

MINUTES
OPEN SPACE AND TRAILS BOARD
CITY OF ASPEN PARKS AND OPEN SPACE BOARD
JOINT REGULAR SESSION
February 24, 2022
530 East Main Street
Aspen CO, 81611

OSTB Present:

Graeme Means Dist. 1	Howie Mallory Dist. 2	Amy Barrow Dist. 3	Michael Kinsley Dist. 4, Chair	Wayne Ives Dist. 5
-------------------------	--------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------

Staff Present: Gary Tennenbaum, Jessie Young, Liza Mitchell, Carly Klein Janet Urquhart, Kim Arensdorf, Janet Urquhart, Ted O'Brien, Dale Will, Ryan Quinn, David Pesnichak, Richard Neiley

City of Aspen Open Space Board: Adam McCurdy, Julie Hardman, Dan Perl, Ted Mahon

City of Aspen Staff: John Spiess, Matt Kuhn, Mike Tuute, Brian Long, Micah Samuelson

Others Present: Mark Frymoyer, Marijean Frymoyer, Ashley Cline, Tom Todd, Sam Guarino, Patty Watson

Media Present: Jason Auslander, Meredith Carrol – The Aspen Times

Michael Kinsley called the meeting to order at 4:40 p.m.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment.

Brush Creek Park and Ride (BCPR) to Aspen Airport Business Center (AABC) Trail Feasibility Study

Introduction: Gary Tennenbaum, Jessie Young, Matt Kuhn & John Spiess:

The purpose of the project is to evaluate the feasibility of a trail connection between BCPR and the AABC, and to determine a preferred alignment. Pitkin County OST, the City of Aspen and the Elected Officials Transportation Committee (EOTC) have jointly funded the feasibility study and have contracted with SGM to produce a report with the trail options and costs. The goal of the project would be to reduce vehicle trips and replace them with pedestrian, bicycle, and/or public transit trips per Pitkin County's Climate Action Plan.

Tennenbaum explained that the meeting goals are to:

- Recommendations for further analysis on:
 - Moving forward with the public process
 - Considering fund strategies
 - Phased project approach

02/24/2022

Page 1 of 5

- Seek a motion of recommendation to EOTC

Michael Kinsley asked if the most appropriate route for a trail would go via the AABC versus via the Rio Grande Trail, and whether it would be a viable commuter link trail. Tennenbaum said that the commuter viability question needs to be answered through the public process. He commented that there is a phased project approach to the bridge trail option, whereas only one bridge could be built, which would skip a portion of the AABC and the trail would connect into Aspen via Cemetery Lane.

Adam McCurdy asked if the public process would include down valley constituents represented by EOTC, as this would be a potential commuting trail for the public coming up valley. Tennenbaum stated that down valley constituents need to be included in the conversation for the public process. First staff needed to determine if there are feasible trail options, and then determine whether it is a viable commuter link from the public, he said.

Howie Mallory commented that the arrival of ebikes has altered the discussion from the previous 2014 Rio Grande Trail Management Plan.

Dan Perl asked for clarification on the jurisdictional responsibilities for this project process. Matt Kuhn explained that the City of Aspen, Pitkin County and EOTC have been equal partners for the feasibility study, however down the road it will need to be determined who will be responsible for maintaining the trail if it is built.

SGM Representatives Ashely Cline, Mark Frymoyer, & Marijean Frymoyer:
SGM designed two trail alignment options:

- Option 1 Twin Bridges Alignment: The first bridge connects the BCPR to the RGT, which increases connectivity from Snowmass Village, Brush Creek and W/J Ranch. The second bridge connects the RGT to the AABC, with both bridges crossing the Roaring Fork River.
 - 13 minute commute via pedal bike (12 miles per hour).
 - Bridge design options include steel deck arch, steel deck truss, and prefab multi-span steel truss bridge. It was determined that the steel deck arch, (Tiehack Bridge design), was determined to be the best fit due to efficiency, aesthetics, and environmental impacts.
- Option 2 SH82 East Alignment: structures would mimic Highway 82.
 - 11 Minutes estimated commute via pedal bike (12 miles per hour)
 - 2.28 Miles of new trail construction.
 - 2,400 Linear Feet of bridge, and elevated walkway structure.
 - Geological hazards exist along the entire corridor.
 - Difficult terrain through the shale bluffs, steep slopes would require retaining walls.
- Both options would connect with the AABC trail into Aspen.

Marijean Frymoyer provided Option 1 and Option 2 alignment graphs which depicts difficulty level per linear feet of trail. This showed that Option 2 would be less difficult to construct.

Project design and construction cost show that Option 1 would cost approximately \$20m – \$21.7m, Option 2 would cost approximately \$26.4m - \$28.7m.

Cline explained that the evaluation criteria for the project should include cost, maintenance, user experience, constructability, and environmental impacts. Based on the study it shows that Option 1 Twin Bridge Alignment most effectively meets the project criteria. Additionally it is more technically feasible, creates a better user experience, has lower construction risks, least environmental impacts, and is the most cost efficient.

