

FINAL Meeting Minutes

Project: CDOT Region 3 – SH 82 Grand Avenue Bridge

Purpose: PLT Meeting #10

Date Held: May 10, 2012

Location: CDOT Glenwood Springs Maintenance Video Conference Room
CDOT Trail Ridge Video Conference Video Conference Room
CDOT Region 3 Grand Junction Monument Video Conference Room

Attendees:

FHWA:	Eva LaDow (conference call)
CDOT:	Josh Cullen, Joe Elsen, Roland Wagner Tammie Smith, Mike Vanderhoof (Video conference Grand Junction)
City of Glenwood Springs:	Bruce Christensen
Glenwood Springs Chamber:	Suzanne Stewart
Colorado Bridge Enterprise:	Charlie Trujillo
Eagle County:	Eva Wilson
Jacobs:	Craig Gaskill, Jim Clarke, Mary Speck (Video conference Golden)
Pitkin County:	Brian Pettet
TSH:	David Woolfall, George Tsiouvaras
Pat Noyes and Associates:	Pat Noyes (Video conference Golden)
Newland Project Resources:	Tom Newland
Transportation Commission (City):	Shelley Kaup
Concerned Citizen:	Dave Sturges

Copies: PLT Members, File

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION:

INTRODUCTIONS

BRIDGE ARCHITECTURE DISCUSSION

1. The project team brought in a bridge architect named Fred Gottemoeller on Tuesday and Wednesday to review the project area and discuss general bridge architecture. It was

decided to start looking at different bridge architecture at this point in the process because as we get to fewer alternatives, some of them might have different opportunities to incorporate aesthetic design and this can provide another means to compare them.

2. Fred had prepared a slide show of different bridge types that were designed to fit into their surroundings. These slides were presented to the PLT along with general narrative of the slides. Some items of note were tapered overhangs and pedestrian walks, lighting, aesthetic treatment of underside of bridge.
3. There was a discussion about the need to inform the public of design (architecture) issues, citing the Downtown Development Authority (DDA) experiences with design for the parking structures and library. Competing interests (e.g., modern vs. historic) generally resulted in a 'watered down' design that accomplished neither.

PHASING

1. The project team is looking at phasing now without any specific bridge types to make sure that there are no fatal flaws in the various options that might preclude a specific alternative. Several criteria in the alternatives screening process speak to constructability, so the phasing options provide a basis of comparison.

COUPLET PHASING

1. Couplets were introduced as alternatives mainly because they were considered a better way of handling traffic during construction. Couplet phasing involves first building the new bridge and converting downtown to a square-about (one way around Colorado, 9th, Grand, and 8th) and moving traffic to the new bridge, then removing the Grand Avenue bridge and building the second bridge. The duration of impact includes the time to construct two bridges. There also isn't a lot of opportunity to use Accelerated Bridge Construction techniques and traffic capacity is limited to one two-lane bridge during construction.

SINGLE BRIDGE PHASING

1. Half and Half bridge approach where the existing bridge is widened to shift traffic out of the way to build half of the new bridge. After the new bridge half is built, traffic is shifted back and second half of new bridge is built.
 - a. Temporary bridge could be utilized to facilitate construction. There is value in not having a 'throw away' bridge. There was a suggestion that instead of building a temporary bridge next to the existing bridge, consider a temporary bridge in a location where it could serve a permanent need, such as at Devereaux Road. While this could be considered, the location of the temporary bridge needs to work for purposes of detouring traffic and needs to be cost-effective as a phasing tool.

- b. Accelerated Bridge Construction Techniques for Single Bridge: Slide In Bridge, Prefabricated Spans, Outside-Inside Construction.
 - i. These would generally involve a much shorter term closure, perhaps 2 to 4 weeks.
 - ii. Closure time frames that would work: April/early May or October 15 November 15.

UTILITIES DISCUSSION

- 1. There was a strong concern expressed that any attempt to underground utilities, particularly in the river area, would greatly concern the Hot Springs Pool with regard to the geothermal resource. This needs to be taken into consideration in the design planning.
 - a. Temporary staging area for prefabricated spans – one option is at ‘wye’ as identified in concept drawings. The land, not just the track, is within the UPRR easement.
 - i. County is anticipating 2014 for construction of their parking structure on Colorado between 7th and 8th. This could affect the ability to use an existing parking lot for construction phasing.

