



SH 82
GRAND AVENUE BRIDGE

AUGUST 22, 2012, PUBLIC OPEN HOUSE SUMMARY

Project: SH 82 Grand Avenue Bridge Environmental Assessment

Meeting: Public Open House
August 22, 2012

Study Team Attendees:

CDOT: Josh Cullen, Joe Elsen, Roland Wagner, Mike Vanderhoof
FHWA: Stephanie Gibson, Eva LaDow
Colorado Bridge Enterprise: Charlie Trujillo
Consultants: Craig Gaskill, Jim Clarke, George Tsiouvaras, Jeff Simmons, David Woolfall, Pat Noyes, Tom Newland, Terri Newland, Mary Speck, Sandy Beazley, Nitin Deshpande

DATE/TIME/LOCATION

August 22, 2012, from 5:00 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. at the Glenwood Springs Community Center. There was no formal presentation.

PURPOSE

To provide additional details on the alternatives and options that were still under evaluation and to gather public input on the public's concerns, issues, and ideas about them. After consideration of the input from this Public Open House, the study team planned to make a recommendation for the bridge alignment. The presentation, exhibits, and the study team provided:

- Project background information.
- Review of the alternatives evaluation process.
- Public input and criteria that have shaped the alternatives.
- Activities since the June 6 Public Open House.
- Results of Level 3 alternatives evaluation and screening.
- New information on:
 - Pedestrian/Bicycle Connections
 - Visual Simulations of View Points
 - Traffic Simulations of Intersection Options
 - South Side Pedestrian Connection Options

MEETING NOTICES

A display ad announcing the Public Open House was placed in the Glenwood Post Independent and Aspen Times on August 6 that included a contact number for Spanish speakers. A press release announcing the Public Open House was sent to the media distribution list on August 8. Accompanying information was distributed via GovDelivery, Facebook, and Twitter.

SH 82 Grand Avenue Bridge Environmental Assessment Summary of Public Open House Held August 22, 2012

Page 2

A briefing was held with the Glenwood Springs Post Independent on August 17. A reminder email was sent to the project contact list on August 20. Also on August 20, a press release to all media was sent out and an announcement was sent through CDOT's Govdelivery system.

A two-page 11- x 17-inch display ad was placed in the Glenwood Post Independent and The Aspen Times on August 20 that contained a reminder about the Public Open House and its purpose, a summary of the evaluation to date with next steps, key public information events since November 2011, a description of the new information that would be displayed, and examples of some of the visual exhibits.

MEETING FORMAT

Boards were displayed starting at 5:00 p.m., and the study team was available to answer questions. In addition to the board exhibits, traffic simulations of the north side intersection options and drive-through visual simulations of the alternatives were projected on screens.

Presentation Boards were as follows:

Project Background

1. Welcome
2. Purpose of Tonight's Public Open House
3. Project Overview/Project Background
4. Existing Bridge Conditions
5. Key Public Events/ Alternatives Evaluation Process
6. Key Ideas Received from the Public That Have Shaped the Alternatives
7. Criteria that Determined the Alternatives
8. Activities Since June 6 Public Open House

Alternatives

1. Alternative 1-A
2. Alternative 1-B
3. Alternative 3-A (Intersection Option A)
4. Alternative 3-D (Intersection Option D)
5. Alternative 3-E (Intersection Option E)
6. South Pedestrian Connection Options for Alternatives 1 and 3
7. Pedestrian Bridge Options for Alternatives 1 and 3
8. South Side Pedestrian Bridge Ramp Option for Alternatives 1 and 3

Visual Simulations

1. View from Downtown (Alternatives 1-A, 1-B, 3-A)
2. View from Hot Springs (Alternatives 1-A, 1-B)
3. View from Hot Springs (Alternatives 3-A, 3-D, 3-E)
4. Views from I-70 (Alternatives 1-A, 1-B)
5. Views from I-70 (Alternatives 3-A, 3-D, 3-E)
6. Views from 6th Street (Alternatives 3-A, 3-D, 3-E)
7. Views from 7th Street (Alternatives 1-A, 1-B)
8. Views from 7th Street (Alternatives 3-A, 3-D, 3-E)

SH 82 Grand Avenue Bridge Environmental Assessment Summary of Public Open House Held August 22, 2012

Page 3

Bicycle/Pedestrian Options

1. Alternative 3-A Bicycle/Pedestrian Options
2. Alternative 3-D Bicycle/Pedestrian Options
3. Alternative 3-E Bicycle/Pedestrian Options

Other Considerations for Evaluation

1. Other Considerations (Alternatives 1-A, 1-B, 3-A)
2. Other Considerations (Alternatives 3-D, 3-E)

Comments

1. We Still Need Your Feedback
2. Project Schedule/Next Steps for the Project Team/How You Can Keep Informed/Please Give Us Your Comments

Other

1. Colorado Bridge Enterprise
2. Thank You for Attending the Public Open House

NUMBER OF ATTENDEES

Approximately 90 people attended - a mixture of business and building owners, area residents, and public officials.

SUMMARY OF MEETING

The attendees at the meeting were very engaged. There was positive discussion surrounding concerns and ideas for the project. There were several opinions about preferences for an alignment alternative (Alternative 1 is on/near existing alignment and Alternative 3 touches down on the north at the 6th and Laurel intersection). The traffic and visual simulations helped many people better understand how the traffic flow would occur and what drivers and pedestrians would experience under each of the alternative configurations. Initial input was also received on what the pedestrian connection on the south side of the river could be and how the project could connect to existing bicycle and pedestrian routes. Three attendees submitted drawings.

The KREX television channel and the KMTS radio station conducted interviews with the study team during the Public Open House.

