 carpoled
2. How far?
 - 2 less than a mile
 - 4 three miles or more
3. How far do most students travel to get to campus? Where do most students live?
 - Orchard Mesa (2)
 - Could bike, but lack of lighting
 - Mile and a half away at Orchard and 21st – walks over
 - Glenwood Ave/14th St
 - Students still live on campus

- Athlete population lives within walking distance
 - People live in Clifton and Orchard Mesa – affordability is a major influence
 - School has been overpopulating – having enough space is an issue
4. What are the most common off-campus destinations for students?
- Los Alberto's Restaurant on North Ave
 - City Market on Patterson and 12th
 - Rimrock Walmart
 - Target/Mesa Mall/Buffalo Wild Wings
 - WCC Campus
 - Central Station at 30 Rd/I-70B
 - Lunch Loop/Co Nat Monument
 - Downtown
 - Colorado River – Corn Lake & Las Colonias
 - Taco Bell
 - Restaurants, Mall
 - Depends on time of year – head to Monument, lunch loops, Main St
 - Palisade Winery
5. How do students currently travel around campus? How do they travel within the city?
- Most walk, some skate (skateboards/one wheel), bike
 - Drive, walk to City Market, GVT
 - MAVrides (safe ride home on nights out/weekends)
6. What is the attitude around biking for transportation?
- Positive attitude in central Grand Junction/city core
 - Drivers view pedestrians as inconveniences, but that's because of the way the roads are designed
 - City has pro-bike culture, however infrastructure is pro-car
 - City cares more about this than CDOT does or the County as a whole. Different jurisdictions pushing different agendas. Not the older population but the people who lived here longer – don't care about bike and pedestrian safety. A lot of the elderly see GJ as a highway town. Conservative population push to not turn into a liberal city. The messaging needs to focus on safety.
7. What do you see as the biggest barriers to biking? . . . to walking?
- Leave house early, so lighting
 - Lighting, especially around Orchard
 - 23 minutes via biking, but 8 minutes driving
 - Heat/weather is a barrier
 - Safety and traveling alone without other people cycling nearby
 - Fear of bike theft and being stranded
 - Lockers for storage of items
 - Time place to place – more direct routes
 - Driveways/curb cuts as safety concern
 - Inconvenient to walk, feels unsafe
 - Missing sidewalks
 - Older people driving who shouldn't have a license
 - Aesthetic piece – streetscapes are not pleasing here

8. Are there certain locations that feel particularly unsafe to cross or travel by foot or bike? What are the key missing in the bicycle and pedestrian network important to student travel?
- Bike crossings missing
 - Riverside Pkwy
 - Unawweep Ave
 - US-50
 - 12th and North Ave intersection, cars turning right
 - People don't pay attention to crosswalks
 - Either going 20 over or 10 under
 - 12th St – need detached sidewalk and make it wider
 - Intersection after Walmart 30th Rd and I-70B
 - North and Patterson – sidewalk right next to the road and uncomfortable
 - Riverside would be nice for recreational biking, but missing link
9. How does the university support biking for its students, faculty, and staff? How could the university support biking more?
- Lots of bike racks
 - Free locks
 - Rent a cheap bike for the semester through the outdoor program
 - University trying to help students without cars by providing bikes, but could support biking culture itself
 - They focus a lot on parking and paying for parking passes – too geared to cars
 - Don't advocate for student body to GJ community
 - Security to prevent bike theft, cameras
 - Maybe they could advertise it better – the bus pass is not as visible. CMU does not want anything else but driving. Not enough parking. The incentives are skewed towards long term planning for parking. Buying houses and turning them into parking lots. Once you step off campus, they don't care how you get to school. If you stay on campus – they won't incentivize you to stay on campus or travel by any other mode by car.
 - 10th street is not utilized the way it should be – it's supposed to be the designated low stress connection but there are so many barriers getting to it. No supportive infrastructure, too much parking to cross on campus to access 10th St. The university does not promote it.
10. What can the city do to improve conditions for biking?...for walking?
- Improve crosswalk visibility
 - Widening bike lanes and/or buffers
 - Better lighting
 - ADA accessibility
 - More road diets
 - More direct routes
 - Better and more linkages across the railroad
 - Narrower travel lanes
 - More detached sidewalks
 - Wind cover
 - Pedestrian bridges
 - Changes in TEDs – cross sections that prioritize pedestrian and biking – trees and landscaping, aesthetically pleasing
 - Connections from campus to popular destinations – those main roads having buffered sidewalks and trees
 - Need to isolate pedestrian and bike from the street – ped bridges

- In the smack dead center – fastest moving cars on the inside. Each mode has their own lanes and enough buffering between each.

Human Services Providers Focus Group

10/17/22 @ 12 PM

Introductions – Why is improving walking and biking in Grand Junction important to you?

- Debbie Southerland, Resource Center – walkways around town are important to families
- Darnell – Fatherhood Program – Would like safe walkways, as an important way for people walking from the corrections facility to the resource center
- Kathy, Catholic Outreach – I ride the bus a lot, important to have walking paths to/from the bus
- Archie?, Affordable Housing – Important to make the community more livable
- Jolene, Hilltop – Safety is really important for walking and biking. Hard to find good walking and biking paths in Orchard Mesa
- ??, Hilltop – Have two little kids at home, lots of kids walk and bike to and from school
- Ashley, Affordable Housing – Cost of transportation is really a barrier for many folks we work with and so walking and biking and the bus is an essential mode of transportation
- Cherri, Asst. Director for Resource Center
 - Access to transit is extremely challenging, homeless often bring their belongings
 - Trails are very important
 - Biking and walking paths for the community
 - Need to connect walking and biking paths
- Rick Diaz, Family Resource Center - At risk kids mentorship, biked with kids all over during COVID – safety is really important
- Lisa – Pathways, represent homeless population and formerly homeless
 - Very difficult to get around town without a car
 - Patterson and 29 Road nearly been killed – turning drivers don't yield to pedestrians
 - Bike storage is an issue – bikes have been stolen many times
 - Need safe trails off-street away from cars

Other Comments

- Demand – where are people walking and biking
 - 1st Street downtown – would be great to have crosswalk
 - North Avenue
- Who pays for sidewalk?
 - City would pay to fill into the gap
- Public education about rules of the road – driving education
- People walking and biking are most vulnerable
- Funding could be an issue

What are some of the key destinations in Grand Junction where people you represent are trying to walk/bike from?

- Stores
- Resources Center

- Through downtown
- Catholic outreach
- Walmart
- Schools
- 28 ¼ Road from Patterson to North Avenue
- New housing development
 - 24 Road by community Hospital
 - 28 Road & Riverside
- Bus stop near the Walmart near the mall - no sidewalk connecting to the stop – bus stop is far from the apartments and Walmart
- Accessibility for wheelchairs

What do you see as the biggest barriers to biking, for you/ your group?...to walking?

- Narrow bike lanes
- Unsafe crossings
- Missing sidewalks
- Roundabouts –
- Driver not paying attention to pedestrian
- 7th & Horizon – no good access for students going to school –
- School zone might not be long enough in places to cover the core areas where students are walking – ex. Along 12th Street near Gunnison
- Crossing arterial streets
- Better crossing at 9th and Riverside
- Concerts – Las Colonia

Where are the important connections (or missing connections) for people walking and biking?

- B ½ - toward Mesa View – don't have a way to get from bus stop to/from home
- New development by Mavericks does not have any sidewalks
- Clifton – Central High School crossing the railroad tracks
- Elm
- Orchard
- 28 Road
- Corridors that access the majority of the core part of the City
- Ute/ Pitikin – walking and biking – lots of people on these streets – crossings could be improved
- B ½ Road
- Unawep and crossing at US 50

What can the city do to improve conditions for biking?...for walking?

- Bike Repair stations on trails or key destinations

What type of facilities do people who currently bike in Grand Junction prefer? What type of facilities would accommodate the 'interested but concerned' bicyclist? What are your thoughts on separated paths vs neighborhood greenways (on local streets) vs protected bike lanes (on arterials)?

- Trails – completely off-street
- Or a protected bike lane – with a barrier
- Helmet requirement

Senior Center & Public Health Focus Group

10/17/22 @ 3 PM

General

- How are cities managing e-bikes
 - On Trails – some of it is social – not wanting to be passed
 - Safety issue of the weight of bikes
 - Class 3 bikes are the issue because they can go so fast – not allowed on RiverFront Trail

What are some of the key destinations in Grand Junction where people you represent are trying to walk/bike to?

- St. Marys
- CMU
- Los Colonias Amphitheater – parking at the amphitheater
- Mesa County Public Health – 29 ½ & North Avenue – lots of people using the bus and wheelchairs struggling to get to campus
- Downtown
- Mesa Mall – connection from downtown to the mall
- Community Hospital & VA – hard to get across North Ave
- Machete Park
- Canyon View Park – has a new playground for accessibility
- Department of Energy –
- Lots of families drop kids off at incubator near DOE – would be great if kids could bike there since it's a bike program
- Schools

What do you see as the biggest barriers to biking, for you/ your group?...to walking?

- East- West connections are worse than North-South connections
- Some parts of Patterson have bike lane – not well maintained
- Don't feel safe riding on Orchard because its not swept
- Speed and traffic on roads with small bike lane
- Sidewalks are not well maintained – especially for people in a motorized wheelchair
- Sidewalks non-existent on North Ave -connectivity on the sidewalks – not and easy way to get
- Lack of driver awareness and education – don't know how to share the road
- Time to cross the street – if people don't feel they have enough time to cross the street that is a barrier for walking – particularly on the major streets
- US 50 is a big barrier along Orchard Mesa
- GJ has changed a lot in 50 years
 - New bike lanes
 - Riverfront Trail
 - Change in culture – people respecting
- People wearing dark clothing
- People don't know what routes to take when walking and biking – need a way to communicate that better
 - John Hodge created a map for bikeways
 - Have a bike map on the City's website that shows the routes (level traffic stress)

Where are the important connections (or missing connections) for people walking and biking?

- Connecting the RiverFront Trail to Downtown
- Do Rios Elementary school – going across Unaweep from US 50 – saw two kids trying to get across near Duck Pond – unsafe intersection
- Riverside Parkway is not fully connected with sidewalks
- 25 Road at Riverside Parkway – not enough room to merge as a cyclist
- How can one get from the east end of the valley to downtown – not great
- Elm is shared street – great connection, but parked cars
- Lots of schools in a “walk/bike” desert – infrastructure should be there for kids to be able to walk and bike
- Qualify for bus at 2 miles or more from school
- Mesa County works on education of students to use infrastructure and be outside
- SRTS does identify projects that should be constructed
- Getting from school to school – afterschool – lots of folks are considered high risk

What can the city do to improve conditions for biking?...for walking? What would people you represent need to allow them to bike more in Grand Junction?

- RRFBS
 - Library to Main Street
 - Orchard
- 7th Street is a long crosswalk – rumble strips on approach to 7th Street
- Advance warning signs for traffic signals – at 7th Street
- Signs for major bike/ped crossings
- Trails – people want to go from park to park – looking at trails connections through parks

Are there any changes you think should be made to the Active Transportation Corridors?

