

1 **Chapter 8 Transportation**
2

3 (January 2009)

4 **Strategic Objectives**

5 The Town of Snowmass Village supports continued improvements to an integrated
6 mobility system that minimizes vehicle traffic, increases pedestrian options, and links
7 land use and urban form with sustainable transportation. The goal is a transportation
8 system that serves residents, guests, employees, and visitors quickly and effectively with
9 minimum impacts on the quality of life.

10
11 The Town of Snowmass Village shall be served by convenient, effective, and attractive
12 transit service between local commercial and residential nodes and work with the Roaring
13 Fork Transportation Authority (RFTA) to improve transit services throughout the greater
14 Roaring Fork Valley. A major objective for the community will be to minimize increases
15 in single-occupant vehicle (SOV) use and to increase the use of transit, pedestrian, and
16 other non-SOV modes of travel in the town. Sustainable land use, urban design, and
17 employee housing strategies that create vibrant, mixed-use nodes that encourage walking
18 and transit use are design elements for achieving these goals.

19
20 **Background**

21 Traffic is the significant carrying capacity limit to the town’s growth and continued
22 success. Recognizing that approved development will push traffic up to or beyond
23 maximum desirable levels, future developers must address traffic in their land use
24 decisions to not increase current levels. These are transportation issues we face today and
25 into the near future:

- 26
27 ▪ Local roadways will exceed previously established level of service (LOS)
28 thresholds during peak periods while congestion exists on Highway 82 for even
29 longer periods
30 ▪ The current local and regional transit systems are approaching peak period
31 capacity
32 ▪ Remote parking lots are at or exceed capacity during peak days of peak season
33 ▪ More designated pedestrian commuting means and walkways are needed
34 (topography and other constraints aside) along with grade-separated crossings
35 when feasible
36

37 **Existing Conditions and Guiding Principles**

38 *(Note: A 12-page document addresses these areas in greater depth with accompanying*
39 *charts, graphs, statistics, and research findings. It can be found in the Chapter 8*
40 *Appendix. The following is a synopsis of the Existing Conditions and Areas of*
41 *Significance information.)*

42
43 ***Measurement of “Person Trips”***

1 Create a useful tool to measure and understand the ramifications of (re)development on
2 the transportation system. It is important to understand the future impacts of
3 (re)development on all the various modes of travel. Modeling of person trips will not
4 replace the LOS measurements of traffic volume, but would incorporate LOS standards
5 for the other modes of transportation as well. We are approaching critical mass in the
6 three current key transportation areas: parking, traffic, and mass transit. It is becoming
7 difficult to make changes in one area without having a negative impact on another. For
8 example, it is possible to say that no employees of a (re)development will be parking in
9 the Village. This would have a favorable impact on traffic volume, but it could have a
10 negative impact on parking in another location and add to the demand for transit services.
11 It is important to know that adequate capacity and funding exists to accommodate and
12 support the (re)development. It is necessary to develop review standards and mitigation
13 measures that will be reasonable, consistent, and applicable.

14 ***Traffic Volume***

15 In the review of Base Village it was stated that the “cumulative total of future projected
16 traffic, including the Base Village and other outparcel’s traffic projections at full
17 buildout, indicate that one-way peak-hour volumes along Brush Creek Road are projected
18 to exceed the Town’s established limits.” It was projected that the cap of 925 one-way
19 trips would be exceeded roughly 15–20 times, at approximately 1,145 one-way trips. This
20 would be considered LOS D. LOS D is described as being congested to the point of
21 approaching gridlock. It is important to note that this is projected to occur between 15
22 and 20 times in the peak season. The Transportation Plan recommends the community
23 continue to apply Transportation Demand Management (TDM) and alternatives to strive
24 to preserve the LOS C standard of 925 into the future. Alternatives that are realistic and
25 financially sustainable will need to be developed to achieve this goal. It is recommended
26 to continually monitor the traffic volume on Brush Creek Road and any other locations
27 deemed appropriate.

