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**Participation:** Approximately 40 citizens participated in this workshop. The workshop included sessions on three topics (groupings of potential options) followed by a larger group discussion and reporting of recommendations from the smaller breakout sessions. Overall, the participants reached general consensus on several of the potential options, recognizing that feasibility and funding will need to be considered. They also had general consensus that any option that will slow traffic speeds through the campus and around the adjacent neighborhood streets would improve safety of drivers and pedestrians.

**Welcome/Reviews**

- Lisa Bachman opened the meeting by welcoming participants and reviewing the format for the interactive workshop, which will include three breakout sessions.
- Each group will identify an individual to serve as a scribe and spokesperson for the group, capturing and reporting on the general thoughts and consensus of the group discussions.
- Each of the breakout groups will move to one of the classrooms upstairs to participate in a discussion focused on three areas:
  - Grade Separated: bridge/tunnel options: technical facilitation by Tim Seibert, N.E.S., Inc.
  - System-wide transportation options: technical facilitation by Kathleen Krager, City Transportation Manager and Todd Frisbie, FHU Engineering
  - Traffic calming options: technical facilitation by Tim Roberts, City Traffic Engineering
- After 25-minutes, groups will move to the next classroom until each group has discussed all three topics.
- Once each group has discussed each topic, the group will reassemble in the Great Hall to present their thoughts and recommendations.

**Group Presentations**

**Group A Spokesperson: Rick Villa**

**Grade Separated: bridge/tunnel options**

- The group did not like the bridge option.
- The structure’s aesthetics, costs, and practicality were all negatives.
- However, the group did indicate that bridges at the University of Pennsylvania and the Chicago Museum were nicely designed.
- The tunnel option was also poorly received and not recommended due to cost, practicality and safety concerns.

**System-wide transportation options**

- It was difficult to gauge group’s overall perception. There was not much consensus on any particular option.
• He reported that the group generally liked the option of reducing Cascade to one lane in each direction.
• There was support for a pedestrian stop light at Tejon and Uintah.
• Road dieting was favorably received by the group on all of the streets surrounding the campus as well as out to Weber St., Wahsatch Ave. and Fontanero St. Need to add Cascade north of Uintah.
• There also was support for accommodating bicycles and increasing the number of bike lanes.

Traffic calming options
• There was consensus for road narrowing and bump outs to decrease speeds.
• Some concerns were expressed that pedestrian bump could become obstacles during winter weather; they may create a false sense of security for pedestrians; and, they would require the appropriate vegetation to remain attractive and functional.
• Improved lighting was favorably received; however, lampposts styles should be more conducive to the historic aspect of the neighborhood.
• There was support for adding “State Law” signs to help protect pedestrians.
• The group also supports using diagonal crossings in crosswalks to enhance pedestrian safety.

Group B Spokesperson: Garrett Benish

Grade Separated: bridge/tunnel options
• The group didn’t favor any of the options.
• They think structures will create barriers between the community and the college and are too expensive.
• The students wouldn’t use a bridge or a tunnel and both go against the culture in Colorado Springs.
• They said the pedestrian/vehicle accident figures are much too low to consider a bridge or tunnel.
• Given that the accident data from the last 12 years presented in the handouts indicates more auto-to-auto accidents, the system-wide transportation options being proposed will address those issues better than a bridge or tunnel.

System-wide transportation options
• The group’s overall preferences are anything that will change the culture for lower speeds through the campus and the surrounding streets.
• The group liked the options presented and prefers narrowing lane widths on Nevada Ave. all the way north to Penrose Hospital to change the culture of the road.
• On Fontanero St., they would like to see changes made to improve turning; changed from 4 to 3 lanes.
• On Weber, they would like to improve parking at Steele Elementary by adding diagonal parking.
• The group agreed that removing crosswalks on Cascade Ave. (on campus) would improve safety and mobility. There is a concern about jaywalking at the Tuff Library

Traffic calming options
• The group would like to see additional bike lanes and diagonal crosswalks to improve pedestrian safety.
• For median parking, they prefer diagonal and parallel parking
• They prefer back-in diagonal parking on Cache La Poudre to improve safety. But, they realize it will be difficult to implement because it represents a drastic cultural change.

Group C Spokesperson: Bart Weinberger

Grade Separated: bridge/tunnel options
• Costs seem prohibitive and the structures are not aesthetically pleasing.
• They also oppose the loss of trees necessary to build bridges or tunnels.
• If the bridge option were to be considered, the design would have to be more aesthetically pleasing.
System-wide transportation options
- Overall priorities of the group were anything that integrates Colorado College as part of the community and to slow traffic speeds system-wide.
- The group wanted to clarify where the transition of lane narrowing would occur approaching the college.
- They suggested that traffic would slow by taking steps on Cascade and Nevada avenues.
- The group likes the community, system-wide approach of the study noting concerns that if traffic on one street were slowed too much, it might shift traffic to other streets in the system. However, they recognize the city traffic engineer’s point that there is ample remaining capacity on the all the surrounding roads.

Traffic calming options
- There was overall group consensus that the priority should be neighborhood safety and slowing traffic.
- They prefer narrowing roads to slow traffic, preferably by using bump-outs.
- They do not like the idea of speed bumps on arterials because they impede emergency vehicles.
- They also want to ensure crosswalks are well lighted and brightly painted to remain visible.

Questions asked during the large group discussion and presentation of recommendation:

Q: What would narrowing Nevada Ave. do to emergency responses?
A: The city traffic engineer responded that one-lane streets normally have enough room on the right side for vehicles to yield.

Overall Comment: There seems to be general consensus that the bridge/ramp option over Cascade is not desirable due to aesthetics and cost. There also seems to be general consensus that a tunnel under Cascade is not desirable due to safety issues.

Sarah Velez: Aesthetics are a major concern, but personal safety is also a major consideration when discussing a tunnel.

Mark Huismann: Would like to see Nevada Ave. narrowed from Penrose Hospital to Platte Ave.

Comment: 15-20 cars seem to always park on Cascade north of the college, immediately north of Uintah. Approximately 20 years ago the college committed to police the parking situation on Cascade, but that hasn’t been successful or adequately done. ONEN negotiated that with the college so the college should be held accountable to continue to do that.

Kathleen Krager: I’m working on a parking study for the Craigmoor neighborhood, which is close to the UCCS campus. A parking permit program for residents may be implemented there, and the concept could be expanded to other neighborhoods, if it’s successful. She encouraged citizens to track that study for possible consideration around the Colorado College campus.

Next steps:
The technical team will work with the city and Colorado College to establish a timeline going forward. The technical team will draft a plan that will be shared with the city to review for costs, feasibility and technical acceptance. The plan will incorporate a vision based on what the team has heard from the working group and the public. The plan will include a traffic analysis of the system to establish existing and future traffic volumes. The working group and the public will have a chance to review the draft plan once it’s posted to the project website and at the next public meeting.

The next public meeting will be in April or May, following Spring Break.