- Opportunity along the railroad between I-70B and railroad

Stakeholder Interview with Sarah Lubin of Colorado Discover Ability

10/25/22

1. Tell me a little bit about your organization – what you do?
 - Adaptive outdoor program – generally stay in Grand Junction (every mountain on Federal Land required to have an adaptive program)
 - Use the RiverFront Trail
 - Heard that a lot of trails are inaccessible for people with disabilities
 - Ex, If I go to work at Patterson in Clifton – how do I get there

- Work with Strive – kids with disabilities – including mental disabilities – assisting them with all these challenges
 - Started workings with disabled community when mom got sick
 - Organization located at 7th Street – has access to the trail
2. What do you see at the biggest barriers to walking and biking in Grand Junction, particularly for people with disabilities?
- 7th Street to Downtown
 - Visibility – markings are not sufficient – seems wide enough to
 - There's a light the restricts right-on-red, but people don't obey – lots of bikers go to the sidewalk
 - Sidewalk on one side
 - 7th Street towards Patterson is not comfortable
 - 7th and Riverside is an issue
 - Disconnectivity of paths and trails – particularly in Orchard Mesa
 - How do you get to the City Market on US 50?
 - City will have a project on SRTS on 27 Road
 - A lot of the trikes are bigger – getting on an off of trails – curbs can be challenging
 - Bike lanes are sometimes too narrow
 - 42" is probably the largest trike
 - Signs that say when bike lanes narrow
 - Pedestrian access to bus system to be able to go longer distance
 - Botanic Gardens is a place where transit service – serves people with disabilities
 - Access to transit and access to the commercial corridor – pedestrians
 - Large retirement community – can people walk from their assisted living facility to bus stop
 - 90% of the clients we have the challenge is getting places
 - Rely on rides
 - Often low-income
 - Bike storage – particularly with the size and weight of a bike
 - Often cant get their bike on the vehicle
 - How do they park their bike so its not likely to get stolen
 - Bike storage lockers would be awesome – hospital, grocery store, downtown, etc. – would need a larger cage for that bike
3. What are the main barriers to traveling *along* a corridor versus crossing at intersections?
- Example on Colorado Ave, especially where there's parking, drivers don't always see people in the crosswalk
 - Visibility – and even worse for people lower to the ground
 - Combination of all way stop and not is confusing for drivers and pedestrians
 - Need to double the time for crossing with people with disabilities
4. Given your knowledge, are there locations within the City that people with disabilities often need to travel to, how do they get there?
- Riverfront Trail
 - Botanic Gardens
 - North Avenue –
 - Grocery stores
 - CMU – beginning to be a hub for people with disabilities
 - Hospital – community hospital
 - Clinics off Patterson – connection from apartments

- Schools – lots of families in pocket communities – can children get to school safely
 - VA Hospital – area around there – can people travel from nearby homes
 - Crossing North Avenue
 - Majority of Veterans have traumatic brain injury
 - Patterson Road is a key corridor and barrier
 - Connecting Orchard
5. **What can the city do to make navigating in a wheelchair more comfortable and convenient? Similarly on an adaptive bicycle?**
- Making bike lanes wider
 - Making the bus stops wider and sidewalks wider to reduce the change that people get off the curb
 - Gentler transition to curb
 - Make the intersection of the sidewalk curved rather than 90 degrees angle – really hard for people walking and on a trike to make a 90 degree turn
 - Cant back up on a recumbent bike – if bike falls off the
6. **What other considerations do you think are important to include in the Plan to improve pedestrian and bicycle mobility and accessibility in Grand Junction?**
- E-bikes
 - Will increase use
 - Biggest barrier is cost
 - Baby boomers seem like the most likely to use them – more likely to be used by the older abled-bodied community as opposed to the disabled community
 - Veterans want them and disabled community wants them
 - There needs to be a standard for speed
 - Would open up the possibility for more people to travel farther
 - How to get bikes – some non-profits only provide bikes to specific groups – someone injured, but not someone with mental disability – also can be challenging to find groups and jump through the paper work hoops

K-12 Student Panel Focus Group

10/27/22

1. **What school do you attend in Grand Junction? How many of you walked or bike to school or to the bus?**
- Central High School– 2 of 6
 - Orchard Mesa Middle School – 3 of 8
 - Mt. Garfield Middle School –
 - Grand Mesa Middle School – 1 of 1
 - Grand Junction High School – 6 of 6
2. **Is there a desire for more walking and biking to school or other places in your neighborhood? What do you think the barriers are to walking to school? What are the barriers to biking to school?**
- Mt. Garfield Middle School
 - Dirt road with no bike paths or 55 mph – no sidewalk – think its G Road
 - One person was hit on their bike by there

- Central High School
 - no way to cross the highway
 - Usually a lot of traffic on the highway
 - Crosswalks from the Walmart and Walmart parking lot
 - US 50 is a barrier – a lot of people go on 27 Road
 - Bridge over the interstate is way too long
 - 27 Road – often gets a flat because of rocks
 - Have to cross the railroad tracks to get to Central – people don't follow the speed limit
 - Not that many sidewalks - Clifton over the bridge close by Rocky Mountain Elementary School
 - Grand Mesa Middle School – Cross Patterson Road – very scary – cars don't yield when you push the sidewalk button – 31 ½ Road
 - GJHS - A lot people cross the road and get hit on North Avenue – at lunch time when kids leave
-
3. **What other destinations do you walk or bike to? Or you would like to be able to walk or bike to?**
 - Parks and places and you've never been to
 - Shopping center by 30 Road – Panaderia – dangerous crossing the bridge – would like to be able to connect the Walmart by Central High School
 - Would like to walk to City Market by the bridge – not enough time to cross – also Family Dollar -by 32 Road – not good crossings
 - Connection from Central High School to Grand Mesa Middle School
 4. **Thinking about your route to school or another destination, are there streets that are difficult to cross? Or locations where you feel uncomfortable walking or biking? Why?**

What road would you make safer

 - Patterson and 31 ½ road
 - Highway
 - 30 Road – cars drive super close to the curb – when you drive or ride your bike not enough space
 - North Avenue
 - Patterson
 - Orchard Avenue
 - Tiger Way in front of Grand Junction High School
 - 27 Road
 - US 50
 - Chilian Drive and Dorothy Avenue
 - Pine Street – no connection between Pine Street and Sherman Drive – would like to be able to walk over the ditch
 - A lot of houses have goat heads – Sunway Drive – no safe place to ride
 - Live right by the highway – lots of crashes – Sherman Drive at B ½ Road
 - Sidewalk ends – from a lot of neighborhoods to where the fast food restaurant- after you walk over the 32 Road bridge
 - Sometime friends walk to gas station – no crosswalk in highway – right after the 32 Road by Clifton South – gambling, archery – 32 Road right after the bridge
 - Connection on 31 ½ Road by railroad tracks

APPENDIX B: Project Prioritization Methodology

Prioritization Factors & Methodology

The prioritization factors in Table 1 emerged from conversations with the public, steering committee, and City staff. These inputs were used to prioritize proposed bicycle and sidewalk projects into three tiers: low-, medium-, and high-priority.

TABLE 1: PRIORITIZATION FACTORS AND RELATED GOALS

Factor	Equitable	Safe	Connected	Multimodal Community	Quality
Low-income neighborhoods	+				
Low-income residents	+				
Provides access across barriers	+		+		
Bus stops	+		+	+	
Frequent & severe crash locations		+			
Lighting		+			
Active Transportation Corridors			+	+	+
Parks & recreation centers			+		
Libraries & public buildings			+		
Social services	+		+		
Schools			+		
Childcare facilities			+		
Healthcare facilities			+		
Grocery stores & shopping centers			+		
Trailheads			+		

Each section below describes how projects receive prioritization points for each input. For each individual score, thresholds for scores 1-5 will be defined based on the breaks established in the data.

Connected: Does the proposed project provide access to key destinations?

Number of the following destinations within a ½ mile buffer of each project:

- Bus stops
- Parks & recreation centers
- Libraries & public buildings
- Social services
- CHFA addresses
- Schools (weighted x2)
- Childcare facilities (weighted x2)
- Healthcare facilities
- Grocery stores & markets (weighted x2)
- Trailheads

TABLE 2: KEY DESTINATIONS SCORING SYSTEM

Score	Number of Key Destinations, Weighted	
	Bike Projects	Sidewalk Projects
1	0-6	0-1
2	7-15	2-6
3	16-27	7-13
4	28-48	14-28
5	49-159	29-120

Connected: Does the project improve access across barriers?

Does the project cross a river, railroad, and/or highway? Weighted double to account for importance of this measure, as stressed by the steering committee.

TABLE 3: BARRIER SCORING SYSTEM

Score	Crosses Barrier
0	N
2	Y

FOR PEDESTRIAN PROJECTS ONLY: Is the project on an Active Transportation Corridor(s)?

TABLE 4: ATC SCORING SYSTEM

Score	ATC
0	N
2	Y

Equitable: Does the proposed project serve low-income neighborhoods?

Does this project improve access for low income populations? This measure assesses whether the project serves a low income census tract, which is one with an annual median income below \$54,570 (the median household income in Grand Junction in 2020). Weighted double to account for importance of this measure, as stressed by the steering committee.

TABLE 5: EQUITY SCORING SYSTEM

Score	Low Income Neighborhoods Served	
	Bike Projects	Sidewalk Projects
0	0	0
2	1-2	1
4	3-4	2

Safe: Does the proposed project address safety concerns in the City?

Is the project on the Active Transportation High Injury Network? Weighted double to account for importance of this measure.

TABLE 6: HIN SCORING SYSTEM

Score	HIN
0	N
2	Y

Are there lighting-related crashes within 50 feet of the project?

TABLE 7: DARK CRASH SCORING SYSTEM

Score	LIGHTING
0	N
1	Y

Is the project in an area that lacks lighting?

TABLE 8: LIGHTING SCORING SYSTEM

Score	Number of Light Poles/Mile	
	Bike Projects	Sidewalk Projects
1	100-358	40-119
2	40-99	20-39
3	20-39	10-19
4	5-19	1-9
5	0-4	0

Bike Projects

Final score 10-15: High priority

Final score 8-9: Medium priority

Final score 2-7: Low priority

Sidewalk Projects

Final score 10-16: High priority

Final score 7-9: Medium priority

Final score 2-6: Low priority

High Priority Bike Projects

FULL_N AME	Facilit yRec	Miles	Trailh _Ct	Grocer y_Ct	Health _Ct	Child c_Ct	Scho ol_Ct	CHF A_Ct	Servic e_Ct	Publi c_Ct	Park _Ct	Stop _Ct	Key_Dest _Ct_Wt	Key_De st_Sc	Barrie r_Sc	Lowin c_Ct	Equit y_Sc	HIN _Sc	DkCras h_Sc	Light _Ct	Posts _MI	Light _Sc	Final _Sc
29 RD	T or CT or PBL	2.16	0	1	1	10	3	4	4	0	1	31	69	5	2	1	2	0	1	6	3	5	15
26 RD	BL	1.78	0	0	1	2	2	0	1	0	6	12	28	4	2	1	2	0	1	5	3	5	14
NORTH AVE	T	1.00	0	0	0	10	5	3	3	6	10	46	98	5	0	4	4	2	0	39	39	3	14
N 7TH ST	T or CT or PBL	1.49	0	1	1	13	6	10	8	13	9	78	159	5	0	4	4	2	1	71	48	2	14
GRAND AVE	BL	1.67	0	1	1	14	5	8	9	14	9	70	151	5	0	2	2	2	0	28	17	4	13
N 5TH ST	BL	0.57	0	0	1	10	5	3	5	4	9	37	89	5	0	2	2	2	1	12	21	3	13
NORTH AVE	T	2.14	0	2	2	18	3	5	10	1	5	58	127	5	0	2	2	2	1	62	29	3	13
N 12TH ST	T or CT or PBL	1.80	0	2	0	16	7	11	6	5	8	70	150	5	0	3	4	2	0	72	40	2	13
PATTER SON RD	T or CT or PBL	1.50	0	1	1	3	3	0	3	1	5	38	62	5	0	1	2	2	1	57	38	3	13
BROAD WAY	BBL	0.51	1	1	0	3	1	2	2	12	4	35	66	5	2	0	0	2	0	17	34	3	12
HWY 6 AND 50	BBL	0.53	0	1	0	4	1	2	3	12	4	38	71	5	0	1	2	2	0	14	26	3	12
ORCHAR D AVE	BL	0.75	0	1	0	9	2	3	5	1	1	32	66	5	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	5	12
GUNNIS ON AVE	BL	0.19	0	0	0	8	3	7	2	4	6	36	77	5	0	2	2	2	0	5	26	3	12
N 23RD ST	BL	0.50	0	1	1	9	2	3	2	0	2	21	53	5	0	3	4	0	0	12	24	3	12
ORCHAR D AVE	BL	1.06	0	2	0	9	2	7	1	1	3	35	73	5	0	2	2	2	0	27	26	3	12
S 12TH ST	BL	0.34	0	0	0	5	2	5	2	3	7	19	50	5	2	1	2	0	0	7	21	3	12
S 7TH ST	BL	0.80	1	0	0	9	3	7	6	14	8	56	116	5	2	1	2	2	0	111	138	1	12
S 9TH ST	BL	0.80	1	0	0	9	3	6	6	12	7	47	103	5	2	1	2	0	0	18	23	3	12
ELM AVE	BB	1.75	0	2	2	15	3	9	7	2	6	70	136	5	0	1	2	0	1	31	18	4	12
Future ATC Trail	T	2.10	0	2	0	17	5	11	4	0	8	60	131	5	0	1	2	0	0	4	2	5	12
Future ATC Trail	T	0.26	0	0	1	1	2	4	2	0	1	18	32	4	0	1	2	2	0	4	15	4	12
Future ATC Trail	T or CT or PBL	1.02	0	2	2	6	1	3	5	1	1	40	70	5	0	1	2	0	0	1	1	5	12
170B	T or CT or PBL	4.10	0	2	1	15	5	2	10	2	5	59	123	5	0	1	2	0	0	4	1	5	12



