

FINAL Meeting Minutes

Project: CDOT Region 3 – SH 82 Grand Avenue Bridge

Purpose: Project Leadership Team Meeting #22

Date/Time: Wednesday, July 23; 1:30 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Location: Grand Avenue Bridge PLT Project Update Conference Call Meeting

Attendees:	CDOT:	Joe Elsen, Roland Wagner, Mike Vanderhoof
	Colorado Bridge Enterprise:	Matt Cirulli
	TSH:	George Tsiouvaras
	Glenwood Springs City Council:	Bruce Christensen
	City of Glenwood Springs:	Kathy Trauger
	Glenwood Springs Chamber:	Suzanne Stewart
	Glenwood Hot Springs:	Kjell Mitchell
Downtown Development Authority:		Leslie Bethel
	Granite/RLW:	Rich Henderson
	Newland Project Resources:	Tom Newland (partial)
	Pat Noyes and Assoc.:	Pat Noyes
	Interested Citizen:	Dave Sturges

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

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

INTRODUCTIONS

PROJECT UPDATE

1. A one-page letter to the PLT related to the current funding challenges was circulated via email and discussed. General message is that the 30 percent opinion of probable construction cost (OPCC) pricing, in conjunction with increased recent estimate projections for right-of-way and utilities, has pushed the project cost higher than the approximate \$99M value that the Colorado Bridge Enterprise Board has allocated to this project. The concept to address this shortfall is as follows:
 - a. Continue to work closely with construction manager/general contractor (CMGC) and our Independent Cost Estimator (ICE) to ensure that the scope, quantities, and approach to pricing is accurate; contractor price needs to be within 5 percent to award a construction contract.

FINAL Meeting Minutes
SH 82 Grand Avenue Bridge EA - PLT Meeting #22

July 23, 2014

Page 2 of 2

- b. Bring additional revenue into the project using a variety of sources: local governments, InterMountain Transportation Planning Region (IMTPR) allocations for Regional Priority Programs (RPP) or FASTER Program, federal programs, Department of Local Affairs (DOLA), Federal Mineral Lease District (FMLD), etc.
 - c. If items (a) and/or (b) cannot address the challenge, then it will be necessary to decrease the scope of the project.
 2. Discussion ensued on what the process would be to cut the project scope, if necessary, and how this will be developed. The main focus in the short term is on items (a) and (b) above. The scope cutting process will involve stakeholder input to be successful because it has the potential to change the environmental document and to reduce local support for the project.
 3. A comment was made that any significant decrease in the “aesthetic quality” would compromise the credibility of the team and the process.
 4. A question on item (c) above (scope change), was related to “who will ultimately decide” – this will require input by the project team, and we will solicit public comment during this period. The project team will make a recommendation to our Regional Director, Chief Engineer, and the Executive Director on how to move forward. This will also involve coordination with FHWA.
 5. A discussion on the Environmental Assessment (EA) status indicated that the process has slowed down until we can gain further information on funding and whether certain project elements should be considered as “design options” instead of project elements or mitigation.
 6. Further discussion focused on item (b) above (bringing in additional revenue). FHWA “TIGER” grants could be an option, and the “Transportation Alternatives Program” (TAP), which is essentially what the former “Enhancements” program is now called. This program contains Bike/Pedestrian, Cultural and Historic categories that could be applicable to Grand Avenue Bridge components; a significant downside to this funding is the extremely close deadline (August 1, 2014), essentially eight days to submit, and the likelihood of being able to have time to develop the application language and exhibits, and the ability to commit to the 20 percent “match” is slim. An attempt will be made by the Downtown Development Authority (DDA) to target an application for the stone veneer finishes and red roof elements that were previously envisioned to be historic mitigation elements.
 7. Discussion was held on the 8th Street Detour plans in relation to the City of Glenwood Springs’ 8th Street Connection project. The most recent City Council Workshop on this resulted in a “decoupling” of the two projects due to uncertainty in alignment (three alignments still being evaluated – two fall outside of the EA study area) and local funding. The 60 percent plan set for the bridge project shows a shallow cut that will meet the original intent of the City Council to have the detoured SH 82 traffic returned to the Grand Avenue corridor in the 8th Street and 9th Street area (versus travelling down Midland Avenue to the 27th Street roundabout and bridge). This is helpful to the cost overrun issue, but does not significantly help the City to implement their long term goal.
 8. The meeting was concluded just after 3 pm.