

FINAL Meeting Minutes

Project: CDOT Region 3 – SH 82 Grand Avenue Bridge

Purpose: PLT Meeting #8

Date Held: March 8, 2012

Location: CDOT Glenwood Springs Maintenance Video Conference Room
CDOT Headquarters Video Conference Room
CDOT Region 3 Grand Junction Room 308 Video Conference Room

Attendees:

FHWA:	Eva LaDow (conference call)
CDOT:	Josh Cullen, Joe Elsen, Roland Wagner Tammie Smith (conference)
City of Glenwood Springs:	Bruce Christensen
Garfield County:	Jeff Nelson
Glenwood Springs Chamber:	Suzanne Stewart
Historic Preservation Commission:	Gretchen Ricehill
Downtown Development Authority:	Leslie Bethel
Colorado Bridge Enterprise:	Charlie Trujillo
Jacobs:	Craig Gaskill
Pitkin County:	Brian Pettet
TSH:	David Woolfall, George Tsiouvaras (conference)
Pat Noyes and Associates:	Pat Noyes
Newland Project Resources:	Tom Newland
Concerned Citizen:	Dave Sturgis

Copies: PLT Members, File

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION:

PROCESS, SCREENING, GOALS

UPDATES

1. Public Involvement
 - a. Craig reviewed previous and upcoming stakeholder and community meetings:

- b. Craig summarized the recent meetings with the City Council and the 6th Street businesses.
 - i. 6th Street business owners were very concerned about routing traffic away from businesses.
 - ii. They also expressed concern that some decisions had already been made. They were assured that wasn't the case.
 - c. Upcoming meetings:
 - i. Elected Officials Transportation Committee – March 12 meeting
 - ii. RE-1 School District – March 14, 6:30 p.m.
 - iii. Garfield County Commissioners – March 15, 8:00 a.m.
 - iv. Rotary Club – March 19, 6:45 p.m.
 - v. Glenwood Springs Transportation Commission – April 3rd
 - vi. Lions Club – TBD
 - vii. Kiwanis Club – TBD
 - d. Team met with the CDOT staff that manages its web page.
 - i. CDOT staff has shown willingness to allow more flexibility on what is presented on project website. This will allow for more functionality to solicit input on alternatives via the site. Site currently is linked with Twitter and Facebook.
 - ii. Twitter and Facebook content is reviewed by CDOT before going out to public.
2. Planning
- a. Dave Woolfall discussed the upcoming travel survey. Survey is to determine origins, destinations, mode, travel route, etc. Dave distributed draft survey for PLT review and comment. The survey will be advertised by radio and variable message signs (VMS).
 - i. Can this information be collected through review of existing traffic data? Per Dave, we could use traffic counters, etc., but this is more data and labor intensive.
 - ii. Why is this information important? Knowing origins and destinations will help with construction detour planning and staging and other uses.
 - b. Level 2 screening –see info below.
3. Environmental
- a. Historic evaluation continuing.
4. Engineering
- a. TSH and AMEC looking at increased engineering detail.
 - i. George indicated that our assessment has found that fatigue is proving to be an issue. We will work to document the issues.

5. Project Management

- a. Role of the PLT.
 - i. Discussion regarding role of PLT in developing and proposing alternatives.
 - ii. Clarified with PLT that their role is to guide the CSS process. Showing preference for certain alternatives could undermine the process.
- b. Schedule
 - i. Reviewed upcoming general meetings:
 - Stakeholders Working Group meetings - April 4th and June 6th
 - Public Open House – April 4th
 - PLT meeting – April 5th
 - Value Engineering - June 26th through 28th
 - Public Open House - August 22nd
 - ii. Revised and added PLT meetings:
 - PLT/PWG combined meeting April 5th, 8:30 am
 - PLT meeting moved to May 10th, 1:30 pm
 - PLT meeting Friday June 15th, 8:30 am
 - PLT meeting Friday July 27th, 8:30 am
 - PLT/PWG combined meeting August 23rd, 8:30 AM

LEVEL 2(B) COMPARATIVE SCREENING

1. An overview of Level 2B screening was provided, along with a preview of potential results of Level 2B. The screening for Level 2B is still comparative at a slightly higher level of design detail. The screening approach using the evaluation criteria turned to potential landing points for the bridge.
 - a. To the north it included:
 - i. Exit 116 / Laurel area.
 - ii. Maple Street Area.
 - iii. Pine Street area, near existing.
 - b. On the south side of the river the screening was divided among:
 - i. Comparing Grand to Cooper as the outbound half of a couplet.
 - ii. Comparing where the Colorado Avenue half of the couplet turned back to Grand Avenue (7th, 8th, or 9th).