PEDESTRIAN & BICYCLE PLAN APPENDIX B: PROJECT PRIORITIZATION METHODOLOGY

PATTERSON RD	T or CT or PBL	2.68	0	1	0	11	2	4	1	1	5	47	86	5	0	1	2	2	0	87	32	3	12
GRAND AVE	BBL	0.62	0	0	0	9	4	7	7	16	8	81	145	5	0	2	2	2	0	61	98	2	11
HWY 6	BBL	0.20	0	2	0	3	2	1	0	0	6	19	40	4	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	5	11
S 1ST ST	BBL	0.50	0	0	0	3	1	2	4	15	4	53	86	5	0	1	2	2	0	30	60	2	11
26 1/4 RD	BL	0.74	0	1	1	5	1	4	5	1	3	26	54	5	0	2	2	0	0	13	18	4	11
GUNNIS ON AVE	BL	0.73	0	1	1	9	2	4	2	2	5	35	73	5	0	1	2	0	0	13	18	4	11
HWY 50 RAMP	BL	0.35	0	1	0	4	1	2	0	1	1	15	31	4	0	1	2	0	0	1	3	5	11
CANNEL L AVE	BB	0.26	0	0	0	8	5	4	1	4	8	35	78	5	0	2	2	0	0	5	19	4	11
CANNEL L AVE	BB	0.18	0	0	0	4	2	4	2	2	3	30	53	5	0	1	2	0	0	3	17	4	11
INDUSTRIAL BLVD	BB	0.50	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	21	28	4	0	1	2	0	0	2	4	5	11
LITTLE BOOKCLIFF DR	BB	0.23	0	1	1	5	2	4	4	1	0	30	56	5	0	1	2	0	0	4	18	4	11
N 9TH ST	BB	0.29	0	1	1	5	3	5	3	2	1	34	64	5	0	1	2	0	0	5	17	4	11
Future ATC Trail	T	0.95	0	1	0	4	1	1	0	1	1	17	32	4	0	1	2	0	0	2	2	5	11
Future ATC Trail	T	0.17	1	0	0	5	2	2	0	0	3	8	28	4	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	5	11
Future ATC Trail	T	0.21	0	0	0	7	3	3	1	2	8	27	61	5	0	2	2	0	0	3	14	4	11
Future ATC Trail	T	0.53	0	1	0	5	2	1	0	0	8	17	42	4	0	1	2	0	0	1	2	5	11
Future ATC Trail	T	0.43	0	1	1	4	3	5	4	0	1	32	59	5	0	2	2	0	0	2	5	4	11
LINCOLN PARK TRAIL/15TH ST	T	0.27	0	0	1	8	2	2	1	2	6	22	54	5	0	1	2	0	0	3	11	4	11
BROADWAY	T or CT or PBL	3.39	1	1	0	7	3	0	0	2	5	8	38	4	0	0	0	2	0	11	3	5	11
Future ATC Trail	T or CT or PBL	0.75	0	1	0	1	3	0	0	1	1	16	28	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	11
HWY 50	T or CT or PBL	3.50	2	1	0	6	2	5	0	4	3	23	55	5	0	1	2	0	0	17	5	4	11
HWY 6 AND 50	T or CT or PBL	0.64	0	3	0	4	2	1	1	5	6	21	52	5	0	2	2	0	0	9	14	4	11
26 1/2 RD	BBL	0.26	0	0	1	1	2	4	2	0	0	16	29	4	0	1	2	2	0	11	43	2	10
PATTERSON RD	BBL	0.25	0	1	1	3	3	4	4	0	0	25	48	4	0	2	2	2	0	11	43	2	10
27 RD	BL	0.37	1	0	0	7	3	4	0	0	3	11	39	4	0	1	2	0	0	6	16	4	10



PEDESTRIAN & BICYCLE PLAN APPENDIX B: PROJECT PRIORITIZATION METHODOLOGY

28 1/2 RD	BL	1.01	1	0	0	4	1	1	0	0	0	6	18	3	0	1	2	0	0	4	4	5	10
29 1/2 RD	BL	1.67	0	1	0	9	2	4	4	1	1	41	75	5	0	0	0	0	0	7	4	5	10
INDEPENDENT AVE	BL	0.03	1	3	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	22	3	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	5	10
LINDEN AVE	BL	0.50	1	0	0	5	2	5	0	1	2	8	31	4	0	1	2	0	0	9	18	4	10
N 15TH ST	BL	0.25	0	0	1	7	2	2	1	2	4	21	49	5	0	2	2	0	0	5	20	3	10
N 5TH ST	BL	0.21	0	0	0	7	2	7	5	16	6	66	118	5	0	1	2	2	0	29	138	1	10
N 7TH ST	BL	0.21	0	0	0	8	2	6	6	13	6	62	113	5	0	2	2	2	0	74	358	1	10
ORCHARDAVE	BL	0.61	0	0	1	7	3	3	2	7	31	66	5	0	2	2	0	0	18	29	3	10	
W PINYON AVE	BL	0.50	1	3	0	3	2	0	0	0	5	19	41	4	0	1	2	0	0	3	6	4	10
28 RD	BB	0.50	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	11	16	3	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	5	10
B 1/4 RD	BB	0.50	0	1	0	3	1	1	0	1	0	6	18	3	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	5	10
BOOKCLIFF AVE	BB	0.99	0	1	0	6	3	0	1	1	1	32	55	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	10
ELM AVE	BB	0.33	0	0	0	7	4	3	1	3	7	33	69	5	0	1	2	0	0	10	30	3	10
MAIN ST	BB	0.62	0	0	0	8	3	7	7	16	7	68	127	5	0	2	2	2	0	110	176	1	10
OXFORD AVE	BB	0.49	0	0	0	3	1	1	0	1	0	7	17	3	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	5	10
PINON ST	BB	0.13	1	0	0	5	2	4	0	0	3	10	32	4	0	1	2	0	0	2	16	4	10
W ORCHARDAVE	BB	0.26	0	2	0	5	2	1	0	0	8	13	40	4	0	1	2	0	0	3	11	4	10
Future ATC Trail	T	0.61	1	1	0	7	3	4	0	1	3	15	46	4	0	1	2	0	0	3	5	4	10
Future ATC Trail	T	0.52	0	1	0	8	2	3	2	0	1	32	60	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	10
S REDLANDS RD/26 3/8 RD	T	0.52	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	6	1	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	5	10
27 1/2 RD	T or CT or PBL	0.50	1	1	0	5	1	0	0	1	3	12	31	4	0	1	2	0	0	8	16	4	10
27 RD	T or CT or PBL	0.54	0	0	0	4	1	4	0	0	1	8	23	3	0	1	2	0	0	2	4	5	10
30 RD	T or CT or PBL	0.97	0	0	0	9	1	0	3	1	0	30	54	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	10
B 1/2 RD	T or CT or PBL	0.49	0	1	0	3	1	1	0	1	0	12	24	3	0	1	2	0	0	1	2	5	10

HWY 6	T or CT or PBL	0.34	0	2	0	4	1	1	0	1	6	19	41	4	0	2	2	0	0	3	9	4	10
-------	----------------	------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Medium Priority Bike Projects

FULL_N AME	Facility Rec	Miles	Trailh_Ct	Grocery_Ct	Health_Ct	Child_c_Ct	School_Ct	CHF A_Ct	Service_Ct	Public_Ct	Park_Ct	Stop_Ct	Key_Dest_Ct_Wt	Key_De st_Sc	Barrier_Sc	Lowin c_Ct	Equity_Sc	HIN_Sc	DkCras h_Sc	Light_Ct	Posts_Mi	Light_Sc	Final_Sc
26 1/4 RD	BBL	0.67	0	0	0	6	0	4	1	0	6	15	38	4	0	1	2	0	0	19	28	3	9
N 12TH ST	BBL	0.21	0	0	0	7	4	5	3	4	7	24	65	5	0	1	2	0	0	9	44	2	9
W GRAND AVE	BBL	0.07	0	0	0	3	1	2	3	12	4	36	65	5	0	0	0	2	0	3	44	2	9
B 1/2 RD	BL	0.48	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	12	19	3	0	1	2	0	0	5	10	4	9
B 1/2 RD	BL	0.59	0	0	0	4	1	1	0	0	0	10	21	3	0	1	2	0	0	7	12	4	9
B RD	T or CT or PBL	1.39	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	12	2	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	5	9
C 1/2 RD	BL	1.50	1	0	0	4	1	1	0	0	3	2	17	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	5	9
CROSB Y AVE	BL	0.32	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	5	2	18	33	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	9
E 1/2 RD	BL	1.24	0	1	0	6	4	0	1	1	1	23	48	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	9
NORTH AVE	BL	0.19	0	0	0	5	0	0	4	1	0	13	28	4	0	1	2	0	0	4	21	3	9
26 3/4 RD	BB	0.19	0	1	1	3	3	4	4	0	0	25	48	4	0	1	2	0	0	4	21	3	9
26 3/8 RD	BB	0.14	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	1	1	7	2	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	5	9
B 1/2 RD	BB	0.21	0	0	0	2	1	4	0	2	0	5	17	3	0	1	2	0	0	4	19	4	9
BOOKC LIFF AVE	BB	0.47	0	1	1	7	3	5	3	1	2	32	66	5	0	2	2	0	0	20	43	2	9
E SHERW OOD DR	BB	0.19	0	0	0	6	3	1	0	2	7	20	48	4	0	1	2	0	0	5	26	3	9
LEGAC Y WAY	BB	0.29	0	0	0	3	1	1	0	2	1	3	15	2	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	5	9
N 23RD ST	BB	0.12	0	1	1	7	1	2	2	0	2	17	42	4	0	1	2	0	0	4	32	3	9
N 24TH ST	BB	0.37	0	1	1	6	1	2	2	1	2	19	43	4	0	1	2	0	0	9	24	3	9
N SHERW OOD DR	BB	0.04	0	0	0	6	3	1	0	2	5	18	44	4	0	1	2	0	0	1	24	3	9



PEDESTRIAN & BICYCLE PLAN APPENDIX B: PROJECT PRIORITIZATION METHODOLOGY

SANTA CLARA AVE	BB	0.25	2	0	0	6	2	5	0	1	4	11	39	4	0	1	2	0	0	6	24	3	9
SANTA CLARA AVE	BB	0.06	1	0	0	5	2	3	0	0	3	10	31	4	0	1	2	0	0	2	35	3	9
D 1/2 RD	T	1.03	0	1	0	9	1	0	0	0	2	14	38	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	9
D 1/2 RD	T	0.87	0	0	0	7	1	0	0	0	0	13	29	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	9
Future ATC Trail	T	0.09	0	0	0	4	2	1	0	2	7	17	39	4	0	1	2	0	0	2	22	3	9
Future ATC Trail	T	0.56	0	0	1	3	2	3	2	0	5	23	44	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	9
Future ATC Trail	T	0.19	0	1	1	3	3	4	4	0	0	23	46	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	9
Future ATC Trail	T	2.80	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	11	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	9
Future ATC Trail	T	0.12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	11	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	9
Future ATC Trail	T	0.55	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	9
HANNAH LN	T	0.55	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	23	28	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	9
24 1/2 RD	T or CT or PBL	1.19	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	14	19	3	2	0	0	0	0	14	12	4	9
25 RD	T or CT or PBL	0.34	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	20	27	3	0	1	2	0	0	5	15	4	9
D RD	T or CT or PBL	2.98	3	0	0	7	1	0	0	0	2	21	42	4	0	0	0	0	0	8	3	5	9
E RD	T or CT or PBL	1.47	0	1	0	6	1	0	3	1	0	9	29	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	5	9
PITKIN AVE	T or CT or PBL	0.39	0	0	0	6	2	4	2	1	3	17	43	4	0	0	0	2	0	9	23	3	9
HORIZON DR	BBL	1.20	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	15	21	3	2	0	0	0	0	35	29	3	8
28 1/4 RD	BL	0.07	0	0	0	4	1	3	1	0	4	14	32	4	0	2	2	0	0	6	80	2	8
29 RD	BL	1.09	0	1	0	6	1	1	0	0	0	6	23	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	8
B 1/2 RD	BL	0.25	0	0	0	4	1	4	0	1	0	4	19	3	0	1	2	0	0	5	20	3	8
B RD	BL	1.35	1	1	0	6	1	0	0	0	0	5	22	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	8
26 1/4 RD	BB	0.21	0	0	0	3	1	1	0	2	1	3	15	2	0	1	2	0	0	3	14	4	8
27 3/4 RD	BB	0.18	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	7	12	2	0	1	2	0	0	1	5	4	8



