

## FINAL Meeting Minutes

**Project:** CDOT Region 3 – SH 82 Grand Avenue Bridge

**Purpose:** Project Leadership Team Meeting #20

**Date/Time:** Wednesday, November 22; 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

**Location:** CDOT Region 3 Glenwood (Maintenance Video Conference Room), Golden and Conference Call

**Attendees:**

<b>CDOT:</b>	Joe Elsen, Josh Cullen, Mike Vanderhoof, Nancy Shanks, Tracy Trulove
<b>Colorado Bridge Enterprise:</b>	Matt Cirulli (phone)
<b>Jacobs:</b>	Mary Speck (phone)
<b>TSH:</b>	Craig Gaskill, George Tsiouvaras (phone)
<b>City of Glenwood Springs:</b>	Bruce Christensen, Shelley Kaup
<b>Planning and Zoning Commission:</b>	Kathy Trauger
<b>Eagle County:</b>	Eva Wilson (phone)
<b>Glenwood Springs Chamber Resort:</b>	Suzanne Stewart
<b>Historic Preservation Commission:</b>	Gretchen Ricehill
<b>Pitkin County:</b>	Brian Pettet
<b>Downtown Development Authority:</b>	Leslie Bethel
<b>Newland Project Resources:</b>	Tom Newland
<b>Pat Noyes and Assoc.:</b>	Pat Noyes
<b>Granite/RLW</b>	Casey Green

**Copies:** PLT Members, PWG Members, Other Attendees, File

---

## SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

### INTRODUCTIONS

1. Introduced Kathy Trauger as new PLT member.
  - a. Representing City of Glenwood Springs Planning & Zoning Commission.
  - b. Nomination received strong support from existing PLT members.
2. Introduced Tracy Trulove as new Region 3 Public Information Manager. Tracy is a business owner in Glenwood Springs with a shop on Grand Avenue between 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> Street. 970-366-2502 cell.

## Final Meeting Minutes

### SH 82 Grand Avenue Bridge EA - PLT Meeting #20

November 22, 2013

Page 2 of 4

---

## STAKEHOLDER WORKING GROUP MEETING (NOVEMBER 21) DEBRIEF

1. Primary purpose of the meeting was to provide project update as it had been several months since the last meeting. 25 people signed in.
2. Key updates included the following: 6<sup>th</sup> and Laurel intersection, Grand Avenue Bridge type, pier locations across river and at the southern end of the bridge, ramp/elevator status, trail underpass, and bike/pedestrian connections.
3. There was no particular information we wanted input on during the project update, but the project team took input on several subjects, as follows:
  - a. Suggestion to consider evening meeting, rather than during the day.
  - b. Comment that average citizen really doesn't know what's going on with the project.
  - c. Comment that City Planning & Zoning presentation on November 19 was great. Suggest putting that on grassroots TV, with a narrated PowerPoint. Tom Newland will check into this.
  - d. Consider a different view of the 6<sup>th</sup> and Laurel intersection, as a driver or pedestrian, rather than from up above. Requested we show the various paths that vehicles can take from different origins and destinations. Maybe consider pedestrian paths too.
  - e. Input on cross-section of 6<sup>th</sup> Street. It's wide enough to carry lots of people. Make that area attractive so people will go there. We're a bike capital - make 6<sup>th</sup> Street wide enough to use bikes.
  - f. Comment that community doesn't know what's going on. Some feel they are not being included. Let people know, including the common public. Consider a strategic insert in local paper.
  - g. Comment that business owners not informed - but manager had been informed.
  - h. Noted misinformation - businesses closed during construction. Citizens to Save Grand Avenue group misinformed on this information and not up to date.
  - i. Be repetitive, put it out there. There will always be someone who doesn't know because they are uninformed. Challenge to communicate with people not connected with technology.
4. SWG also provided input on what they would like to see to help the decision process on design details. This information was summarized and will be used as input.