- iii. Potential cross sections on Grand Avenue in either 4-lane or 2-lane half-couplet options will be discussed, no screening planned.
 - c. Knowing more about the landing points helps us match alignment alternatives to the landing points.
 - d. The preview anticipated that we might be able to screen out alignments using Cooper, that we would screen out alignments landing at Maple, and that the Colorado couplet would turn at 9th. Details to be discussed during the remainder of the meeting.
2. For Level 2B, the project team used the evaluation criteria that had previously been identified in visioning and other processes. At Level 2B, this includes comparative analysis on concept designs, so not all criteria are applicable or show differences.
- a. Some criteria apply to certain areas of comparison but not others.
3. Red-Yellow-Green used in evaluation matrices.
- a. Red is worst comparatively in a criteria category, not necessarily fatally flawed.
 - b. Yellow means average, neutral, same as today.
 - c. Green is best for an evaluation criterion.
4. Full list of criteria shown, likely applicable criteria were highlighted, those that are not yet applicable or likely same among all alternatives not yet used.
5. First comparison is Cooper vs. Grand as the outbound half of the couplet.
- a. As determined in Level 2A, only reason to consider Cooper is to pair it with Colorado as a couplet, resulting in a “ped mall” or other non-SH 82 use on Grand Avenue from 7th to 9th. The evaluation matrix was prepared to compare Grand vs. Cooper as outbound.
 - b. Potential cross sections for Grand 7th to 9th if it is not SH 82 include:
 - i. 60-degree head-in parking, 18-foot sidewalks, 24-foot, two-way drive lane.
 - ii. 30-foot sidewalks, parallel parking, 24-foot, two-way drive lane.
 - iii. Full pedestrian mall (100 feet), no public traffic.
 - c. To offset the parking loss on Cooper, 60-degree parking would be needed.
 - d. Potential historic properties shown, main ones effecting Cooper alternatives include the train station and the Hot Springs Pool property (not just the building).
 - e. The evaluation matrix comparing Cooper to Grand was shown. Although Cooper seemed to compare worse in many criteria, there were criteria where Cooper was very favorable – improvement to businesses and community for Grand Avenue.
 - f. It was noted that the PWG agreed that it would be better to get input from the public/businesses in that area to use for the criteria ratings. Therefore no Cooper alignments were screened, they will be presented to the public.

- g. Input that couplet alternatives are better for pedestrians and angled parking is better for shops
 - h. Concern was noted about potential impacts to the new parking structure on Cooper and potential impacts to Hotel Denver with a Cooper couplet.
6. The north landing points were discussed next.
- a. Previously four possible alignments were shown, two landing near Exit 116 / Laurel. After the project team evaluated designs for this landing area, the two alignments were combined into a single alignment, since an alignment landing in that area requires very specific intersection designs, to be shown later.
 - b. In a preview of potential screening discussed that the primary differences for north side landing points are right-of-way and traffic operations/intersections, as well as constructability.
 - i. All landing points require some right-of-way, except landing at/near the existing Pine Street location.
 - ii. All alignments seem to impact the pool parking area similarly.
 - c. The intersection alternatives landing near Exit 116 are unique and varied and include:
 - i. Large roundabout.
 - ii. Signals for SH 82 traffic with adjacent roundabout for local traffic.
 - iii. Flyover bridge for SH 82 to west I-70 outbound traffic.
 - iv. Inbound half of couplet only.
 - d. Landing at Maple or Pine will result in intersection configurations similar to the existing 6th and Pine intersection.
 - e. Large roundabout concept at Exit 116 shown and discussed. Roundabout would need to be near 200 feet in diameter due to traffic volume and design for truck turning. This would require acquisition of the Shell station.
 - i. Operations evaluated include pedestrian crossings, truck turning paths, metering signal at adjacent Exit 116 off ramps. Not an ideal location for a roundabout due to traffic volume imbalance. Probably three lanes for SH 82 outbound path.
 - f. Signal alternative that orients SH 82 traffic directly to/from I-70 shown, local traffic uses adjacent roundabout. Would also require acquisition of Shell station.
 - g. Alternative similar to the signal alternative, but with a flyover for outbound SH 82 to I-70 traffic was shown, characterized as probably an over-design for traffic purposes.
 - h. Other issues discussed for alternatives near Exit 116 include concerns about the uphill grade for trucks going up the new bridge. Probably 5 or 6%. Also, concerns about wayfinding to the tourist attractions discussed.