PEDESTRIAN & BICYCLE PLAN APPENDIX B: PROJECT PRIORITIZATION METHODOLOGY

30 1/2 RD	BB	0.34	1	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	1	6	16	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	
30 1/4 RD	BB	0.04	1	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	1	4	16	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	
BELFOR D AVE	BB	0.04	0	1	1	6	1	2	2	0	1	18	40	4	0	1	2	0	0	2	53	2	8
CHEYE NNE DR	BB	0.62	1	0	0	5	1	0	0	0	3	5	21	3	0	1	2	0	0	14	23	3	8
COLOR ADO AVE	BB	0.13	1	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	1	6	18	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	8
COLOR ADO AVE	BB	0.28	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	1	8	17	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	8
COLOR OW DR	BB	0.07	0	0	0	7	1	0	1	0	1	2	20	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	8
ELM AVE	BB	0.10	0	0	0	4	2	1	0	2	7	15	37	4	0	1	2	0	0	5	48	2	8
GUNNIS ON AVE	BB	0.69	0	0	0	7	2	0	1	0	1	5	25	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	8
HAWTH ORNE AVE	BB	0.76	0	0	0	6	1	2	0	0	3	10	29	4	0	0	0	0	0	13	17	4	8
HILL CT	BB	0.14	0	0	0	4	0	0	3	1	0	4	16	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	8
OLSON AVE	BB	0.01	2	0	0	5	2	3	0	0	3	10	32	4	0	1	2	0	0	1	75	2	8
RIVER CIR	BB	0.01	2	0	0	4	2	5	0	1	4	9	33	4	0	1	2	0	0	1	73	2	8
S 12TH ST	BB	0.41	2	0	0	3	2	2	2	2	5	5	28	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4	8
SOUTH AVE/S 2ND ST	BB	0.78	0	0	0	3	0	7	4	15	5	58	95	5	0	0	0	0	0	23	30	3	8
SANDPI PER AVE	BB	0.19	1	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	1	6	16	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	8
CHATRI ELD DR	T	0.01	0	0	0	7	1	0	0	0	0	6	22	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	8
Future ATC Trail	T	0.42	0	0	0	5	1	1	0	0	0	4	17	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	8
Future ATC Trail	T	1.78	1	0	0	5	2	2	0	0	3	6	26	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	8
Future ATC Trail	T	1.19	1	0	0	6	1	0	0	0	2	8	25	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	8
Future ATC Trail	T	0.47	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	12	20	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	8
Future ATC Trail	T	0.50	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	1	1	10	22	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	8
Future ATC Trail	T	0.91	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	1	1	12	22	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	8



PEDESTRIAN & BICYCLE PLAN APPENDIX B: PROJECT PRIORITIZATION METHODOLOGY

Future ATC Trail	T	1.75	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	16	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	8
Future ATC Trail	T	3.11	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	3	13	22	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	8
Indian Wash Trail from Matchett Park	T	0.68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	8
Matchett Park ATC	T	1.37	0	0	0	4	0	2	0	0	3	7	20	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	8
Trail Connection	T	0.17	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	1	1	14	22	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	8
23 RD	T or CT or PBL	2.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	1	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	8
29 1/2 RD	T or CT or PBL	0.44	0	1	0	6	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	8
30 RD	T or CT or PBL	0.38	0	0	0	8	1	0	3	1	2	6	30	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4	8
31 RD	T or CT or PBL	1.16	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	13	22	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	8
B 1/2 RD	T or CT or PBL	1.98	0	0	0	7	1	1	0	0	0	4	21	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	8

Low Priority Bike Projects

FULL_NAME	FacilityRec	Miles	Trail_Ct	Grocery_Ct	Health_Ct	Child_Ct	School_Ct	CHFA_Ct	Service_Ct	Public_Ct	Park_Ct	Stop_Ct	Key_Dest_Ct_Wt	Key_Dest_Sc	Barrier_Sc	Lowinc_Ct	Equity_Sc	HIN_Sc	DkCrash_Sc	Light_Ct	Posts_Mi	Light_Sc	Final_Sc
23 1/2 RD	BL	0.50	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	7
27 1/2 RD	BL	0.22	0	0	0	3	1	1	0	0	2	7	18	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	18	4	7
30 RD	BL	0.73	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	7
30 RD	BL	0.62	1	0	0	5	1	0	0	0	2	3	18	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4	7
30 RD	BL	0.50	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	9	19	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4	7
F 1/2 RD	BL	1.00	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	15	20	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	11	4	7
F 1/2 RD	BL	0.51	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	6	10	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	7
G RD	BL	1.00	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	12	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	10	4	7
RIMROCK AVE	BL	0.32	1	3	0	2	0	0	0	1	4	12	28	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	31	3	7
ROSEVALE RD	BL	0.91	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	2	11	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	7
B RD	BB	0.50	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	7
CANYON RIM DR	BB	0.49	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	2	0	10	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	7
COLORADO AVE	BB	0.04	1	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	1	5	15	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	7
D RD	BB	0.30	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	2	11	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	7
E 1/2 RD	BB	0.82	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	7
F 1/2 RD	BB	0.33	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	8	11	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	7
HOPI DR	BB	0.20	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	2	0	1	2	0	0	4	20	3	7
LAKESIDE CT	BB	0.20	0	2	0	2	2	2	3	0	0	21	38	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	26	3	7
MEADOW WALE WAY	BB	0.05	1	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	6	14	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	7



PEDESTRIAN & BICYCLE PLAN APPENDIX B: PROJECT PRIORITIZATION METHODOLOGY

RIDGE DR	BB	0.25	0	1	0	2	1	0	1	0	1	11	21	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4	7
ROSEVA LE RD	BB	0.22	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	7
WEDGE WOOD AVE	BB	0.39	1	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	1	5	15	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	7
Future ATC Trail	T	1.95	0	0	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	7
Future ATC Trail	T	0.55	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	7
Future ATC Trail	T	0.99	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	5	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	7
Redlands 360 Trail	T	3.61	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	7
Future ATC Trail	T	0.61	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	7
Future ATC Trail	T	0.95	1	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	1	0	12	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	7
Future ATC Trail	T	0.44	0	3	0	4	1	1	0	3	6	20	46	4	0	0	0	0	0	14	32	3	7
Future ATC Trail	T	1.37	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	12	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	7
Future ATC Trail	T	0.64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	12	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	7
Future ATC Trail	T	0.67	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	12	14	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	7
Future ATC Trail	T	0.40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4	7
Future ATC Trail	T	2.19	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	7
24 RD/REDLANDS PKWY	T or CT or PBL	0.41	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	11	2	2	0	0	0	0	11	27	3	7
29 RD	T or CT or PBL	0.50	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	2	11	19	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4	7
30 RD	T or CT or PBL	0.38	1	0	0	8	1	0	0	0	2	5	26	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4	7
F 1/2 RD	T or CT or PBL	0.82	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	4	14	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	7
H RD	T or CT or PBL	0.59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	9	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	7
RIVER RD	T or CT or PBL	2.37	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	15	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	7
RIVERSIDE PKWY	T or CT or PBL	0.21	1	0	0	3	1	0	1	2	1	14	27	3	0	0	0	2	0	17	81	2	7
S CAMP RD	T or CT or PBL	0.07	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	2	0	10	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	7
25 RD	BBL	0.17	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	15	2	0	1	2	0	0	7	42	2	6

WEST AVE	BBL	0.16	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	3	1	15	27	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	24	3	6
25 1/2 RD	BL	0.20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6
F 1/2 RD	BL	0.22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4	6
F 1/2 RD	BL	0.50	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2	5	10	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4	6
H RD	BL	1.00	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6
H RD	BL	0.25	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6
S BROADWAY	BL	1.50	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	6
23 RD	BB	0.22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6
29 3/4 RD	BB	0.23	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6
ATHENA ST	BB	0.37	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6
B 3/4 RD	BB	0.24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6
CANYON CREEK DR	BB	0.30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6
CHESTNUT DR	BB	0.28	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	2	0	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4	6
COLONIAL DR	BB	0.18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6
EASTER HILL DR	BB	0.05	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6
F 1/2 RD	BB	0.15	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6
G 1/4 RD	BB	0.02	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6
GARDEN RD	BB	0.12	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6
HERMOSA AVE	BB	0.26	0	1	0	3	1	2	2	0	2	15	31	4	0	0	0	0	0	11	42	2	6
LAKESIDE DR	BB	0.05	0	2	0	2	1	2	2	0	0	19	33	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	55	2	6
MONUMENT VILLAGE DR	BB	0.28	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6
OL SUN DR	BB	0.23	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6
RAILHEAD CIR	BB	0.35	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6
RIDGE DR	BB	0.60	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	3	5	14	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	18	4	6
S BROADWAY	BB	0.18	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6
S REDLANDS RD	BB	0.65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6

W GREENW OOD CT	BB	0.06	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	
W GREENW OOD DR	BB	0.13	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	
W MAIN ST	BB	0.05	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	5	1	14	29	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	78	2	6
WEST AVE	BB	0.05	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	5	1	14	29	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	55	2	6
Future ATC Trail	T	2.41	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	5	6
26 RD	T	0.29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	6
Brodick Way/Heron Drive	T	1.09	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	6
DESERT HILLS RD	T	0.26	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6
FREEDOM DR	T	0.06	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6
Future ATC Trail	T	0.14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6
Future ATC Trail	T	2.83	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6
Future ATC Trail	T	0.25	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	10	16	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	20	3	6
Future ATC Trail	T	0.24	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6
Future ATC Trail	T	1.09	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6
Neighborhood Connection to 26 Rd	T	0.07	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6
Trail Connection	T	0.19	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6
25 RD	T or CT or PBL	0.14	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	7	10	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4	6
25 RD	T or CT or PBL	0.05	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6
28 RD	T or CT or PBL	0.64	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	6
30 RD	T or CT or PBL	0.50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6
BROADWAY	T or CT or PBL	0.11	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6
BROADWAY	T or CT or PBL	1.57	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6



PEDESTRIAN & BICYCLE PLAN APPENDIX B: PROJECT PRIORITIZATION METHODOLOGY

C RD	T or CT or PBL	0.99	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6		
F 1/2 RD	T or CT or PBL	0.22	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	6	
G RD	T or CT or PBL	2.25	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	15	2	0	0	0	0	0	17	8	4	6	
G RD	T or CT or PBL	0.46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	6	
H RD	T or CT or PBL	0.82	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	
I RD	T or CT or PBL	0.46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	
I RD	T or CT or PBL	0.29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	
MONUMENT RD	T or CT or PBL	1.42	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	
RIVERSIDE PKWY	T or CT or PBL	0.32	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	6	1	27	42	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	51	2	6
S BROADWAY	T or CT or PBL	0.51	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	6
S BROADWAY	T or CT or PBL	0.51	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	
S CAMP RD	T or CT or PBL	0.96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	
24 1/2 RD	BBL	0.30	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	16	22	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	40	2	5
RIVERSIDE PKWY	BBL	0.31	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	20	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	52	2	5
23 RD	BL	0.49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4	5
24 1/2 RD	BL	0.50	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	19	25	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	60	2	5
26 1/2 RD	BL	0.33	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4	5
28 RD	BL	0.33	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	2	1	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	24	3	5
H RD	BL	0.45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	31	3	5
MARIPOSA DR	BL	0.66	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	0	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	24	3	5
DESERT HILLS RD	BB	0.33	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4	5
ESCONDIDO CIR	BB	0.34	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4	5
G 1/2 RD	BB	0.51	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	2	0	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	24	3	5



PEDESTRIAN & BICYCLE PLAN APPENDIX B: PROJECT PRIORITIZATION METHODOLOGY

LEVI CT	BB	0.06	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	9	13	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	31	3	5
W COLORADO AVE	BB	0.02	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	4	1	12	26	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	98	2	5
24 RD	T or CT or PBL	0.99	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	13	2	0	0	0	0	0	21	21	3	5
24 RD	T or CT or PBL	0.42	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	21	3	5
RIVERSIDE PKWY	T or CT or PBL	0.29	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	20	3	0	0	0	0	0	12	41	2	5
E MAYFIELD DR	BL	0.04	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	26	3	4
G 1/2 RD	BL	0.18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	27	3	4
S RIM DR	BL	0.04	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	23	3	4
FOUNTAIN GREENS PL	BB	0.06	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	35	3	4
STRUTHERS AVE	BB	0.12	1	0	0	2	1	1	0	1	2	2	13	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	40	2	4
STRUTHERS AVE	BB	0.03	1	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	1	1	10	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	96	2	4
RIDGES BLVD	BL	0.02	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	53	2	3
W RIDGES BLVD	BL	0.02	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	0	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	115	1	3
I RD	BB	0.01	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	118	1	2

Proposed Minor Tweaks to Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan



Chapter 6

Potential Changes

New Wording for proposed changes to the March Final Draft Plan by Planning Commission at their April 6, 2023 workshop

ANTICIPATED COSTS AND FUNDING SOURCES

Total annual maintenance cost estimates per mile vary greatly across communities based on trail characteristics such as the types of vegetation, amenities included, and the number of annual users. Soft surface trails cost between \$1,000 and \$2,600 per mile and paved trails cost anywhere from \$2,000-\$12,000 per mile, according to Rails-to-Trails, the Ohio River Greenway, and the city of Billings. In Colorado, the city of Windsor estimates trail maintenance costs \$5,000-\$6,000 per mile annually. The city of Fort Collins estimates a cost of \$9,144 per mile annually, but states that the best practice would be to spend \$12,000. The city of Grand Junction should plan for increases in the budget of the Parks and Recreation Department and Public Works Department commensurate with additional assets and capital facilities that the Parks Operations Division and Street Systems Division must operate and maintain.

In communities nationwide, usually more funding exists for capital construction than for maintenance. According to Rails-to-Trails, trail system managers nationally report receiving funding primarily from municipal budget allocations (49%), then from local fundraising activities (39%), in-kind donations (29%), the state budget (24%), community fees or taxes (9%), and federal funding (7%).