28 ***Parking Inventory and Distribution***

29 The Base Village land use application and Entryway projects have changed the parking
30 inventory in the Village. Development upon the base area lots A-C will result in a
31 parking structure containing public parking with the capacity in the morning peak hour
32 for 200 day skiers and 175 commercial parking spaces. Adding this to the 1,000 parking
33 spaces in the numbered lots results in 1,375 public parking spaces above the Wooden
34 Skier Bridge. This is an increase of 175 parking spaces over the 1,200 spaces
35 recommended in the original Comprehensive Plan. This increase in parking spaces would
36 not have a significant impact on the LOS on Brush Creek Road. The Entryway project is
37 designed to have 325 surface parking spaces upon completion. The 1998 Plan and this
38 updated Comprehensive Plan recommend 650 parking spaces at the Entryway site or
39 alternatives to providing the 650 parking spaces or more as may be necessary in order to
40 fulfill the demand. This will require further solutions that need future study and will most
41 likely push parking further from the community. This will have impacts on other
42 jurisdictions and the regional transit services.

1 ***Transit Carrying Capacity***

2 The existing regional and local transit services are reaching their carrying capacity in
3 the morning and evening peak hours. The local service (Village Shuttle) is operating
4 at 6,000–7,000 passengers per day during peak periods. The regional services (RFTA)
5 are at 2,500–3,000 passengers for valleywide services and 3,500–4,000 passengers for
6 day-skier services. The existing facilities for both regional and local transit services
7 are at their practical limits in the peak periods for both bus bays and queuing space
8 for passengers. Making significant increases in the carrying capacity of transit
9 services will require investments in infrastructure, rolling stock, and personnel. The
10 original Comprehensive Plan and the Base Village land use committees both
11 contemplated a redeveloped Mall area with a transit station. This was tied directly to
12 the binodal commercial goal stated in both studies. If redevelopment of the West
13 Village and the reconfiguration for the existing transit facilities are put off
14 significantly into the future, then interim solutions may be necessary to continue
15 quality transit services.

16 ***Alternative Technologies***

17 Cable technologies, aerial trams, and pedestrian improvements have been
18 incorporated into the Base Village development plan to help mitigate traffic impacts.
19 Evaluation studies have been launched to examine and monitor overall success of
20 these alternative technologies. Long-range planning that preserves corridors for
21 alternatives are still recommended in the Transportation Plan. We should preserve
22 these corridors and do this throughout the entire Village.

23 **Policies**

24 The Town of Snowmass Village shall:

- 25
- 26 • Measure transportation performance in the context of person trips rather than only
27 in vehicle trips. It has become increasingly clear that using a roadway/car-based
28 LOS metric leads to roadway-based mitigation measures. Given current realities,
29 this creates a conflict with the community vision for a rural Brush Creek Road.
30 Shifting the metric to person trips allows a more complete context of moving
31 people through town and expands the tool kit of strategies to use. This approach
32 allows for new development only by mitigating traffic through other strategies
33 such as remote/intercept parking, parking shared-use measures, transportation
34 demand management strategies, mixed land uses, on-site employee housing,
35 attractive pedestrian environments, and other measures to address traffic. This
36 involves measuring the use (volume/ridership) of each travel mode, the capacity
37 or availability of each mode, and the associated costs of expanding each mode.
 - 38 ▪ Require new development and redevelopment to project the number of person
39 trips generated by their application, and present alternatives that strive to achieve
40 a zero growth rate in traffic volume in the peak periods. The approach must be
41 realistic and not overtax any one of the components of the overall transportation

1 system. Developers are to demonstrate how alternative modes of transportation
2 will be encouraged through traffic mitigation such as:

- 3 ○ Design and configuration of the development or redevelopment
- 4 ○ Amenities
- 5 ○ Roadway design
- 6 ○ Parking (on site and/or off site)
- 7 ○ Transit
- 8 ○ Staggered employment and service shifts and creative staffing solutions
- 9 ○ Pedestrian corridors
- 10 ○ Alternative mobility devices (gondolas, independent two-way escalators,
11 etc.)
- 12 ○ Additional employee housing in town
- 13 ○ Funding or construction of intercept parking
- 14 ○ Long-term commitment to a lodging community shuttle service that
15 complements the public system
- 16 ○ Contribution to a mass transit system
- 17 ○ Creative alternatives to transportation funding including but not limited to
18 transit mitigation impact fees that could be put into a trust fund (possibly
19 using the interest to subsidize operating and maintenance costs)