- i. Video simulations of the roundabout and signal alternatives were shown. Simulations were not yet fully optimized but showed that generally the alternatives should work with future traffic levels.
 - j. Inbound half of couplet leaving at Exit 116/Laurel was shown. It would require acquisition of the Shell station and would smooth out inbound traffic but not change outbound traffic.
 - k. Inbound leaving 6th at Maple discussed, basically replicates existing double rights at Pine. Requires acquisition of Sioux Villa and at least one adjacent business.
 - l. Evaluation matrix comparing Exit 116/Laurel vs. Maple vs. Pine was shown in overall. Generally, Maple was mostly yellow, but lots of opposing red vs. green between Exit 116/Laurel and Pine. Nothing was clearly superior based on the matrix.
 - m. Decision for north landing points was similar to the decision on Cooper vs. Grand outbound. Many of the criteria were subjective, so we should take the options to the public and get input on the subjective criteria. So none of the north landing points were screened in Level 2B.
7. Next area to evaluate was 7th vs. 8th vs. 9th as the way to shift the inbound Colorado couplet back over to Grand Avenue.
- a. 7th as an option is not really a couplet, so has no advantages that other couplet alternatives do. However, four lanes on Grand could split into a couplet right over the railroad, so this is more dependent on north landing options.
 - b. 8th as a one-block one-way eastbound route would interrupt continuity for 8th, since 8th is more of a primary east-west route and has higher existing traffic flows.
 - c. 9th functions as the edge of the historic downtown; south of 9th there are residences. The evaluation matrix comparison showed that 9th was the most favorable of the three routes, and the PWG agreed that 9th was the most logical alternative for this area.
8. It was previously asked where other couplets were, so a list of other towns were shown. There are many on the coasts--US 101 in California and US 1 and 9 on the east coast where the major route splits into a couplet through town.
9. The Grand Avenue cross-section was discussed in the context of what is important to have within the 100-foot right-of-way. No screening of cross sections was anticipated for Level 2B.
- a. Similar to other potential screening, it was decided to bring cross-section choices to the public to gain input. In general, the questions are:
 - i. Should there be no sidewalks or bike lanes on the bridge south of 7th? This would maximize the sidewalk at ground level in front of Grand Avenue businesses.
 - This means ramps for ADA would need to be provided between the railroad and 7th, likely need stacked ramps, two levels, to make grade change. Other option is an elevator which has cost and maintenance issues.

- ii. If sidewalks, bike lanes, etc., are added to the bridge south of 7th, it would reduce space at ground level on Grand Avenue. We need to ask the public what the acceptable trade-off would be--what is the minimum acceptable sidewalk area at ground level.
 - Need to also consider how road/bridge get higher going north; higher bridge may make sidewalk feel less open.
 - Half couplet on Grand is narrower, so more opportunity for sidewalk, parking, wider sidewalks.
10. Primary conclusion from the meeting is that we should show more to the public to get a full range of input to help with screening alternatives.
11. All were OK with the criteria as presented.

ADDITIONAL ITEMS

NEXT STEPS:

1. April- Level 2B
2. Refinement of alignments
3. Public meeting preparation
 - a. PLT would like input on the questions use for the public meeting on values.

ACTION ITEMS

1. Obtain input from the PLT on questions to be used at the public meeting on values.

Attachments

- ▶ Presentation (with final notes) -on ftp site
- ▶ Sign-in sheet

J:_Transportation\WVXX1306_GrandAve\meetings\PLT\PLT8-Mar 8 2012\SH 82 Grand Ave PLT #8 FINAL meeting minutes_030812.doc



SH 82
GRAND AVENUE BRIDGE

AGENDA
SH 82 Grand Avenue Bridge
Project Leadership Team Meeting #8
Thursday, March 8, 2012
1:30 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.

CDOT Region 3 Glenwood (Maintenance Video Conference Room)
CDOT Region 3 Grand Junction (Room 308 Video Conference Room)
CDOT Headquarters (Room 159 Video Conference Room)

1. **Updates**
 - a. Public Involvement
 - b. Planning
 - c. Environmental
 - d. Engineering
2. **Level 2b Screening**
 - a. Recommendations
3. **Public Meeting Discussion**

SH 82

GRAND AVENUE BRIDGE

Project Leadership Team Meeting #8

Thursday, March 8, 2012

1:30 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.

CDOT Region 3 Glenwood (Maintenance Video Conference Room)
 CDOT Region 3 Grand Junction (Room 308 Video Conference Room)
 CDOT Headquarters (Video Conference Room)

✓ Dave Sturgis

Present	
Colorado Department of Transportation, Region 3	
✓	Josh Cullen
✓	Tammie Smith
✓	Joe Elsen
✓	Roland Wagner
City of Glenwood Springs City Council Representative	
✓	Bruce Christensen
	Shelley Kaup (alternate)
City of Glenwood Springs	
	Dave Betley
Colorado Bridge Enterprise/ AECOM	
	Ken Szeliga
✓	Charlie Trujillo
Eagle County	
	Eva Wilson
Garfield County	
✓	Jeff Nelson
Pitkin County	
✓	Brian Pettet

Present	
FHWA ✓ Eva LaRow	
	Stephanie Gibson
Jacobs	
✓	Craig Gaskill
	Jim Clarke
	Mary Speck
Tsiouvaras Simmons Holderness, Inc. (TSH)	
	George Tsiouvaras
✓	David Woolfall
Glenwood Hot Springs	
	Kjell Mitchell
Glenwood Springs Chamber Resort Association	
✓	Suzanne Stewart
Downtown Development Authority	
✓	Leslie Bethel
Historic Preservation Commission	
✓	Gretchen Ricehill
Other (Name/Organization)	
✓	Pat Noyes
✓	Tom Newland