



Public Comment on Initial Recommendations

PUBLIC INPUT PROCESS

The public input process for a major restructuring of the routes included providing summary information to a large populace in the area. Some areas were recommended for service elimination, some neighborhoods would be affected slightly by route changes, and some areas would be getting new services; hence a comprehensive effort to notify affected persons was made. The public input process was comprised of the following:

- Citizens Advisory Committee
- Steering Committee
- GVRTC
- TAC
- Mailing notification to approximately 8,500 residents
- Web-based information dissemination
- Local newspaper articles and notices
- Radio advertisement
- Local Open House
- Drivers

During the process, the RTPO received comments via e-mail, phone calls, written comments delivered or mailed, and during the open house comment period. The actual comments are provided in Appendix D, with a summary of the key points in the following section.

SUMMARY OF INPUT

Public Comment

Public comments were taken in various forms. Some people provided comments on the web, through e-mail, by calling the RTPO or GVT directly, through written comments and mail, and through LSC. The RTPO sent a mailing to nearly 8,500

residents in the Grand Valley notifying them of system changes. Additionally, an Open House was held on October 8, where over 50 residents showed up to discuss route changes. Much of the discussion was positive. Some of the following themes were noted through all the public comments received:

- Routes need to be shorter and more direct.
- Express buses should be considered between Clifton and Fruita.
- Service should be kept on 33 Road in Clifton.
- Elimination of the UTECH area is good; however, this route should continue to serve Mesa State College.
- Numerous negative comments on the proposed Fruita Route (service to Mesa Mall every two hours).
- Some say service to the Ridges is needed.
- Numerous comments on removal of stops and new stops needed.
- Increased service hours and frequency during peak hours.
- Grand Junction High School needs to be served.
- Service on 7th Street is important.
- Mesa State College should have service.
- 12th and Patterson area needs improvement for access to St. Mary's.
- Keeping Orchard Mesa and Clifton separate is needed.
- North Avenue should go up 7th Street.
- Happy to see the Shopping Route (#10) back.
- E Road and 31 Road need service.
- Service to new Kohls development is required.
- A grid system should be established.
- Need consistent Saturday service and something on Sundays.

All comments were provided on the draft route changes presented to the GVRTC in September 2007. However, during this time, the RTPO, LSC, the Citizens Advisory Committee, and Laidlaw have been working on the improved route structures. Routes have been driven for timing, and changes have been made based upon timings, impacts, and further analysis. It must be stressed that all the comments were based upon preliminary route recommendations. Since that time, new routes based upon this analysis and public comment have been investigated and are presented in Chapter VII.

Driver Comments

The RTPO and LSC met with the GVT drivers to discuss the preliminary route recommendations, as presented to GVRTC. Those comments are provided in Appendix D. Driver comments are very useful as these are the ones who drive routes on a daily basis and know of the operational challenges like no other. Their comments and recommendations are very highly valued and are continually being addressed. A highlight of those discussions is presented:

- Drivers are unsure the Orchard Mesa and Clifton combined route will work effectively.
- Routes need to be more direct and allow for some layover time at the transfer points for breaks.
- Running late is very stressful for the drivers.
- The drivers are very conscious of the passengers they serve and know their riders very well.
- Pulling into schools is unnecessary; stops should be on the road adjacent to the schools.
- No need to stop at Albertsons and the Riverside neighborhood in the Redlands.
- Main Street should have some service.
- Routes do need some changes across the board. Many are not serving the public well.

CONCLUSION

The RTPO did an excellent job at public notification. Representatives responded quickly to the public concerns either through e-mail or phone calls. The Open House had a large amount of citizen input. While it is impossible to incorporate every comment and suggestion, many were quite valid to the changing of routes in the area. Certainly, the high number of Fruita residents who responded to initial recommendations has made a strong argument for not changing the Fruita route. Grand Junction has many challenges to serving the public efficiently and effectively. The area is geographically diverse, which presents challenges for serving the area in a timely manner. Some destinations, unfortunately, require long travel times and inconvenient transfers. However, this is the challenge which faces the planners who oversee establishing routes and stops. As part of this process, it was critical to look at past performance, future growth, public comment, and in some cases, innovative solutions to providing the best service possible under

Public Comment on Initial Recommendations

certain financial, geographical, and environmental constraints. Chapter VII uses this input as well as the further analysis of the situation in the area to present revisions to the initial draft route recommendations. These are the route structures GVRTC ultimately adopted. It must be stated that the routes may need minor adjustments once operational to adjust for unforeseen timing issues and passenger input.