



VelociRFTA Community Workshops | SUMMARY

THE WORKSHOPS

A series of highly interactive workshops were held February 16th through the 22nd during the evening hours in Glenwood Springs, Aspen, Basalt and Carbondale. Lunch time workshops were also held in Glenwood Springs and Aspen.

WHO ATTENDED?

A total of 183 attendees signed in to the workshops, and many others stopped by the workshop displays and chatted with staff while on their way in and out of each venue. The Glenwood Springs Recreation Center, Carbondale Recreation Center, Basalt Library and CMC-Aspen campus attracted many people who otherwise might not have attended a workshop. Plus, seven elected officials attended, including five RFTA Board members.

WORKSHOP PUBLICITY/BROADER OUTREACH

The workshops created the opportunity to tell the BRT story to a broad valley-wide audience. The Aspen Daily News, Aspen Times, Glenwood Post Independent, LaUnion and El Montanes newspapers all featured articles published before and during the workshops. KDNK and Aspen Public Radio/Grass Roots TV produced stories including interviews conducted at the Carbondale workshop. Access Roaring Fork filmed the Basalt workshop and a DVD will air on our local access stations over the coming months. In addition, newspaper ads, posters, e-vites, e-blasts, event calendars, e-newsletters, websites, public service announcements and even Twitter were used to publicize the workshops. The RFTA website, information line, and drivers also helped to get the word out.

WHAT PEOPLE THOUGHT

So far, RFTA received 571 comments during the workshops and via email and mail. Overwhelmingly the comments are supportive of BRT and the elements proposed.

GENERAL BRT/RFTA

12% of all comments collected dealt with general inquiries and comments on RFTA and the BRT project as a whole.

- 86% of comments specific to BRT and RFTA expressed enthusiasm for BRT.
- 6 comments expressed support for rail and not BRT.

"Great work. It's nice to start to see concepts come to life. Thanks." (Aspen noon)

"I like it. I want BRT now!" (Glenwood Springs evening)

TRANSIT SERVICE PLAN

16% of all comments pertained to the BRT service plan. Questions relative to how BRT would integrate with local bus services (37% of questions) and what the fare structure for BRT would be (23% of questions) dominated service plan inquiries. Overall, the comments were positive with some disapproval of current bus fares.

- 60% of comments specific to the transit service plan expressed support.
- 12% of comments expressed disapproval of the current fares (vs. cost of driving a car), but did express support for BRT.

"It's currently very expensive and cheaper to drive."
(Glenwood Springs evening)

"I really like the improved service times." (Aspen noon)

"Faster is the single best thing." (Aspen evening)

"If you make it convenient and reliable then people will ride." (Aspen noon)

PHYSICAL DEFINITION

42% of all recorded comments—by far the greatest response—focused on the BRT bus shelter design and locations. The questions, comments and suggestions will be invaluable resources for future design efforts. Specific to the project's physical definition:

- 90% of comments specific to BRT physical definition expressed clear approval. For those comments expressing clear disapproval of BRT station designs, the main reason offered was a preference for unique or community specific designs.
- 21% of comments focused on safe pedestrian access to BRT stations.
- 15% of comments stressed the use of sustainable materials, design and educational opportunities.
- 11% of comments dealt with shelter weatherization and other amenities.

"I like the design because it is clean and simple."

(Glenwood Springs noon)

VEHICLES

5% of all comments focused on BRT buses.

- 43% advocated the use of highly efficient green technology buses.
- 25% of comments focused on comfort issues, primarily space and cold temperatures on buses.
- 19% focused on bike racks on BRT buses.

"I like the low-floor buses. It is easier for the elderly to board." (Carbondale)

ITS PROGRAM

9% of all comments taken dealt with BRT ITS components.

- 22% of comments specific to the ITS feature expressed enthusiasm for real time information for BRT buses, including digital signs, web and smart phone updates.
- 14% of comments focused on the automated ticket features and were all positive.
- 77% of comments expressed approval of ITS features.
- The automated enunciator feature on BRT buses had 1 detractor who felt it was too impersonal for the valley.

"The technology is really exciting. Very cool. Nice that a small community can be in the 21st century." (Basalt)

"The ITS boards and ticketing machines could be a great way to increase ridership... The technology makes it sexier for all to use." (Aspen noon)

BRANDING AND MARKETING

Feedback to VelociRFTA branding was very positive.

"The VelociRFTA mascot is a much better mascot than the greyhound." (Carbondale)

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

9% of all comments focused on BRT public involvement. This category included general questions about how the public has been engaged to date and what opportunities there will be for future involvement. All opinionated comments were in support of BRT public involvement efforts.

"Very informative and helpful. It's great to keep the public engaged." (Aspen evening)

"Thank you so much for having us here to see all of this and to include our thoughts. I love RFTA!"

(Glenwood Springs noon)

SCHEDULE

All comments relative to the BRT project schedule were positive.

"I love it! Great idea. Congrats on getting to this point so quickly." (Glenwood Springs noon)

"I look forward to the service starting." (Basalt)

OPERATING AND CAPITAL COST

1% of all comments dealt with the operating and capital costs of BRT. The majority of responses were inquiries into the expenditure for new buses and increased service levels. 1 recorded comment felt the BRT project was too expensive.

FUNDING

3% of comments are categorized as funding questions. Inquiries about the timing and availability of funding were the primary topics.