



SH 82
GRAND AVENUE BRIDGE

FINAL Meeting Minutes

Project: CDOT Region 3 – SH 82 Grand Avenue Bridge

Purpose: PLT Meeting #12

Date Held: June 15, 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
Glenwood Springs Chamber:	Suzanne Stewart
Colorado Bridge Enterprise:	Charlie Trujillo
Jacobs:	Craig Gaskill, Mary Speck
Pitkin County:	Brian Pettet
TSH:	David Woolfall, George Tsiovavaras
Glenwood Hot Springs:	Kjell Mitchell
Historic Preservation Commission:	Gretchen Ricehill
Downtown Development Authority:	Leslie Bethel
Newland Project Resources:	Tom Newland

Copies: PLT Members, Other Attendees, File

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION:

INTRODUCTIONS

UPDATES

Public Involvement

1. Last week, Public Open House, meetings with City Council and Board of County Commissioners, and the Hot Springs Board.
2. Scheduled meetings – Colorado Mountain College, Glenwood Springs Chamber, Colorado National Bank, and Louis Meyer.
3. Tom Newland is scheduling follow-up meetings with civic groups he met with earlier in the process.

4. Discussions last week about what is most effective to communicate project information. The project team is changing the way we're communicating as we get feedback. The process is flexible and dynamic. Current approach involves:
 - a. Focus on the newspaper.
 - i. The project is publishing weekly FAQs in the newspaper for the next 15 weeks.
 - 1/8 page ad with questions/answers published. Consider developing an FAQ about information in the City's Comprehensive Plan.
 - ii. More one-page ads about alternatives and other topics.
 - b. Continue to populate website.
 - i. Modify so information is easier to find.
 - ii. It is possible to provide a link from our website to YouTube to post videos. Traffic simulations will be posted there as soon as they are ready.
5. Tom Newland is working with Brian Pettet to draft an open letter from PLT to address perception that the process is moving too fast and that decisions are being made behind closed doors.
6. Flyers will be made to leave at Chamber, Colorado Mountain College, businesses, City Hall, County Building, etc. Important to include a date on them and keep current. Suzanne would support getting these out.
7. Will use the email list from Public Open Houses and other emails we've received.
8. Will also start posting new information through GovDelivery.
9. The project will have a booth at Strawberry Days weekend of June 15 to 18. Also trying a space at the Tuesday Market. Will evaluate after first time to gauge interest.
10. Desire to get results of Level 3A screening out quickly, perhaps through use of full page newspaper ad and press release.

Engineering

1. Value Engineering (more of an Independent Peer Review) is being held June 26 to 28.
2. 2-1/2 days, 7 people attending, including Harry Jasper from Vail (Bridge), Bill Hinton (Construction Expert), Terri Partch (City of Glenwood Springs Engineer).
3. Objective: How can we maximize alternatives for project goals and the purpose and need; other items to improve the alternatives?
4. Presentation to project team Thursday morning. There is a PWG meeting scheduled that afternoon to decide how to use the information. PLT is invited to attend.
5. One question: Would this VE happen again? The answer depends on the delivery method, with a traditional design-bid-build, a project of this size would require a formal value engineering session. However, the project team has completed a preliminary project



delivery selection process and determined that CM/GC would be the most appropriate delivery method.

- a. Under this method, the contractor is selected based on best value and is brought on board before design is done so there is opportunity to conduct “value engineering” with the design team, making another VE much less likely. One of the advantages is that there is much tighter control over construction phasing, which can minimize impacts to the public.
6. Question: Is there opportunity for subcontractor bidding? Can there be local involvement for subs, smaller local firms? Answer: The team is part of selection process and scoring is on project team and capabilities. CDOT requires 30% of project be subcontracted so there is opportunity for smaller local firms.