Possible funding sources and opportunities for the city to explore include:

- Department of Local Affairs/Great Outdoors Colorado/Conservation Trust Fund (Colorado Lottery)
- Land and Water Conservation Fund
- Colorado Parks and Wildlife
- Conservation, trail advocacy groups, local organizations, non-profits
- Federal Highway Administration BUILD Grants, Recreational Trails Program Funding, Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP)
- Highway Safety Improvement Program, National Highway Performance Program, FASTER Safety Grants

- Grand Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization
- Rails to Trails
- Property taxes
- Development impact fees on new construction
- Open space sales tax
- Sales tax
- Public utility bill donations

OBJECTIVE Q4

Explore and pursue new funding sources to support maintenance of the expanded system.

Pedestrian & Bicycle Amenities

The following section outlines guidance for pedestrian and bicycle amenities for the city to incorporate alongside installation of new sidewalks, trails, and bikeways. With any corridor upgrade, the city should consider how to improve the overall streetscape to create a more pleasant environment for those walking and biking.

OBJECTIVE M1

Grand Junction's streets shall be designed as public amenities and include aesthetic elements such as street trees, landscaping, pedestrian lighting, street furniture, and wayfinding signage wherever possible.

Revised to read:

SOURCING FUNDS

Total annual maintenance cost estimates per mile vary greatly across communities, based on the type of facility (e.g., width, surface, structural design), as well as context-sensitive characteristics, such as the types of vegetation, amenities included, and number of annual users. The City of Grand Junction should continue to plan for increases in the budget of the Parks and Recreation Department and Public Works Department commensurate with additional assets and capital facilities that the Parks Operations Division and Street Systems Division must operate and maintain.

In communities nationwide, usually more funding exists for capital construction than for maintenance. According to Rails-to-Trails, trail system managers nationally report receiving funding primarily from municipal budget allocations (49%), then from local fundraising activities (39%), in-kind donations (29%), the state budget (24%), community fees or taxes (9%), and federal funding (7%).

Many funding sources could be used for construction and maintenance. The city can explore these and more:

- Department of Local Affairs/Great Outdoors Colorado/Conservation Trust Fund(Colorado Lottery)
- Land and Water Conservation Fund
- Colorado Parks and Wildlife
- Conservation, trail advocacy groups, local organizations, non-profits
- Federal Highway Administration RAISE Grants, Recreational Trails Program Funding, Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP)
- Federal Safe Streets for All (SS4A) grants
- Highway Safety Improvement Program, National Highway Performance Program, FASTER Safety Grants
- City Capital Improvement fund (sales tax)
- City General Fund (sales tax)

Revised to read:

Utilize existing and pursue new funding sources support construction and maintenance of an expanded system.

Wayfinding systems should also include estimated walking time to each destination listed to further highlight ease of pedestrian access.

As recommended in the Vibrant Together downtown plan, Grand Junction should initiate a comprehensive wayfinding and signage study to create a consistent strategy for connecting people walking, biking, and driving to downtown and other key destinations.

OBJECTIVE M6

Initiate a comprehensive wayfinding and signage study to create a consistent strategy for connecting people walking, biking, and driving to downtown and other key destinations.

Bikeway and trail signage is especially important to help people walking, rolling and biking reach major destinations and landmarks. In partnership with the Urban Trails Committee, in 2020 the city installed 300 wayfinding signs to guide cyclists throughout the community. As the city continues to build out bike facilities and new trails over time, they should incorporate additional signs with the same wayfinding standards at decision points – typically at the intersection of two or more bicycle facilities and at other key locations along bicycle routes. Signage should be regularly refreshed or replaced as it becomes damaged, faded, or out of date. Over time, outdated signage should also be replaced with new, updated information. Signs may be directional and related to routing users to key destinations, mile markers to help users self-locate, or pertaining to trail etiquette.

OBJECTIVE M7

As the city continues to build out bike facilities and new trails over time, incorporate additional signs with the same wayfinding standards at decision points.

The Steering Committee was particularly concerned with signage on the Riverfront Trail and suggested two major changes in that specific area – first, striping a centerline on the trail starting on the east end of Las Colonias Park and continuing to the west through the high use area of the trail, and second, installing signage on trail etiquette along the Riverfront Trail. The centerline is recommended to highlight two-way traffic on the trail, maintain space for passing, and reduce safety conflicts. Trail etiquette signage is intended to communicate responsibilities of trail users to keep to the right, leash dogs, respect proper cycling speeds, pay attention at high traffic intersections, etc.

OBJECTIVE M8

Improve signage on the Riverfront Trail.

BIKE/SCOOTER SHARE

In 2022, the City released a Referral for Proposals to solicit bike and scooter share services from two micromobility companies and to evaluate the effectiveness of this mode of transportation on first- and last-mile connections and modal shifts. The 18-month pilot study was slated to start during the month of April 2023. More information on this pilot can be found at <https://www.gjcity.org/1228/Shared-Micromobility-Pilot-Study>

Scoters and bike share have been successfully deployed in several Front Range communities including Fort Collins, Boulder, Colorado Springs, Denver, and Longmont. However, sharing services are most successful and financially sustainable where there is a higher density of land uses, since people can travel shorter distances to reach destinations, the ideal trip type for micromobility to support.

Shared micromobility has numerous benefits, including flexible travel options, better first-and-last-mile connections to transit, and replacement of vehicle trips. A key concern for the city of Grand Junction is maintaining sidewalk access and reducing visual clutter in the streetscape. Dockless shared micromobility will be explored initially, which could be expanded or converted to a city-run docked model once enough data is available to show trip patterns.

Revised to read:

SHARED MICROMOBILITY

In 2022, the City released a Referral for Proposals to solicit **shared micromobility (e.g., bike and scooter share)** to evaluate the effectiveness of this mode of transportation on first- and last-mile connections and modal shifts. The 18-month pilot study is slated to start 2023.

Scoters and bike share have been successfully deployed in several Front Range communities including Fort Collins, Boulder, Colorado Springs, Denver, and Longmont. Sharing services are most successful and financially sustainable where there is a higher density of land uses, since people can travel shorter distances to reach destinations, the ideal trip type for micromobility to support.

Shared micromobility has numerous benefits, including flexible travel options, better first- and last-mile connections to transit, and replacement of vehicle trips.

The city will use geofencing and micromobility corrals and eventually explore a docked system to keep walkways clear for pedestrians and people using wheelchairs and other mobility devices, while also reducing visual clutter along the sidewalk. The city will build and leverage new development to provide additional bike parking and micromobility corrals. The street standards or development overlays will be updated to include a buffer/amenity zone in new sidewalks in core areas of the city that can be used for micromobility parking safely outside of the sidewalk.

OBJECTIVE M9

Close the gaps on first-and-last mile connections through the deployment of shared micromobility devices (e-scooters, e-bikes, etc.) and utilize geofencing and parking corrals to accommodate device parking in high-traffic areas.

Safe Routes to School (SRTS)

Safe Routes to School (SRTS) programs are designed to make it safer for students to walk and bike to school, and thus encourage more walking and biking. Beyond supporting safety, SRTS programs can reduce traffic congestion, provide environmental benefits, and improve health outcomes by promoting habits of walking and biking that may influence travel decisions later in life.

The city of Grand Junction dedicates a portion of the federal Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) distribution it receives each year to the city's Safe Routes to School Program. Since 2016, the city has invested more than \$700,000 in walking and biking infrastructure improvements around schools, including new sidewalks, crosswalks, traffic calming, and accessibility projects. The Mesa County Regional Transportation Planning Office (RTPO) has a separate program that conducted SRTS assessments of 12 elementary schools and 8 middle schools in School District 51.

OBJECTIVE S5

Bolster the existing Safe Routes to School program by incorporating new elements of the six Es.

The city of Grand Junction can bolster their Safe Routes to School program by incorporating all elements of a successful SRTS program: the "six Es." The six Es represent an integrated and comprehensive approach to making streets healthier and safer for everyone, regardless of their destination or travel mode. The following section describes each of the six Es and related initiatives.

Education – Providing students and the community with the skills to walk and bicycle safely, educating them about benefits of walking and bicycling, and teaching them about the broad range of transportation choices.

- Schools can launch advertising campaigns to promote travel to school by means other than driving.
- Public education can include information distributed to students about travel options, including safe walking and biking routes, transit services, and carpools.

Encouragement – Generating enthusiasm and increased walking and bicycling for students through events, activities, and programs.

- Walk Pools/Walking School Bus: Organized walking groups for children, chaperoned by an adult, that encourage students to walk together to school.
- Bike Bus: Organized bike rides to school chaperoned by an adult(s), that provide a fun morning experience and safety in numbers.
- Walk, Roll, and Bike to School Day: Event that encourages participation and educates students on the benefits and ways to walk and bike to school comfortably and safely.
- Partner with local organizations to lead/help with SRTS programs.
- Engage parents as volunteer crossing guards and walk/bike bus leaders.
- Create speed sign program.

Revised to read:

The city will build and encourage development to provide additional bike parking. Should the micromobility pilot be successful, property owners may choose to provide device parking, in coordination with micromobility vendors. The street standards could be updated to include a buffer/amenity zone in new sidewalks in core areas of the city which could be used for micromobility parking safely outside of the sidewalk.

Education & Awareness

Numerous comments received during the public engagement process referred to the need for education and awareness to establish a more positive culture around walking and biking in Grand Junction. Residents noted that drivers are often unaware of cyclists in the roadway and don't expect them. Many residents also have had negative experiences with drivers, ranging from distracted and dangerous driving to verbal and physical harassment, hostility, and aggression.

OBJECTIVE S6

Work with local driving schools to expand the curriculum on laws governing interactions with people walking, rolling, and biking.

Better driver education is needed to establish respect for people walking and biking and create a more "peaceful coexistence," as one commenter wrote. City law enforcement should work with local driving schools to expand the curriculum on laws governing interactions with people walking, rolling, and biking, such as three-foot passing distance, permission for cyclists to occupy a full travel lane, requirements to stop for people in the crosswalk, window tinting laws, as well as the danger of running red lights and turning right on red during a walk cycle.

In a similar vein, several comments highlighted negative cyclist interactions with law enforcement in Grand Junction and the need to improve relations with people walking and biking. City staff should partner with law enforcement to increase enforcement of speeding and reckless driving in areas with high pedestrian volumes and/or safety issues and consider automated enforcement. The police department may also consider expanding their bike patrol unit to improve bicyclist/officer relations, and ensure that all law enforcement officers have basic training or experience with bicycling.

OBJECTIVE S7

Partner with law enforcement to increase enforcement of speeding and reckless driving in areas with high pedestrian volumes and/or safety issues and consider automated enforcement. Consider expanding the police bike patrol unit.

OBJECTIVE M11

Establish a more positive culture around walking and biking in Grand Junction by creating Bicycle & Pedestrian Coordinator position, educating city staff, promoting the Bicycle Friendly Business program, and/or hosting an LCI seminar.

Beyond these measures, the city should pursue the following recommendations highlighted in the Bicycle Friendly Community Designation and the Walk Friendly Community Report Card:

- Educate staff on walking, walkability, and pedestrian safety.
- Encourage more local businesses, agencies, and organizations to promote cycling to their employees and customers and to seek recognition as a Bicycle Friendly Business.
- Host a League Cycling Instructor (LCI) seminar to increase the number of local LCIs.
- Expand the audience for educational programs to include high school students, college students, and new drivers.
- The city's new Bicycle & Pedestrian Coordinator can take the lead on these actions, along with many of the other programs and policies in this plan.

Revised to read:

Establish a more positive culture around walking and biking in Grand Junction by creating **staff position(s)** to assist in public education, promoting the Bicycle Friendly Business program, and/or hosting an LCI seminar.

Revised to read:

City staff

Policies

One of the most tangible and cost-effective ways to improve the bicycle and pedestrian environment in Grand Junction will be to implement effective policies. Policies can be used to guide the private sector in new development or redevelopment projects, as well as city departments as they perform major street construction projects and routine street maintenance. Adopting policy will ensure these projects incorporate the city's goals for the bicycle and pedestrian environment and create a consistent experience for users.

Based on the existing conditions analysis and in collaboration with the Steering Committee, the following set of actionable policies are recommended to support buildout and use of the future bicycle and pedestrian network.

Access Management

Access management is an important strategy to mitigate curb out frequency and conflicts between pedestrians, bicyclists, and turning vehicles. The TEDS Manual states that access should be provided on the lower street classification when a property is adjacent to multiple streets. Additionally, the North Avenue Zoning Overlay provides access management guidance to limit curb cuts specifically along North

Avenue. The city should consider expanding this type of policy to all Active Transportation Corridors and corridors identified on the Active Transportation High Injury Network to mitigate conflict points between vehicles and pedestrians and bicyclists. Potential access management strategies include redirecting access to side-streets and alleys, consolidating driveways among single and adjacent property owners, adding medians, and adopting more overlay districts and/or amend existing codes and regulations to define and limit the frequency of driveways and access points

OBJECTIVE S8

Improve the North Avenue access management policy in alignment with national best practices and expand to all the Active Transportation Corridors.