Graeme Means recommended studying the commuting aspect of the trail by determining the commuting benefits vs the cost. Mallory noted that a study would need to figure out how many people will use the trail to commute as well as how much it will be utilized recreationally.

Kinsley commented that he would not support a \$20m purchase if the trail only benefits recreation and not commuting.

Amy Barrow commented that Option 1 provides a great connection and offers two options into town. She asked about the Nordic skiing/plowing for the proposed and existing trail. Tennenbaum stated that there would be plowed Nordic on the soft surface portions of the trail and groomed on the paved portions, which is how it operated on the Rio Grande Trail.

Means suggested dropping Option 2 from the proposed plan. Perl stated that it may be beneficial to keep in both options to show the cost savings and environmental benefits to the public.

McCurdy noted that if the trail is focused on commuting, it wouldn't show benefits in the winter. Mallory suggested surveying the public based on seasons. Perl stated that the trail would assist with commuting in the summer, spring and fall. He stated that residents of the AABC & Burlingame would benefit going down valley as well.

Tennenbaum stated that comments from this meeting will be included in the letter to EOTC.

Maroon Creek Multiple-Use Trail

John Spiess provided an activity map that shows a significant rise in trail users in the Maroon Creek Valley. There are safety concerns around the Aspen School campus, and the need to pursue an alternate trail which would go around the campus, he said.

Spiess commented that the study area is separated into four segments:

1. Aspen Chapel to Alberta Moore Drive (Moore Open Space - Pitkin County)
2. Alberta Moore Drive to Aspen Recreation Center (ARC) service entrance
3. ARC service entrance to Aspen Recreation Center bus stop
4. ARC bus stop to Iselin Tennis Courts

Spiess stated that the goal of the trail aims to create a safe year-round connection between the Highway 82 roundabout, the ARC, and the greater Maroon Creek Valley.

Spiess stated that the City of Aspen has chosen OTAK to work on the project due to their proposal and local experience. He stated that currently contracted is Phase 1 which includes trail layout alternatives, option of probable cost, and community outreach. Phase 2 would take place August 2022 – January 2023 and would include design development and construction documents. Phase 3, trail construction, would take place the summer of 2023.

Spiess explained that The Moore Open Space Management Plan that was adopted in 2019 acknowledged the potential for future trail alignment adjacent to and potentially within the Moore Open Space (Segment 1: Aspen Chapel to Alberta Moore Drive).

Spiess stated that the goal for the meeting is to achieve support to continue working with Pitkin County Staff on alignments that may cross into the Moore Open Space. Additionally, a discussion of values related to the evaluation of trail alignments.

Spiess provided the trail characteristics and design:

- Surfacing: Paved surface that will be cleared of snow in the winter.
- Width: The trail will be a minimum of 10 ft wide to accommodate a variety of users.
- Grade: The trail will meet ADA accessible guidelines, including a maximum 5% grade where practical.
- Separation from Road: Provide safety and comfort for all user groups by providing separation from Maroon Creek Roadway
- Minimize Impacts: Prioritize alignments that have the smallest impact on the existing conditions.
- Winter Maintenance Considerations: Trails that are continuous with road surface or directly adjacent to plowed surfaces are very difficult to maintain and should be avoided where possible.

Dan Perl asked if the trail could potentially move further into Moore Open Space. He noted that the multi-use components of this trail is essential. Tennenbaum stated that staff does have wildlife concerns. He explained that staff will study further and bring back to the Boards.

The OSTB supported the City of Aspen to move forward with the trail project.

ADJOURN

The OSTB meeting of February 24, 2022 adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

Approved:

Michael Kinsley

Michael Kinsley, Chair
Pitkin County Open Space & Trails Board

Attest:

Kim Arensdorf

Kimberly Arensdorf
Pitkin County Open Space & Trails
Administrative Specialist

02/24/2022

Page 4 of 5

2022.02.24 OSTB_COA Regular Minutes_Aproved

Final Audit Report

2022-04-09

Created:	2022-04-08
By:	Kim Arensdorf (kim.Arensdorf@pitkincounty.com)
Status:	Signed
Transaction ID:	CBJCHBCAABAA4VyRKJkSeJxOaHcw4SatuvGVj2ppvfxr

"2022.02.24 OSTB_COA Regular Minutes_Aproved" History

-  Document created by Kim Arensdorf (kim.Arensdorf@pitkincounty.com)
2022-04-08 - 7:59:39 PM GMT
-  Document emailed to Michael Kinsley (michaeljkinsley@gmail.com) for signature
2022-04-08 - 8:00:03 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by Michael Kinsley (michaeljkinsley@gmail.com)
2022-04-09 - 0:52:50 AM GMT
-  Document e-signed by Michael Kinsley (michaeljkinsley@gmail.com)
Signature Date: 2022-04-09 - 4:41:56 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 69.170.193.113
-  Agreement completed.
2022-04-09 - 4:41:56 PM GMT