LEVEL 3-A SCREENING RESULTS

1. Alternative 1 – Carried Forward
 - a. Alternative 1A: Keep existing pedestrian bridge, no sidewalk on bridge north of railroad.
 - b. Alternative 1B: Remove pedestrian bridge, pedestrians/bikes on new bridge.
2. Alternative 3 – Carried Forward
 - a. Alternative 3A: SH 82 separated from 6th Street traffic, plus local roundabout, as modified based on public meeting input.
 - b. Alternative 3D: SH 82 separated from 6th Street traffic, plus T intersection at 6th and Pine.
 - c. Alternative 3E: SH 82 separated from 6th Street traffic, plus more direct 6th Street connection, connection to River Road.
3. South Pedestrian Connection Options Added (Apply to both Alternatives 1 & 3)
 - a. Attach 10' Sidewalk to bridge between the railroad and 8th (11' Lanes)
 - b. Attach 6' sidewalk to bridge between the railroad and 8th, 4' shoulder for bikes
 - c. No attached sidewalk between 7th and 8th, optimize pedestrian bridge option (pedestrian ramps and/or stairs combined beside or beneath the new bridge)
4. Alternative 4 – Screened Out
 - a. Similar impacts to Alternative 3, without traffic benefits, and no pedestrian benefits. This alternative also has fewer opportunities for aesthetics due to the two bridges.
5. Alternative 6 – Screened Out.
 - a. Residential impacts, circulation impacts, worse traffic operations than Alts 1 or 3.
 - b. Downtown parking impacts, low public acceptance, worse historic impacts.
 - c. Phasing opportunities no better than Alts 1 & 3 when A.B.C. is considered.



- d. Less opportunities for aesthetics

SECTION 106 AND 4(F)

1. At the PWG meeting held the previous day, Jim Clarke had provided an update on impacts to historic properties for Alternatives 1, 3, 4, 6. The impacts are being researched early in the process because they can influence the alternatives evaluation/screening. Impacts to historic resources are factored in as a criterion and will be looked at in increasing level of detail.
 - a. Orange properties are listed or eligible properties that are covered by section 106 and 4f.
 - b. Green properties are being evaluated.
 - c. For all practical purposes orange and green should be considered the same for purposes of evaluation.
 - d. Each of the alternatives was overlayed on the properties to investigate impacts.
2. Alternative 6 showing the most Adverse Effects.

ALTERNATIVE 3A REFINEMENT

1. Looked at several more alternatives for Alternative 3 (creating an interchange accessing a local street):
 - a. 3A (modified based on input received at Public Open House).
 - i. Original alternative relocated River Road to 6th/Pine. Revised connects to the new local access to U.S. 6 and 6th Street.
 - ii. Full acquisition of Shell Station.
 - iii. One comment was to send pedestrians along the KUM-N-GO (north) side of the street.
 - iv. Feedback from public is that the configuration as shown is confusing. As a result the roundabout has been reconfigured to make it easier to understand.
 - b. 3D developed since Public Open House.
 - i. Origin was to see if Shell Station could be saved. Off ramp has to get pushed closer to I-70, right turns for trucks squeezed to a minimum; there is an intersection on the middle of the bridge – connects to Pine. Local access would connect here and use 6th Street. 9,000 vpd.
 - Feedback from Shell – access closed, partial property take – still functions, but not desirable. Feedback from Shell owner is that he'd rather have his property entirely taken, and not partially.
 - ii. Wider structure over river to accommodate turn lanes.
 - iii. Creates a "T" connection onto the bridge from local 6th traffic.
 - iv. Ability to make bridge aesthetically pleasing is greatly reduced.



- c. 3E developed since Open House
 - i. Takes the Shell Station and Dairy Crème.
 - ii. Simplifies 6th Street local connection.
 - iii. Adds SH 92 access to River Road connection to south side.
 - iv. Potential property trade for former north abutment area.
 - v. Discussion with the Hot Springs Pool Board and access. 3A and 3E are favorable because they allow River Road access to Pool. New local connection would make U.S. 6 the through road. A similar intersection is in Glenwood Springs at SH 82 and Blake with McDonalds and parking lot.
 - vi. Additional information needs:
 - Check size for trucks. Truckers will need to adapt to new access.
 - Need to compare D with A and E. Access to River Road and back to the Pool – traffic volume of turn is moved from intersection.

PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE CONNECTIONS

- 1. At the south end of the bridge several options are available and applicable to all alternatives; the ultimate solution could be a combination of these.
 - a. 1: 9' or 10' sidewalk on east side of new road bridge, 8th to UPRR.
 - b. 2: Single long ramp along 7th toward train depot – jogs to prevent skateboarders from picking up speed.
 - c. 3: Stacked ramps at end of pedestrian bridge, north or south of 7th. Visually not appealing.
 - d. 4: Spiral or segmented ramp, north or south of 7th.
 - e. 5: Elevator or similar vertical mechanical device. Initial feedback from public is this is not a favorable option.
 - f. 6: Connect to planned County parking garage from west side of bridge. This is difficult – and relies on a non-committed project (parking garage).
- 2. The project team will look at options to tuck in the pedestrian facility under the new bridge. Goal to minimize width of bridge between 7th and 8th. Still need to get clearance over 7th and land on Grand Ave. or 7th. Using 5% max grade, steeper with landings is possible but probably won't shorten length of ramp by much.
- 3. There is currently no bicycle traffic on pedestrian bridge.
- 4. Question: What criteria do you use to decide on role of existing pedestrian bridge? Answer: Impacts to properties, visual impacts, etc. Need to decide about existing ped bridge thru NEPA- if there is a big impact, don't want to get to a decision document without previously evaluating.



5. Some additional improvements around bridge project could be done by the bridge contractor if there were economic savings; funding would be from local sources and identified through an Intergovernmental Agreement.
6. Amtrak – wants to make improvements to their ADA access improvements.

PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION ON NORTH SIDE

1. ADA requirement – a cross walk across two lanes or more requires active control – signal.
2. Alternatives 1 and 6 are the same at the Pine Street intersection.
 - a. 6th and Laurel wouldn't change – there will be new CDOT signals.
3. Alternatives 3A, 3D, and 3E
 - a. Alternatives 3A and 3E could have a sidewalk along the north edge of the bridge and keep the existing pedestrian bridge. An option to remove the existing pedestrian bridge and incorporate pedestrian functions into the new bridge. There is concern about having pedestrian functions close to highway traffic.
 - b. Alternative 3D would more likely use the existing pedestrian bridge as the alignment is closer. A pedestrian crossing at the new local access intersection would not be as preferable as routing pedestrians under the local access connection to tie to the existing system.
4. Alternative 4
 - a. Could have sidewalks on both sides. Is similar to Alternatives 1 and 6 along 6th Street.
5. On all alternatives – At the River Road connection – need to cross several lanes of traffic.

CONCEPT DESIGN COMPARISON

1. Grade, profile – similar for all alternatives
2. Bridge Deck Area
 - a. One consideration for cost. Alternative 1 – 30% less. Hardest to phase, which might offset that cost.
3. Don't know bridge type, which could change cost.
4. Alternative 6 worst for all variables. One-way roads aren't more efficient because you've got traffic on additional roads.
5. Alternative 3 is best related to concept design

TRAFFIC MEASURES COMPARISON

1. Alternative 6 performs the worst (delay) in both AM and PM.
2. Alternative 3D is best in the AM.
3. Alternative 3A is mostly best in the PM.



PHASING CONCEPTS

1. The project team is starting to look at several options to begin to determine which are suited for which alternative and the relative length of time required for each concept.
2. Alternative 1 can be phased with more concepts because it's straight.

ALTERNATIVE ROUTES/CONCEPTS

1. The project team has drawn the lines on an aerial to illustrate the various alternative route options that have been considered or talked about. This is to more accurately assess if any of them meet project Purpose and Need, Goals, and Criteria. These will be evaluated for review by the PWG.

DDA PROPOSAL FOR SKETCH ARTIST

1. Joe, Roland and Craig met with Leslie and she has solicited a proposal from an urban design sketch artist to consider urban design and neighborhood opportunities for the whole area on both sides of the bridge. The sketch artist would create several plan views and a range of options including land use and how this neighborhood could operate. The proposal included a public process to vet the alternatives. The process would be complete by the end of July.
2. A packet was sent to the DDA Board, and Leslie is getting positive feedback on the proposal. This needs to be approved by the board prior to initiating the work
3. Ongoing coordination with the Access Control Plan is important.
4. Discussion related to how to present this to the public.

NEXT STEPS:

1. Develop plan for communicating Level 3A evaluation results.
2. Finalize open letter from PLT.
3. Continue Level 3 evaluation.
4. Finalize schedule for sketch artist workshop if approved.

Attachments:

- ▶ PLT Presentation Slides
- ▶ Sign-in sheet