## DECISION PROCESS DISCUSSION

1. Roles of the various groups were discussed regarding decision making
2. One of the roles of the PLT is to enable decision making while the SWG and City Council (Council) provide input to the decision making process. The PWG takes that input and provides recommendations of the decisions. The CM/GC group provides input into the

construction. The decisions are made by FHWA and CDOT as part of the approval process.

3. In the case of the elevator/ramp decision, Council has an additional role as a decision to choose an elevator would require Council approval on both funding and liability.
4. The project decision making has moved from Environmental Assessment decisions to design decisions. A question was raised to the PLT if there were still concurrence of the PLT role in the decision making process. The PLT reconfirmed their role.
5. **Task Force:** Because of the current challenge with developing a supported recommendation on the elevator/ramp decision, the PLT decided to set up a Task Force for the purpose of supporting the elevator/ramp decision making process. This task force would help the Council and PWG provide needed input and recommendations.
  - a. The task force would include members of the PLT who would hold a workshop to review new information comparing ramp and elevator options as requested by Council. The Task Force would review the information provided by various sources, including the project team, the DDA, and City staff; address inconsistencies; and format it in a manner that best provides comparative information to facilitate the decision process. This information would be packaged into a Council packet for Council review and action.
  - b. The Task Force agreed to meet on December 10 at 9 a.m. The meeting is scheduled for 6 hours to provide enough time to complete the task.
  - c. Pat Noyes would facilitate the Task Force and would be supported by PWG members and other agency and consultant members needed to support the information being provided.
6. Information from Council could provide clear direction to PWG in terms of recommendation. For example, if Council provides a strong direction for a ramp, PWG has already indicated they would concur and formalize this recommendation.

## **RAMP/ELEVATOR DISCUSSION**

1. Input to the elevator/ramp discussion ensued:
  - a. Costs previously presented may not be accurately represented. New information is being provided on costs.
  - b. FHWA has website information supporting an elevator over a long ramp.
  - c. Recognition that there are many different sources of costs. Concern these are evaluated and understood on how applicable.
  - d. Noted a difference in opinion between CDOT ADA experts and other ADA experts on what ADA requirements and needs area.
  - e. Noted that there has been a lot of public input but not necessarily on the same design. There have been various ramp designs presented.
  - f. The current ramp design is based on this input and is different still.

- g. Desire to have existing view and views with ramp and elevator options. Confirmed that this is being developed.
- h. Concern that an Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) between the City and CDOT would have unreasonable options. If there is an IGA, this will need to be worked out.
- i. There are several scenarios on how the Council might move forward:
  - i. If Council recommends elevator only, Council would need to sign an IGA agreeing to take responsibility for ADA access, and agree to pay for any capital costs beyond the cost of the ramp.
  - ii. If Council recommends ramp only, this IGA would not be required.
  - iii. If Council recommends both an elevator and a ramp, Council would need to agree to pay for and own the elevator.
  - iv. If Council recommends two elevators, Council would need to sign an IGA agreeing to take responsibility for ADA access, and agree to pay for any capital costs beyond the cost of the ramp.
- j. Project team is providing information for Council discussion:
  - i. Renderings for double elevator with sizes; ramp option; ramp and elevator option.
  - ii. Information on Operation & Maintenance costs.
  - iii. Range of capital costs (better number).
  - iv. Pros and cons (blue book) with where information came from.
- k. Maybe need to separate bikes from pedestrians? Transportation Commission had concerns about mixing bikes and pedestrians. To separate them would require a wider bridge. The current design is 60% wider than existing.
- l. What is really required as redundancy?
  - i. CDOT is taking a conservative approach in that bus bridge would be required with a 30 minute maximum down time. This is still being discussed.
- m. Need to define what the IGA will consist of. This is being prepared.

## **VALUE ENGINEERING RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 1. Some of the VE recommendations were discussed:
  - a. Consider a single column on the pedestrian bridge rather than double. Architect input is that single column would not flow well with canopy structures above the bridge.
  - b. Consider a variable depth girder over the railroad to lower the profile and reduce costs of piers. This will be looked at by the project team, but it could affect clearance downtown under bridge and could add cost to that girder.