LEVEL 2B SCREENING

- 1. Craig reviewed the alternative screening process and the role of the PLT. A comparative process was utilized for each screening criteria using green, yellow and red to code the relative comparison. Alternatives were compared against each other, not against a standard.
- 2. It was pointed out that some criteria may be considered more important than others and that some ratings are more comparative than others. However, ratings showing up as red are comparatively worse and provide some indication as to potential reasons an alternative may be comparatively worse than others. Unless alternatives that have a lot of negative comparisons have some overriding comparative positive attributes, these alternatives should be considered to be eliminated for further consideration.
- 3. Dave Sturgis (non-PLT member and attending as a citizen) offered input that it is very important to provide transparency and communication to the public about screening. More information is better than less.
- 4. It was noted that the project team will get the information out to the public following recommendations by the PWG and review of the process by the PLT. Part of this plan includes buying an ad in the paper to summarize the screening results.
- 5. The PWG recommendations on screening were presented. The following alternatives were recommended to be screened out and not considered further:
 - a. The rehabilitation alternative – Not as good at addressing the bridge condition Purpose and Need criteria and relatively worse on construction impacts. Poor ratings on the ability to provide an aesthetically pleasing bridge. Few advantages over other alternatives that would outweigh the disadvantages.

FINAL Meeting Minutes
SH 82 Grand Avenue Bridge—PLT#10

May 10, 2012

Page 4 of 5

- b. Alternatives 10 and 11 (Cooper and Colorado Couplets) – Negative public input on these alternatives was consistent with analysis that showed relatively greater impacts regarding traffic circulation, noise, air quality, and historic resources. Plus there was negative public input on adding in multiple new “S” curves into SH 82. There were also more impacts on accesses along Cooper. Benefits to Grand Avenue as a result of this alternative were not seen as strong positives by many and were generally seen as a detriment by more.
 - c. Alternatives 5, 7, 8, and 9 (Colorado and Grand Couplets) – Public input on these alternatives was also generally negative although not as negative as with Alternatives 10 and 11. There are still circulation problems, additional noise and air quality concerns and the addition of new “S” turns. However, there are still some benefits that a Colorado Grand couplet could still provide in terms of enhancing the environment on Grand Avenue and providing for phasing options. As the best of this group, one Colorado / Grand couplet alternative was retained – Alternative
 - d. Alternative 2 – Single bridge alternative with connection to Maple Avenue on the north. Compared to Alternative 1, this alternative was pretty much the same except that it created more property impacts. It was considered the weakest of the single bridge alternatives.
6. Also screened out were the intersection options B (big roundabout) and C (flyover entrance ramp). Option A (local traffic at Laurel and 6th Street intersection) was considered to provide better traffic operations than Option B, better opportunities for pedestrian movements than Option B, lower cost and more aesthetically pleasing than Option C, and had more support from the public at the recent public meeting.
 7. The above screening process resulted in retaining the following alternatives:
 - a. Alternative 1 – Single bridge at existing location
 - b. Alternative 3 – Full bridge to Laurel; Option A for intersection
 - c. Alternative 4 – Two bridges, single connection to Grand Avenue
 - d. Alternative 6 – Couplet
 8. These alternatives were considered to provide a good mix of options with a range of trade-offs that can be developed further to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of these trade-offs.
 9. The PLT concurred that the screening process was followed appropriately and confirmed that the alternatives retained seemed reasonable. Therefore, Alternatives 1, 3, 4, and 6 will be carried forward to Level 3 Screening and will be presented to the public.
 10. There was an ensuing discussion about how important it is to communicate the process and the screening results to the public:
 - a. The project team will document the screening process in a report that will be available to the public. It will contain full detail on why alternatives were screened out and why the four were retained for further development and consideration.

- b. It is important to show the public that we are following the process, that there are a lot of people (consultant team, Project Working Group, the public) that are developing and providing input to the screening process, not just a small group of people making decisions in the dark behind closed doors.
- c. It is also important that the public understand the reasoning behind why certain alternatives were carried forward or eliminated. And, it is important to communicate this as quickly as possible. The PLT discussed developing a 1 to 2 page advertisement that will present the alternatives being carried forward in the screening process and why, and the alternatives that have been screened out and why. The newspaper requires a two-week advance notice to reserve space, and the electronic file needs to be transmitted two days prior to publication.
- d. It was also discussed that it would be very important and helpful to have a public meeting on this information followed-up by a debrief on the next day. Two additional public meetings were suggested – one on June 6th to coincide with the next SWG meeting and one near the middle to end of July.
- e. Other suggestions included:
 - i. Matrix: Organize it so that the alternatives appear from left to right, best to worst (those screened out would appear on the right side). Noting on the matrix what public input was used in the evaluation.
 - ii. Post the bridge rehabilitation report on web site.
 - iii. Provide enough detail to the public on why alternatives were screened out or retained, but keep it simple enough to understand.
 - iv. Press release to announce the results of Level 2 Screening.

NEXT STEPS:

1. Project team will develop more details on the four alternatives.

Attachments:

- ▶ PLT Presentation Slides
- ▶ Screening Matrix
- ▶ Sign-in sheet