Vision Zero

Through their Bicycle Friendly Community designation, the League of American Bicyclists encourages municipalities to adopt a comprehensive road safety plan or a Vision Zero policy. It is increasingly common for municipalities around the country to adopt Vision Zero policies and programs. These Vision Zero policies and programs consist of communities committing to eliminating traffic crashes that result in fatalities or serious injuries by providing safety training, implementing engineering solutions that are proven to slow vehicle speeds while reducing conflicts with other roadway users, and forming multidisciplinary initiatives for implementing safety programming. Grand Junction can join Colorado's statewide program – Moving Towards Zero Deaths – as a first step in solidifying a citywide commitment to supporting multimodal travel through ensuring all trips in the community are as safe as possible.

OBJECTIVE S9

Join the statewide program – Moving Towards Zero Deaths – as a first step in solidifying a citywide commitment to supporting multimodal travel through ensuring all trips in the community are as safe as possible.

Revised to read:

One of the most tangible and cost-effective ways to improve the bicycle and pedestrian environment in Grand Junction will be to implement effective policies. Policies can be used by city departments as they perform street construction projects and routine maintenance. The policies can also be used to guide the private sector in new development or redevelopment projects. Adopting policy(ies) may assist in ensuring projects incorporate the city's goals for the bicycle and pedestrian environment and create a consistent experience for users.

Revised to read:

Avenue. The city should consider expanding this type of policy to Active Transportation Corridors and corridors identified on the Active Transportation High Injury Network (Figure 14, Appendix A Existing Conditions and Needs Assessment) to mitigate conflict points between vehicles and pedestrians and bicyclists. Potential access management strategies typically include redirecting access to side-streets and alleys, consolidating driveways among single and adjacent property owners, and adding medians.

Revised to read:

Improve the North Avenue access management policy in alignment with national best practices and consider expanding to all the Active Transportation "High Injury Network" Corridors.

Construction Zones

The city of Grand Junction should consider strengthening enforcement and compliance with the construction zones policy that requires developers and construction companies to reroute sidewalks and bicycle facilities that are impacted by construction, similar to the way that they must currently continue to facilitate roadway access for people driving. This could mean accommodating people walking and biking with a temporary covered walkway and bikeway adjacent to the construction zone, or at minimum signing alternate detour routes on either end of the construction zone. The city could consider enforcing stricter requirements along the Active Transportation Corridors.

For example, in Denver, developers must obtain a street occupancy permit and submit a plan for accommodating people driving and walking. City staff reviews engineered drawings, traffic control plan(s), and street occupancy requests. Their [Pedestrian Walkway Entrance Requirements](#) stipulate that construction sites must provide covered walkways and less often, fenced pedestrian walkways to accommodate people walking and protect them from construction activity. The requirements include details on walkway dimensions and design features.

OBJECTIVE C2

Strengthen enforcement and compliance of the existing construction zones policy that requires developers/construction companies to provide sidewalks and bicycle facilities during construction.

Implementing or Funding Bicycle Facilities

Through application of the street standards with new development, Grand Junction will continue to enforce the current policy where planned Active Transportation Corridors that run through a site or along the edge of a site be constructed by the developer (as identified in Figure 44 and Figure 46). For example, if there is a missing or deficient sidewalk or planned trail adjacent to the development, the developer is responsible for implementing or upgrading this sidewalk or trail according to the widths and standards identified in this Plan. It is important that the city work with the developer and re-prioritize proposed projects to ensure

Revised to read:

Pedestrian and bicycle accommodation in work zones is already a federal standard defined in the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, and the city currently has a work zone policy consistent with federal standards. The city should strengthen compliance with the work zone policy that requires developers and construction companies to reroute sidewalks and bicycle facilities that are impacted by construction, similar to the way that they must currently continue to facilitate roadway access for people driving. This means accommodating people walking and biking with a temporary walkway and bikeway adjacent to the work zone, or at minimum signing alternate detour routes on either end of the construction zone. The city could consider more active enforcement of current work zone policy along the Active Transportation Corridors.

Revised to read:

Constructing Active Transportation Facilities

Consistent with current Municipal Code, when an Active Transportation Corridor (ATC) is shown as part of a Collector or Arterial street, the city should continue to plan for and construct the facility. If an ATC is along a local street within a development, a developer should continue to construct deficient or missing facilities, unless other funding sources are secured. The city should continue its current policy for new development to construct an ATC within or adjacent to the site unless other funding sources are secured.



FIGURE 43: EXAMPLE OF COVERED WALKWAY AT CONSTRUCTION SITE

that bicycle and pedestrian facilities are connected and not inconsistently adjacent only to new developments. Additionally, commercial and multifamily residential developments should also be required to provide bike parking. The city could consider providing incentives or requiring larger developments to provide secured bike parking.

OBJECTIVE Q6

Continue to enforce the current policy where planned Active Transportation Corridors that run through a site or along the edge of a site be constructed as part of the development.

Building a Connected Network

Public input and an analysis of the existing transportation network highlighted the lack of connectivity between many neighborhoods in Grand Junction due to the curvilinear street network, especially for people walking or bicycling.

opportunities for new train connections between neighborhoods should be considered. Creating a trail at the end of a cul-de-sac or between two unconnected streets can greatly decrease the trip lengths for people walking and bicycling, as conveyed in Figure 42.

This can make taking trips by walking or bicycling easier and more feasible. In established neighborhoods, these connections can be created by finding existing easements or right-of-way or by acquiring new right-of-way or easements if none currently exists. For redevelopment projects, it is recommended that all new developments be required to provide pedestrian and bicycle connections or preserve right-of-way or easements for future connections where there is a lack of connectivity in the roadway network (e.g., cul-de-sac).

For new developments, the city should develop an ordinance mandating a minimum level of street connectivity (defined by a "connectivity index", which is the ratio of roadway links to intersections) or a maximum block length. A connectivity index or maximum block length can help reduce the number of cul-de-sacs and guide new development to a more walk and bike-friendly street network.

OBJECTIVE C3

Require new developments to provide or set aside space for pedestrian and bicycle connections within the local street network of new developments and to adjacent streets in situations where there is a lack of connectivity in the roadway network.

OBJECTIVE C4

Develop an ordinance mandating a minimum level of street connectivity. A more densely connected or gridded network makes for a more walkable and bikeable area by increasing route options and reducing out of direction travel. Connectivity can be defined by a "connectivity index," which is the ratio of roadway links (or block) to intersections. An ordinance on maximum block length can also increase connectivity. A connectivity index or maximum block length can help reduce the number of cul-de-sacs and guide new development to a more walk and bike-friendly street network.

Revised to read:

Additionally, bicycle parking should be provided at commercial and multifamily residential locations.

Revised to read:

Continue the current policy where Active Transportation Corridors which run through or adjacent to a site be constructed as part of the development.

Revised to read:

Connectivity can be defined by a "connectivity index," the ratio of pedestrian and bicycle connections to blocks (or intersections). Consider reducing the maximum distance between pedestrian and bicycle connections to be less than the existing maximum block length for vehicular access of 1200 linear feet.

Revised to read:

The city's existing Subdivision Standards already require connectivity to "Promote pedestrian uses, bicycling, and transportation modes other than private automobile." This connectivity standard should remain, as creating a connection between two otherwise unconnected streets/neighborhoods can greatly decrease the trip lengths for people walking, rolling, and bicycling, as conveyed in Figure 44.

In established neighborhoods, these connections can be created by finding existing easements or right-of-way or by acquiring new right-of-way or easements if none currently exists.

The City's current maximum block length of 1200 linear feet is established in the Transportation Engineering Design Standards (TEDS) for vehicular access. The City should consider pedestrian and bicycle connections at an interval closer to 600 feet, which is the distance data indicates is a more comfortable block length for pedestrians to navigate. A "Connectivity Index" could also be used.

Applying Transportation Demand Management

Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures are strategies typically designed to facilitate the use of alternate transportation modes to decrease demand on the roadways system by single occupant vehicles. Grand Junction should update its Transportation Impact Study guidelines (Chapter 29.08.200 of the Municipal Code) to encourage TDM measures that major developments should provide specifically to support walking and biking. These could include bike racks, showers, car share, or support for bike commuters. This ordinance can give more weight to certain TDM measures over others.

OBJECTIVE M12

Update the Transportation Impact Study guidelines (Chapter 29.08.200 of the Municipal Code) to encourage Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures that major developments should provide specifically to support walking and biking. These could include bike racks, showers, car share, or support for bike commuters.

Parking Policy

Encouraging developments to right-size off-street parking increases the walkability of an area by increasing density, activating the pedestrian experience, prioritizing pedestrian infrastructure, and allocating space for people instead of vehicles.

The city's Municipal Code (21.06.050) currently identified parking minimums for different land uses. These standards should be revised to serve as parking maximums for development. Parking requirements can also be reduced to better align parking with the community's goals. Other parking ordinances that promote walkability include:

- **Fee-in-lieu**-Fee-in-lieu allows landowners and developers to pay a fee into a municipal fund in lieu of providing on-site parking spaces required per the zoning code. This policy is especially effective for small parcels where redevelopment may be less viable due to parking requirements. This fee can finance public parking spaces or fund other transportation demand management and multimodal investments that will help to reduce single occupancy vehicle use.
- **Paid and time restricted parking**-Paid and time restricted parking is a management approach to shift behaviors and encourages more walking and biking.

OBJECTIVE M13

Revise the parking minimum standards for different land uses in the city's Municipal Code (21.06.050) to serve as parking maximums for development and/or reduce parking requirements to better align parking with the community's goals.

Revised to read:

The city should explore incentives-based measures, such as updating its Transportation Impact Study guidelines (Chapter 29.08.200 of the Municipal Code) to encourage TDM strategies, into which major developments could opt, specifically to support walking and biking. These could include constructing Active Transportation Corridors, bike facilities, showers, car share, or other support for bike commuters. Incentive-based measures may weigh some TDM measures over others.

Revised to read:

The city's Municipal Code (21.06.050) currently identifies parking minimums for different land uses. Reducing or, in some cases, relieving all parking requirements is a strategy which may better align with the community's goals of mobility and affordability, as well as reduce one of the highest costs associated with new development. Other parking strategies that warrant further study include:

- **Fee-in-lieu** allows a developer the choice to pay a fee into a municipal fund instead of providing on-site parking spaces required per Municipal Code. This policy is especially effective for small parcels where redevelopment may be less viable due to parking requirements. This fee can assist in financing public parking spaces or/and fund other transportation demand management and multimodal investments that will help to reduce single occupancy vehicle use.

Revised to read:

Explore incentives-based Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures, into which major developments could opt, to provide support for walking and biking. These could include constructing Active Transportation Corridors, bike facilities, showers, car share, or other support for bike commuters.

Revised to read:


Revise the parking minimum standards for different land uses to better align with the community's goals; reducing development costs associated with excessive parking to allow for innovations, flexibility, and greater affordability.

Proposed Minor Tweaks to Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan

Chapter 1

Potential Changes

New Wording for proposed changes to the March Final Draft Plan by Planning Commission at their April 6, 2023 workshop



KEY THEMES

of Plan Development

Two themes are important to acknowledge as they served as overarching principles in developing the PBP. These include:

1

An inclusive approach to community engagement.

2

A conscientious effort to address the needs for both people walking and people biking.

Inclusive Community Engagement

The approach to community engagement in developing the PBP recognizes that Grand Junction does not have one voice or one perspective, but is a conglomeration of individuals and families that represent a diverse set of backgrounds, perspectives, and experiences. As such, engagement was conducted in a manner to be inclusive and representative of these diverse perspectives. This was achieved through three distinct strategies:

- Providing a variety of methods for the public to participate including through an online survey, an in-person public open house, via the project website, and interacting with the public at over a dozen in-person community events.
- Conducting nine focus groups with representatives of groups that are directly impacted by the walking and biking environment and can sometimes be difficult to reach through traditional engagement means, such as students (college and K-12), people experiencing homelessness, disabled persons, seniors, and the Spanish speaking community among others.
- Lastly, the PBP was guided by a 17-member Steering Committee selected from a pool of over 70 interested citizens that applied for that role. Selection of the Steering Committee was based on criteria to ensure representation was

geographically diverse, inclusive of different age groups and professions, and representative of vulnerable or underrepresented users, such as individuals with disabilities, youth, low-income populations, and service industry workers.

Altogether, the vision, goals, and recommendations included in the PBP reflect the input received through this broad and inclusive public engagement process.

Both a Pedestrian AND a Bicycle Plan

People walking, rolling, and biking are human-scale, have negligible emissions, and primarily bear the cost burden of travel. Unfortunately, they are also more vulnerable users that are more susceptible to severe injury in a crash and often do not have the option to drive. For those reasons, the PBP was developed to address the needs of all of these users. However, the needs of pedestrians, people with mobility challenges, and bicyclists are also often inherently different and the PBP provides guidance that addresses the unique needs of all active transportation user groups. Please also refer to the definitions section of the plan that defines the various forms of transportation.

Best Practices in Pedestrian & Bicycle Design

The design recommendations included in this plan are based on best practices from local and national resources. A leading resource in urban bicycle design is the National Association of Transportation Officials (NACTO). Other resources for pedestrian and bicycle design include the American Association of State Highway Transportation Officials (AASHTO), the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT).

