



Review of Existing Plans and Documentation

This chapter provides a brief review of the existing planning documentation and ongoing efforts in the Clifton area. There was a parallel planning effort—the Clifton/Fruitvale Area Community Plan—which took place at the same time as this pedestrian study. Portions of this plan are included in the Community Plan; however, the study areas of each plan/study differ and therefore not all information from each study could be seamlessly integrated into the other.

There are very good sources of information from previous plans and studies of the area. A major source of information is the Clifton Transportation Study which details some of the existing deficiencies in pedestrian facilities for the area. Other plans detail the current Capital Investment Program (CIP) as well as specific neighborhood plans. This section highlights the major recommendations or elements which pertain to this Pedestrian Circulation Study. Please refer to the referenced plan for more detailed information.

EXISTING PLANS

Clifton Transportation Study

The Clifton Transportation Study was completed in January 2003 and represents a comprehensive multimodal plan through 2025. The study area is the same as this Pedestrian Circulation Study.

2.1 Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities

The section entitled *Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities, Section 2.1* of the study presents a brief review of existing facilities. The study team conducted a field review of the existing facilities and compared this review with the 2001 Urban Trails Master Plan and the locations of schools within the study area. The evaluation noted the following:

- Pedestrian sidewalks are not continuous – “most of the older roads do not have sidewalks and the ones that do are in need of repairs. The lack

Review of Existing Plans

of continuity forces school children and other pedestrians to walk next to, or on the roadways...This problem may also lead to increased congestion around schools as more parents choose to drive their children to school.”

- Bicycle facilities are very limited or not continuous – “many secondary schoolchildren who do not have bus service commute to school by bicycle and have to ride on the shoulder of the road. Many existing bike lanes are not continuous.”

The consultant recommended that the following improvements be made:

1. Provide continuous sidewalks within one-half mile of all schools. (Phase 1/2003-2008)
2. Provide continuous sidewalks within one mile of all schools. (Phase 2/2009-2014)
3. Expand the current bicycle facilities in accordance with the 2001 Urban Trails Master Plan.

2.2 Transit System

Section 2.2, *Transit System*, briefly describes the transit system, and the consultant who completed the study noted the following problems.

- Not enough formal bus pullouts – “Traffic backs up when a bus pulls over...not completely out of a travel lane.”
- 32½ Road is not continuous – “32½ Road is not continuous between E Road and D Road. This discontinuity limits transit routing in that area.”

The consultant recommended that the following improvements be made:

1. Formal bus pullouts should be constructed as part of roadway widening projects along current GVT routes.
2. Extend the current Palisade transit route further south once 32½ Road is extended from D½ Road to E Road.

Public Comments

As with any planning process public comments were received during the planning process. Those which have specific bearing on this pedestrian study are:

- Include a new sidewalk on E from 30 to 31.5
- Include pedestrian bridge at B70 and 31.5
- Fix Post Office access
- Install signal at 2nd and F Road
- Add bike paths to E.5 from 32 Road to 33 Road
- Signalize 32 Road and Mesa Avenue

Pear Park Neighborhood Plan

The Pear Park Neighborhood Plan was completed in December 2004 and adopted by the County Commissioners. The Pear Park area includes all properties located between 28 Road and 32 Road and between the Railroad (I-70 B) and the Colorado River. The purpose of the Plan was to take a proactive approach to planning for the extreme growth in the area.

According to the Plan, public comments received at an open house in 2004 reflected a concern that growth in the area is overwhelming the existing infrastructure. A windshield survey of the existing network showed that intermittent improvements had been constructed with some of the development, while the bulk of the major street network is a rural, two-lane cross section.

Urban Trails

The Pear Park Plan briefly reviewed the urban trail network through Pear Park. The Plan states that sidewalks are lacking throughout the Pear Park Neighborhood. The Plan states that, “Recent development has constructed sidewalk on the local street network but the connections to destinations such as schools, public spaces, shopping and the riverfront trail system are, for the most part, non-existent or below standard.”

It also must be noted that the intersection of I-70 B and 31½ Road was viewed as one of the most problematic areas for pedestrians. Two local schools are located on the north of this intersection; however, the marked crosswalk and pushbutton signal activator are located on the east side of the intersection, while both schools are located on the west side.

Mesa County Public Works (2005-2010 Capital Investment Program)

The current Capital Investment Program (CIP) specifies all Public Works projects and improvements to be completed in Mesa County by 2010. The following projects in the CIP relate directly to pedestrian improvements in the Clifton area:

- Bike and Pedestrian Paths (repair and maintenance) - \$550,000
- Safety (Right-of-Way Safety Improvements) - \$225,000
- Safety (Intersection Safety) - \$700,000
- Bike and Pedestrian Paths (improvements) - \$750,000
- F¹/₄ Road Widening - \$10,000
- North/South Corridor Improvements
- B¹/₂ Road to 30.5 to 31 Road Improvements - \$400,000
- Clifton Road Corridor Improvements
- Orchard Avenue Improvements (30 Road to 31.5 Road)
- E Road Improvements
- 31¹/₂ and E Road Improvements
- 32.5 Road Pathway

The preceding improvements have been identified in this review as affecting pedestrian activity in the Clifton area. These improvements include activities such as road widening, intersection, and safety improvement; however, all improvements have some impact on pedestrian activity.