- 20 ■ Uphold the following performance standards as a baseline for measuring the
21 impact of future development:
 - 22 ○ **Upper Brush Creek Road (above Woodbridge):** No significant (equal
23 or greater than 5 percent of current evening peak-hour, peak-direction
24 (phpd) roadway traffic) net increase in vehicle trips during the evening
25 peak travel period (3:00 to 5:00 P.M.)
 - 26 ○ **Lower Brush Creek Road (below Woodbridge):** Maintain existing LOS
27 standard/threshold of 925 peak-hour, peak-direction (phpd) trips
 - 28 ○ **Owl Creek Road:** Maintain existing LOS standard/threshold of 650 peak-
29 hour, peak-direction (phpd) trips
 - 30 ○ **Intersections:** Maintain existing LOS C standard/threshold
 - 31 ○ **Non-auto travel modes (for example: walking and buses):** Monitor
32 usage and capacity to ensure that capacity is not to exceed more than that
33 of the 10 busiest days of peak season
- 34 ■ Comprehensively link land use/employee housing decisions with mobility
35 options. Increase the availability of affordable housing in the Town Core to
36 reduce workforce commuting along Brush Creek Road.
- 37 ■ Address future parking needs primarily through off-site parking and programs,
38 limiting the amount of new on-site parking provided in Town. Require
39 development to provide adequate parking per the Land Use Code but at a Town-
40 approved location so that it does not cause a net increase of vehicles on the
41 critical sections of Brush Creek Road during peak hours. Parking may be built off
42 site with proven ability to move people from the parking lots to the Town Core
43 and base of the ski area. Additional parking may be allowed in the Two Creeks
44 Lot, the Rodeo Lot, or other Town-approved location if parking offsets traffic
45 volume on Brush Creek Road.

- 1 ▪ Maintain a maximum of 1,375 spaces for public parking in the Town Core (1,000
2 in the numbered lots and 375 in Base Village). Make space available at the Two
3 Creeks Lot and the Rodeo Lot for day-skier parking and limit 200 of the 1,375
4 spaces in the Town Core to day-skier parking. Continue to ensure that the
5 objective of achieving 85 percent utilization of day parking through pricing
6 (Ordinance 9, Series of 1994) remains in balance with this Plan’s goal to control
7 traffic volumes within the community.
- 8 ▪ For multifamily development, increase the use of mass transit in the Brush Creek
9 corridor to reduce individual automobile use. The use of personal vehicles may be
10 lessened by providing effective transit, intercept parking, traffic demand
11 management, courtesy van service, enhanced pedestrian/bicycle opportunities,
12 and improved amenities such as ski lockers near transit stations.
- 13 ▪ Develop a fully integrated commuter-oriented trail, bike, and pedestrian system
14 for year-round use that connects to regional trail systems and transit stops.
- 15 ▪ Work with RFTA, Aspen Skiing Company, and other transportation stakeholders
16 to provide an integrated premium mass-transit system for the Roaring Fork
17 Valley.
- 18 ▪ Maintain the village feel and character of Brush Creek Road from Highway 82 to
19 the Town Core, but plan for future premium transportation technologies in the
20 Brush Creek corridor.
- 21 ▪ Develop seamless transportation links between Base Village, Snowmass Center,
22 and West Village so guests and workers will be able to travel back and forth
23 without cars. Ensure that the capacity and speed will meet expectations.
- 24 ▪ Reduce conflicts between pedestrians, buses, and delivery services. Encourage
25 limited and operationally functional underground parking and/or underground
26 service and delivery in the West Village.
- 27 ▪ Support and encourage the use of alternative fuels in all vehicles.