The following publications were used to inform design guidance in the PBP and will be useful resources for city planners and engineers to consult during implementation:

- NACTO Urban Bikeway Design Guide
- NACTO Don't Give Up at the Intersection: Design All Ages and Abilities Bicycle Crossings
- AASHTO Guide for Development of Bicycle Facilities
- FHWA Guide for Improving Pedestrian Safety at Uncontrolled Intersections
- CDOT Roadway Design Guide: Chapter 14 Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities
- CDOT Pedestrian Crossing Installation Guide

Revise to add new section:

Context Sensitive Design

Context Sensitive Design establishes design elements based on the context and character of the street. The City of Grand Junction has a wide variety of settings, unique landscapes, and environmental conditions. Any facility identified in this plan will need to take into consideration existing conditions and characteristics of the surrounding area to ensure that design is context sensitive. This principle provides and promotes sufficient flexibility to allow application of appropriate roadway elements and dimensions to different situations within the city. Different standards for street cross-sections may be appropriate for a bike or pedestrian facility as it travels through urban, suburban and rural transects, reflecting the different roles of roadway infrastructure among these different transects. Additionally, Context Sensitive Design takes into account existing building encroachments and constraints in right-of-way widths to adjust the facility type where needed.

Notable Updates from the Draft Plan to the Final Plan

- Page 5 - Added reference to growth of LEVs.
- Page 7 – Changed Both a Pedestrian AND a Bicycle Plan subsection to have more inclusive language in related to people with mobility challenges and people walking, rolling, and biking.
- Page 12 - Added sentence to Community Engagement section stressing outreach to non-bikers: “Over 75% of survey respondents reported driving as their primary mode of transportation. Thus, community input reflects the input of both regular bicyclists and non-bicyclists.”
- Page 25 - Added paragraph with information on the Bike Boulevard and what that looks like for connectivity for the network: “Many of the new connections added are on local streets that will be designated as Bike Boulevards (see description of Bike Boulevards below). These connections will provide additional low-stress options for people biking and fill in key gaps in the network.”
- Page 29 - Added paragraph on Planning for Two-Way Traffic: “All bicycle facilities will accommodate both directions of travel. Most on-street facilities will be designed as one-way on each side of the street. Multiuse trails will also be on both sides of the street in most contexts to serve land uses on both sides of the street. Protected bike lanes and raised cycle tracks will also typically be designed as one-way on both sides of the street, but can be also be designed as two-way facilities. In these situations special design considerations will be needed at intersections and driveways, especially at signalized intersections. The NACTO Urban Bikeway Design Guide provides guidance on two-way cycle track design.”
- Page 30 - Highlighted the following statement to call more attention: “Recommendations shown are the minimum facilities needed to create a high-comfort environment for biking, given street characteristics. Facilities with greater separation and protection than the minimum option are desirable and sometimes warranted.”
- Page 31 - Added sentence on who is allowed on trails: “Trails will be designed to serve both pedestrians and bicyclists, including people on electric and non-electric mobility devices and electric bikes that meet city standards and obey the city speed limits.”
- Page 32 - Added sentence clarifying options for parallel routes: “Facilities will generally follow the routes on the Future Bicycle Map, but can also be located along a parallel street (generally within one block) if found to be more feasible during implementation.”
- Page 65 - Added language about importance of lighting within the sidewalk buffer zone.
- Page 67 - Added emphasis in Pedestrian Crossing Guidance section on designing for people with mobility challenges or with visual impairments.
- Page 75 – In the Street Furniture sub-section, added statement: “Along trails, amenities like shade, water fountains, seating, and ADA accessible restrooms support recreation and active transportation.”
- Page 91 - Added sentence explaining how new development could alter priorities: “Priorities may be amended in the future as land uses change and new growth occurs that may increase (or decrease) the priority for new connections.”
- Page 92 - Updated Figure 45 (Order in Which to Prioritize Sidewalk Projects) to make low priority missing sidewalks and high priority sidewalk retrofits equal priority.
- Page 119 - Reframed Local subsection of Funding Opportunities section:
 - Removed mill levy, vehicle registration, utility fees, and language about dedicated sales tax.
 - Added private foundations.
 - Added paragraph: “Community input received during this planning process indicated interest in a dedicated local funding source. Continued community involvement in the budgeting process can support establishment of this source.”
- Page 122 – Added a Glossary section.
- Objectives - Added two new objectives:

- Page 60 - S1: Conduct a signalization feasibility study as a first step to determine what improvements are needed at signalized crossings.
- Page 76 - S4: Conduct a lighting needs assessment for each active transportation corridor as a first step in identifying lighting needs for safety improvements.
- Map Updates:
 - Updated Horizon neighborhood Future Bicycle Network basemap to include Patterson Road.
 - Upgraded 24 Road/Redlands Pkwy project (bridge over US 50) to High Priority pedestrian and bicycle project.
 - Included missing 27 Rd/I70 bridge link in the Active Transportation Corridor Map and Future Bicycle Network Map.
 - Removed conflicting bike lane recommendations along section of G Rd east of 26 Road in the Future Bicycle Network Map.

CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION, COLORADO

ORDINANCE NO. _____

**AN ORDINANCE ADOPTING
THE 2023 PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE PLAN**

**AN ELEMENT OF THE ONE GRAND JUNCTION COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR
THE AREA GENERALLY LOCATED BETWEEN 21 ROAD, J ROAD, 32 ROAD,
AND A SOUTHERLY BOUNDARY OF APPROXIMATELY ONE- QUARTER OF A
MILE NORTH OF THE MESA COUNTY LANDFILL**

**AND APPROVING THE 2023 PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE PLAN AND ORDINANCE
TO BE PUBLISHED IN PAMPHLET FORM**

Recitals

City Staff, a Steering Committee of 17 community representatives, and Fehr and Peers the City's consultant have diligently worked to prepare a Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan (Plan) for the urban growth area of Grand Junction. The Plan was prepared with and through an extensive public engagement process. That process consisted of 20 intercept events throughout the community, a walk audit and bike audit with members of the Steering Committee, nine focus groups, an online survey and an interactive mapping exercise, and three public open houses. Hundreds of people participated in the process.

After nine months of extensive public involvement and deliberation, the City's Urban Trails Committee recommends adoption of the Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan, a plan that identifies strategies, complete streets objectives, and performance measures to guide the planning, funding, and implementation of future active transportation projects, and to encourage increased non-motorized trips across all ages and abilities within the One Grand Junction Comprehensive Plan planning area.

The planning area includes Grand Junction, Redlands, Fruitvale, Pear Park, Orchard Mesa and the Appleton Areas.

The 2023 Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan:

1. Meets criteria 5 of Section 21.02.130(c)(1) of the Zoning and Development Code; and,
2. Develops a community vision with achievable goals; and,
3. When fully implemented it will provide accessibility for all users; and,
4. Prioritizes active transportation corridor segments addressing "missing links" and improves accessibility of underserved neighborhoods; and,
5. Will help guide and facilitate decision-making on future pedestrian and bicycle facility infrastructure needs and projects within the City; and,

6. Incorporates the City's *Complete Streets* policies adopted in the City's *2018 Complete Street Policy* and the implementation strategies of the *2020 One Grand Junction Comprehensive Plan*.
7. Protects, preserves, and creates opportunities to enhance quality of life in Grand Junction.

The Plan amends the Active Transportation Corridor Map in the Grand Junction Circulation Plan (Ordinance 4808) and in the One Grand Junction Comprehensive Plan (Ordinance 4971).

The 2018 Grand Junction Circulation Plan established an Active Transportation Corridor Map that was incorporated into the 2020 One Grand Junction Comprehensive Plan that has also been incorporated into 2023 Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan as a base map for the Bicycle Network of the planning area. The Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan amended the Active Transportation Corridor Map with additional corridor segments being shown for active transportation. So that the Grand Junction Circulation Plan and the One Grand Junction Comprehensive Plan are consistent this ordinance will serve to amend both maps as shown in the Active Transportation Corridor Map as amended.

Furthermore, when adopted the Plan and this Ordinance will functionally repeal and replace the City's *2018 Complete Street Policy* (Resolution 48-18).

The Plan will serve as a guide to public and private transportation infrastructure decisions. The Plan establishes the community's vision for its own future and a road map providing direction to achieve that vision; the Plan is shaped by the community's values, ideals, and aspirations about the management of the community's resources.

In addition to defining the community's view of its future, the Plan describes a vision for the future pedestrian and bicycle network, identifies and prioritizes facility investments that the City will implement over time to create a more comfortable and welcoming place for people of all ages and abilities to walk, roll, and bike.

The Plan implements the *2020 One Grand Junction Comprehensive Plan*, specifically the following Plan Principles, goals, and policies:

Plan Principle 6: Efficient and Connected Transportation

Goal 1: Continue to develop a safe, balanced, and well-connected transportation system that enhances mobility for all modes.

- o Strategy a. Balanced Modes. Consider and strive to balance the safety and needs of all transportation modes-driving, bicycling, walking, and taking transit-in day to-day planning, development review, and decision making by the city.
- o Strategy c. Circulation Plan. Maintain and regularly update the City's circulation Plan. The proposed Active Transportation Corridor Map will replace the same map found in the Circulation Plan (Ordinance 4808).
- o Strategy d. Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan. Develop and implement a Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan.
- o Strategy f. Complete Streets. The Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan incorporates

the policies established in the 2018 Complete Street Policy (Resolution 48-18) and replaces that policy.

Goal 4: Encourage the use of transit, bicycling, walking and other forms of transportation.

The Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan will be heard by Planning Commission prior to final reading of this ordinance by City Council. Their recommendation will be forwarded to City Council and be made a part of the record that City Council will consider.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GRAND JUNCTION THAT:

That the City's 2023 Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan, in the form of the document attached hereto, is hereby adopted.

Be it further ordained that the 2023 Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan will serve to amend the Active Transportation Corridor Map in the Grand Junction Circulation Plan as adopted by Ordinance 4808 and the same map found in the One Grand Junction Comprehensive Plan adopted by Ordinance 4971.

With this Ordinance and the adoption of it and the 2023 Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan the City Council does repeal and replace the City's 2018 Complete Street Policy as adopted by Resolution 48-18.

The full text of this Ordinance, including the full text together with all maps, charts and graphs contained therein of the 2023 Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan, in accordance with paragraph 51 of the Charter of the City of Grand Junction, shall be published in pamphlet form with notice published in accordance with the Charter.

INTRODUCED on first reading the 5th day of April, 2023 and ordered published in pamphlet form.

ADOPTED on second reading the ___ day of April, 2023 and ordered published in pamphlet form.

ATTEST:

Anna M. Stout
President of the City Council

Amy Phillips
City Clerk



Grand Junction Planning Commission

Regular Session

Item #5.

Meeting Date: April 25, 2023
Presented By: Nicole Galehouse, Principal Planner
Department: Community Development
Submitted By: Nicole Galehouse, Principal Planner

Information

SUBJECT:

Consider a request by the City of Grand Junction to Amend Title 21 of the Grand Junction Municipal Code to regulate cannabis product manufacturing facilities by providing use-specific standards, specific location requirements, and definitions.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the request.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Referred measures 2A and 2B were passed on April 6, 2021, in the municipal election, providing the Council with an opportunity to consider establishing tax rates and regulations for cannabis businesses. Since that time, City Council and staff have focused on regulation and licensing of retail and co-located retail and medical cannabis businesses. As that process comes to a close, the City is now interested in evaluating the regulation of extraction and/or processing of cannabis.

BACKGROUND OR DETAILED INFORMATION:

BACKGROUND

Cannabis Manufacturing Businesses

Cannabis Manufacturing Businesses manufacture cannabis products intended for consumption in concentrated form for smoking, or for consumption other than by smoking, such as edible products, ointments, and tinctures, and are required to have both a state license and a local license to be a "Product Manufacturer." These businesses may vary widely in terms of their products and processes and may include hazardous uses which in Grand Junction currently requires a Conditional Use Permit. Medical product manufacturers may transact only with medical cannabis cultivation and sales licenses, and likewise for retail. These businesses may generate jobs for their processing and packaging activities, depending on the type of product manufactured,

scale of operation, and the degree of automation. There is no sales or excise tax on manufactured products (excise tax is to be collected on the first sale or transfer of unprocessed retail marijuana by a retail cultivation facility within the City).

This ordinance amends Title 21, including Chapter 4 and Chapter 10, and includes proposed changes to the use table, location specific limitations and definitions. As a component of licensure, as well as a process pertinent to any business operation in the City, land use and its related impacts (e.g. noise, odor, traffic, etc) is a primary consideration related to cannabis Cannabis Manufacturing Businesses. Unlike retail cannabis businesses, Cannabis Manufacturing Businesses are primarily industrial in function. When discussed with the Planning Commission at a series of five workshops from January 21, 2021 to February 18, 2021, recommendations for regulating this land use reflect that distinction. Previous workshops led the Planning Commission to recommend such businesses be limited to areas where general manufacturing and food product manufacturing are allowed, depending on the nature of the specific business, to include I-O (Industrial – Office), I-1 (Light Industrial), I-2 (General Industrial), and C-2 (General Commercial) zone districts. Though the current code requires hazardous uses (H Occupancy) per Fire Code to seek a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to operate in I-O, I-1, and I-2 zone districts, this requirement has been removed in the current draft of the Zoning and Development Code. In the interim, the proposed regulations exclude Cannabis Manufacturing Businesses from having to obtain a CUP.