Clifton/Fruitvale Community Plan

Currently, a year-long effort to update the Master Plan for the Clifton/Fruitvale area is underway. This plan will address land use, law enforcement, fire protection, water and sanitation services, parks and recreation, and transportation and pedestrian circulation. The plan will define community goals to be achieved by providing specific guidance, priorities, and implementation strategies for the future of the community. This Pedestrian Circulation Study will be incorporated into the Clifton/Fruitvale Community Plan and, ultimately, the Master Plan for the area. The newsletters are provided in Appendix A.

INITIAL SAFETY REVIEW

Any part of transportation planning should involve, at the least, a review of the relevant safety elements. This is particularly important when planning for pedestrian and bicycling facilities. A brief review of recent crash data provided by the

Colorado Department of Transportation revealed six bicycle or pedestrian-related crashes since 2000 in the Clifton area. The following are locations of these crash incidents:

- I-70 Business and 30 Road
- I-70 Businesses and 31½ Road
- Colorado 141 (32 Road) and Hill Avenue
- State Highway 6 (I-70 Business) and 33 Road
- State Highway 6 (I-70 Business) and 1st Street
- Colorado 141 (32 Road) and D¾ Road

Nearly all these crash incidents involved a pedestrian/bicyclist crossing the road, not at a designated crosswalk (midblock), and being hit by a motorist. No fatalities or serious injuries were reported. No geometric or road design characteristics appear to have been a cause of the crash. Most appear to be either pedestrian or driver carelessness.

US ACCESS BOARD REVIEW

The US Access Board has recently released draft accessibility guidelines for new or altered public facilities. The draft will be adopted at some point by the US Department of Transportation and subsequently be adopted by state departments of transportation which local governments will be required to follow. These are not new guidelines, but constitute an update to the currently adopted guidelines. Revisions are underway from public comments, and a final document will become available in 2006. Appendix B presents a summary from the US Access Board on the contents of the document and where to obtain more information. These guidelines should be currently followed by the local government entities; however, the final guidelines may have changes which should be updated to the appropriate departments of government.

STATEWIDE GUIDE

The information presented in the following section is taken from the *Colorado Guide for the Development of Local and Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans*. This document is intended to outline the state's inclusion of bicycle and pedestrian

planning in the Statewide Transportation Plan. The Guidebook covers the four “Es” of planning for facilities:

- Engineering
- Education
- Enforcement
- Encouragement

Taken directly from the Guidebook, the following principles provide the foundation for providing a safe and equitable bicycle and pedestrian network throughout the state. These same principles should guide development in the Clifton area.

- *Accessibility* – Walking and bicycling are a free and direct means of accessing local goods, services, community amenities, and public transit, and should be provided with equitable access to all transportation facilities and services. Facilities must meet all Americans with Disabilities Act rules and regulations.
- *Connectivity* – Enhance modal and intermodal transfers and connections within the transportation network.
- *Coordination* – Integrate bicycle and pedestrian transportation facilities and services with other planning and development.
- *Corridor Preservation* – Identify transportation corridors necessary for expansion or enhancement of the transportation system.
- *Customer Focus* – Address the needs and perceptions of community members through a comprehensive public involvement process.
- *Environmental Sustainability* – Be dedicated to protecting and enhancing the environment. Walking and bicycling rely on human power and have negligible environmental impact.
- *Equity* – Walking is the only mode of travel that is universally affordable and allows all people (children, adults, senior citizens, people with disabilities, and low income) to travel independently.
- *Economic Viability* – A bicycle- and pedestrian-friendly environment encourages social interaction and contributes to the economy.
- *Financial* – Identify and consider new and creative sources of funding in addition to anticipated resources.

- *Health and Well-being* – Walking and bicycling are proven methods of promoting personal health and well-being.
- *Mobility* – Consider the movement of people, goods, services, and information.
- *Multimodal* – Consider all modes of transportation and identify the most appropriate mix of modal facilities and services.
- *Popsicle Principle* – Facilitate the ease by which an eight-year-old child can safely and happily walk or bike to a neighborhood store for a Popsicle.
- *Safety* – Incorporate appropriate measures to minimize danger, risk, or injury in the development, operation, and maintenance of transportation facilities. An environment in which people feel safe and comfortable walking increases community safety for all.
- *System Management* – Optimize the effectiveness of current transportation facilities and services.
- *System Maintenance* – Define the appropriate maintenance level for transportation facilities and services.

These principles were observed when and where appropriate when prioritizing projects in the Clifton study area.