After further consideration and research, staff recommends further refinement to the areas in which some Cannabis Manufacturing Businesses are allowed. Within the broader use category, there are two distinct types of operation – those who extract and process raw material and those who produce a cannabis-infused product. The extraction and processing of raw material presents greater risk factors due largely to the use of volatile materials as well as nuisance issues such as odor. Because of the difference in potential risk and impact, staff recommends dividing the use with the following definitions:

Cannabis manufacturer shall mean a business licensed as a Product Manufacturer to purchase cannabis; manufacture, prepare, and package cannabis products; and wholesale cannabis and cannabis products to other licensed cannabis businesses for wholesale. Extraction of cannabis is permitted in this use category.

Cannabis Manufacturing Business is a Cannabis Manufacturer or a Post-Extraction Cannabis Processor.

Extraction shall mean the process of separating and concentrating desired constituents from plant material via solvent or mechanical based methodologies. This includes, but is not limited to, hydrocarbon, CO2, alcohol/ethanol, agitation, heat and pressure, ice water, bee-assisted, and conversion methods.

Post-extraction cannabis processor shall mean a business licensed as a Product Manufacturer that utilizes cannabis previously extracted and/or manufactured off-site to infuse into products, prepare, and package products intended for wholesale. No on-site extraction is permitted in this use category.

The zone districts originally recommended by the Planning Commission remain consistent with zone districts contemplated to allow Cannabis Manufacturers; however, staff recommends that certain areas of the City that have these zone districts are removed from allowing this use due to potential safety and nuisance issues. The general areas proposed to be removed include the Greater

Downtown area (Rail District), areas in the vicinity of the Dos Rios and Las Colonias Improvement Districts, and specific areas that are nearby or adjacent to residential development and/or residential land use areas. This will be accomplished with a zoning overlay; the proposed zoning overlay boundaries are shown in the attached map. This approach would streamline verification of allowable sites for the use.

The Post-Extraction Cannabis Processors, as defined above, does not have the same concerns regarding hazardous materials. As such, staff recommends defining a separate Use Category for businesses that exclusively infuse instead of extract. The use is proposed to be allowed in all zone districts previously recommended by the Planning Commission and adds the C-1 (Light Commercial), B-1 (Neighborhood Business), B-2 (Downtown Business), M-U (Mixed-Use), and BP (Business Park Mixed Use) zone districts.

		Key: A = Allowed; C = Conditional; Blank Cell = Not Permitted																						
USE CATEGORY	PRINCIPAL USE	R R	R E	R 1	R 2	R 4	R 5	R 8	R 1 2	R 1 8	R 2 4	R O	B 1	B 2	C 1	C 2	C S R	M U	B P	L O	L 1	L 2	M X	
Manufacturing and Production – firms involved in the processing, fabrication, packaging, or assembly of goods	<u>Cannabis Manufacturer</u>																A				A	A	A	
	<u>Post-Extraction Cannabis Processor</u>															A	A	A		A	A	A	A	A

*Subject to the zone district being located within the adopted zoning overlay.

In addition to the overlay and amendments to the zone district, the ordinance also proposes a limitation for Cannabis Manufacturers which requires the use to be in a standalone building. While the application of fire codes is highly effective in mitigating any danger, the volatility of the substances in use creates enough cause for concern that this additional standard is recommended to protect adjacent businesses.

ANALYSIS

In accordance with Section 21.02.140(c), a proposed Code amendment shall address in writing the reasons for the proposed amendment. There are no specific criteria for review because a code amendment is a legislative act and within the discretion of the City Council to amend the Code with a recommendation from the Planning Commission. Reasons for the proposed amendments are provided in the Background section of this report.

NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

Notice was completed as required by Section 21.02.080(g). Notice of the public hearing was published on April 2, 2023 in the Grand Junction Daily Sentinel.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION AND FINDINGS OF FACT

After reviewing the ZCA-2023-200, a request to amend Title 21 of the Grand Junction Municipal Code to regulate cannabis manufacturing businesses by providing use-specific standards, the following findings of fact have been made:

1. The proposed amendments to the Zoning and Development Code are useful in that they ensure the health, safety, and general welfare of the public, and refine

processes that assist in the logical and orderly development of the city as described in the background information of this report.

2. The proposed amendments to the Zoning and Development Code support the following goals of the Comprehensive Plan:
 - a. Planning Principle 2: Resilient and Diverse Economy – 1 Foster a vibrant, diverse, and resilient economy.
 - i. 1(a) – Economic Diversity: Support the further diversification of the economy that is prepared to anticipate, innovate, and proactively respond to cyclical economic fluctuations and evolution.
 - ii. 3(a) - Modern Manufacturing and Technology Hub - Support the continued growth of the city's manufacturing and technology industries and leverage the region's assets to broaden the economic base through the attraction of manufacturing and technology employers.

Therefore, staff recommends approval of this request.

SUGGESTED MOTION:

Planning Commission Chair, on the Zoning and Development Code Amendments, ZCA-2023-200, I move that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of approval with the findings of fact as listed in the staff report.

Attachments

1. ORD-ZDC CPM 04.20.23 CLEAN

40 business, or hold itself out as a marijuana facility, business, or operation of any sort in the
41 City limits. Later that same year, City Council adopted Ordinance 4599 which prohibited
42 the operation of marijuana cultivation facilities, marijuana product manufacturing facilities,
43 marijuana testing facilities, and retail marijuana stores. Ordinance 4599 also amended
44 Sections in Title 5, Article 15 of the GJMC that prohibit certain uses relating to marijuana.

45 In late 2015, the City, Mesa County and Colorado Mesa University, by and through the
46 efforts of the Grand Junction Economic Partnership (GJEP), were successful in
47 establishing the *Colorado Jumpstart* business development program. One business
48 which was awarded the first *Jumpstart* incentive planned to develop a laboratory and
49 deploy its advanced analytical processes for genetic research and its ability to mark/trace
50 chemical properties of agricultural products, one of which was cannabis. In October 2016,
51 City Council passed Ordinance 4722 which amended Ordinance 4599 and Section
52 21.04.010 of the GJMC to allow marijuana testing facilities in the City.

53 On January 20, 2021, the City Council approved Resolution 09-21, the adoption of which
54 referred a ballot question to the regular municipal election on April 6, 2021 to repeal
55 Referred Measure A contingent on and subject to voter approval of taxation of marijuana
56 businesses. A majority of the votes cast at the election were in favor of repealing the
57 moratorium on marijuana businesses and in favor of taxation of cannabis businesses.

58 City Council has decided to allow certain regulated cannabis businesses within the City.
59 On April 6, 2022, the City Council approved Ordinance No. 5064, the adoption of which
60 included certain cannabis use licenses and regulations in the GJMC. On May 4, 2022,
61 the City Council adopted Ordinance No. 5070 related to cannabis business licensing land
62 use regulations, including use standards, buffering, and signage requirements.

63 City staff and community members, including the Cannabis Working Group, have
64 researched, reviewed, and discussed various approaches to manufacturing of cannabis
65 products within the City. Regulations have been established at the state level with the
66 adoption and implementation of the Colorado Marijuana Code in the Colorado Revised
67 Statutes (C.R.S. 44-10-101, *et. seq.*); however, regulation of regulated marijuana uses at
68 the state level alone are inadequate to address the impacts on the City of regulated
69 cannabis, making it appropriate for the City to regulate the impacts of regulated cannabis
70 uses.

71 The City has a valid interest in regulating zoning and other impacts of cannabis
72 businesses in a manner that is consistent with constitutional and statutory standards. The
73 City Council desires to facilitate the provision of quality regulated cannabis in a safe
74 manner while protecting existing uses within the City. Regulation of the manner of
75 operation and location of regulated cannabis uses is necessary to protect the health,
76 safety and welfare of both the public and the customers. The proposed ordinance is
77 intended to allow manufacturing of cannabis products that will have a minimal impact and
78 where potential negative impacts are minimized.

79 This proposed ordinance amends the City's Code to permit cannabis manufacturers in
 80 the specific zone districts where like uses are permitted through an overlay informed by
 81 specific land uses including, certain schools and specific rehabilitation facilities, as well
 82 as residential districts. Post-extraction cannabis businesses are proposed to be permitted
 83 in line with commercial uses. This ordinance also includes definitions for cannabis
 84 manufacturing businesses.

85 After public notice and public hearing as required by the Grand Junction Zoning and
 86 Development Code, the Grand Junction Planning Commission recommended approval
 87 of the proposed amendments.

88 After public notice and public hearing, the Grand Junction City Council finds that the
 89 amendments to allow cannabis manufacturing businesses by and through the uses and
 90 the Use Table, are responsive to the community's desires and otherwise advance and
 91 protect the public health, safety and welfare of the City and its residents.

92 **NOW THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF**
 93 **GRAND JUNCTION THAT THE FOLLOWING SECTIONS OF THE GRAND JUNCTION**
 94 **MUNICIPAL CODE INCLUDING TITLE 21: ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT CODE ARE**
 95 **AMENDED AS FOLLOWS (new text additions underlined and deletions marked with**
 96 **strike-through notations):**

97 21.04.010 Use Table.

Key: A = Allowed, C = Conditional, Blank Cell = Not Permitted																								
Use Category	Principal Use	R-R	R-E	R-1	R-2	R-4	R-5	R-8	R-12	R-16	R-24	R-O	B-1	B-2	C-1	C-2	CSR	M-U	BP	I-O	I-1	I-2	M X-	Std.
Manufacturing and Production – firms involved in the processing, fabrication, packaging, or assembly of goods	<u>Cannabis Manufacturer</u>															A*				A*	A*	A*		
Retail Sales and Service	<u>Post-Extraction Cannabis Processor</u>													Δ	Δ	Δ		Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	Δ	

98 *Subject to the zone district being located within the adopted zoning overlay.

99

100 21.04.030 Use-specific standards.

101

102 (x) Cannabis Product Manufacturing Facilities.

103

104 (1) Applicability. These regulations apply to all Cannabis Manufacturing
 105 Businesses in the City in addition to the other provisions in the GJMC pertaining

106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124

to cannabis businesses, including but not limited to, GJMC Chapters 5.10, 5.13, and 5.15.

(2) Zoning.

(i) A Conditional Use Permit, if required by another provision in this Code, is not required for a Cannabis Manufacturing Business.

(ii) Overlay established.

(A) The purpose of the Cannabis Manufacturer Overlay is to provide appropriate locations for extraction and processing of cannabis to occur within City limits while considering proximity to schools, rehabilitation facilities, and residential land uses.

(B) The Cannabis Manufacturer Overlay includes properties within the General Commercial (C-2) and Industrial (I-O, I-1, and I-2) zone districts as identified on the maps below.

125
126



Figure 1 - Cannabis Manufacturer Overlay, Horizon Drive Area

127
128




Figure 2 - Cannabis Manufacturer Overlay, Northwest Area




Figure 3 - Cannabis Manufacturer Overlay, Pear Park Area

129
130

131
132
133

(iii) Cannabis Manufacturers shall only be located in standalone buildings.

134 21.10.020 Terms defined.

135

136 Cannabis manufacturer shall mean a business licensed as a Product Manufacturer to
 137 purchase cannabis; manufacture, prepare, and package cannabis products; and
 138 wholesale cannabis and cannabis products to other licensed cannabis businesses for
 139 wholesale. Extraction of cannabis is permitted in this use category.

140

141 Cannabis Manufacturing Business is a Cannabis Manufacturer or a Post-Extraction
 142 Cannabis Processor.

143

144 Extraction shall mean the process of separating and concentrating desired constituents
 145 from plant material via solvent or mechanical based methodologies. This includes, but is

146 not limited to, hydrocarbon, CO2, alcohol/ethanol, agitation, heat and pressure, ice water,
147 bee-assisted, and conversion methods.

148
149 Post-extraction cannabis processor shall mean a business licensed as a Product
150 Manufacturer that utilizes cannabis previously extracted and/or manufactured off-site to
151 infuse into products, prepare, and package products intended for wholesale. No on-site
152 extraction is permitted in this use category.

153
154 All other provisions of Title 21 Chapter 4 and Chapter 10 shall remain in full force and
155 effect.

156
157 Introduced on first reading the _____ day of _____,
158 2023 and ordered published in pamphlet form.

159
160 Adopted on second reading this ____ day of _____ 2023 and ordered published in
161 pamphlet form.

162
163
164
165

166 ATTEST:

167
168

169

170 _____
171 Amy Phillips
172 City Clerk

172

Anna Stout
President of City Council