COMMENT FORMS

The Comment Form was designed to receive feedback on which alignment and which of the three intersection options for Alternative 3 best addressed certain criteria. (A copy of the Comment Form is attached.) There were 45 Comment Forms filled in and left by attendees the day of the Public Open House. There were an additional 3 forms submitted to the study team after the Open House.

All of the comments are recorded as part of the documentation for the NEPA process.

**SH 82 Grand Avenue Bridge Environmental Assessment
Summary of Public Open House Held August 22, 2012**

Page 4

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RECEIVED VIA COMMENT FORMS

Please refer to the actual Comment Form provided at the end of this document for the complete questions.

1. Differences Between the Alignments. Please indicate which alternative (1 or 3) best addresses the criteria categories provided.

	Alternative 1	Alternative 3	Unanswered
Traffic/access	4	30	14
Visual	5	26	15
Bike/ped	10	23	15
Land use	7	25	16

It was noted that the two alignments did not have a big differences related to the visual criteria.

Those who preferred Alternative 1 cited that it is simpler, keeps the existing traffic patterns, appears to have fewer impacts on businesses, and has lower costs and right-of-way needs.

Comments showed support for Alternative 3 because it creates a pleasant environment for pedestrian on 6th Street, it keeps traffic moving smoothly, it allows redevelopment options, and the bridge can be constructed off line, which minimizes impacts to businesses on the south side. One comment indicated that property acquisition was a concern with Alternative 3.

A few of those showing that Alternative 3 best addressed the criteria commented that it was the best of two undesirable options.

Some of those who left this question unanswered added comments indicating that neither alignment was acceptable, a bypass or moving traffic off of Grand Avenue needs to be considered, or the existing bridge could be rehabilitated. Concerns were expressed about construction impacts, negative effects on small businesses, cost, and the size of a replacement structure.

2. Differences Between the Alternative 3 Intersection Options. Which intersection option best addresses the criteria provided?

	Alternative 3-A	Alternative 3-D	Alternative 3-E	Unanswered
Traffic	25	4	2	17
Bike/ped	17	5	5	21
Visual/land use	16	4	2	24



SH 82 Grand Avenue Bridge Environmental Assessment Summary of Public Open House Held August 22, 2012

Page 5

Several of the Comment Forms returned did not have any checkmarks to answer this question.

17 of the Comment Forms indicated that one of the three options best met the criteria in all categories (most of them indicated Option 3-A best met the criteria).

Several indicated that 3-A or 3-E was better for traffic/access and visual/land use, but thought 3-D addressed the bike/pedestrian criteria better.

There were many written comments that were not specifically related to how the options met the criteria. They are summarized below.

In general:

- Observation that all options are still one lane merging onto I-70.
- All options will ruin businesses on 6th Street.
- Idea is to move traffic at the expense of pedestrians and bicycles. Look too big city. Options don't fit the outdoor activities focus of Glenwood Springs (moving cars).
- Didn't indicate best, but wanting to allow growth of businesses on 6th Street.
- Keep pedestrians away from the highway.
- Combine 3-A and 3-E for best bicycle use.

Support for 3-A

- Best blend of efficiency and aesthetics.
- Roundabout has potential to be a beautiful entryway to Glenwood Springs.
- Roundabout more modern and efficient.
- Preserves potential for a future bypass location. Simpler than the other options.

Comments on 3-D

- Less complicated than 3-A and 3-E more complicated than necessary.
- Questioned 3D as a safe, dependable option.

Those who indicated 3-D or 3-E best met the criteria noted the following about 3-A.

- 3-A has a confusing left hand turn.
- 3-A has lots of possible traffic movements. Snow-covered roads will make this difficult to maneuver. Would require lots of signage, which is potentially visually unattractive.
- 3-A has potential for traffic to back up in roundabout. Model needs to be adjusted to take into account all the traffic merging from hotels, gas station, businesses.

Comments on pedestrian connection on south side:

- Preference for pedestrian ramp at 7th Street because of lower impact to storefronts.
- Pedestrian ramp significantly lightens visual, physical, and psychological impact of the block between 7th and 8th Streets.

Ideas presented on the Comment Forms:

- Would like to see parking space leading to the pedestrian bridge.
- 6th and Laurel needs to be incorporated into any improvements.
- Keep bridge as low as possible to mitigate noise.
- Keep pedestrian bridge. It is an attraction and provides a critical link across the river.



SH 82 Grand Avenue Bridge Environmental Assessment Summary of Public Open House Held August 22, 2012

Page 6

- Keep existing bridge and convert it to a pedestrian or bicycle bridge with connection to Wing Street.
- Create a pedestrian walkway between the Hot Springs Pool and gas stations.
- What would happen with the existing 6th and Grand intersection?
- Concern that bridge will be icy and people will slide through the lights.
- Make sure those on south side have bike access to the Hot Springs.

SH 82 Grand Avenue Bridge Environmental Assessment

Public Open House, Wednesday, August 22, 2012

COMMENT FORM

Differences Between the Alignments.

Please indicate which alternative (1 or 3) best addresses the criteria categories below.

	<u>Alternative 1:</u> <u>Bridge at existing</u> <u>location aligned to Pine</u>	<u>Alternative 3:</u> <u>Bridge aligned to Exit</u> <u>116/Laurel/6th</u>
Traffic and Access:		
• North side traffic circulation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• North side bike and pedestrian circulation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Volume of SH 82 traffic on 6 th Street	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Hot Springs pool parking access	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Access to and from I-70	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Visual:		
• View from the Hot Springs Pool	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• View from downtown	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• View from I-70	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bike/Pedestrian:		
• Ability to accommodate bikes and pedestrians	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Compatibility with bike network	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Land Use:		
• Development opportunities in 6th Street area	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Impacts to businesses	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (please describe below)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please provide any additional comments on the advantages you see for either alternative

Differences Between the Alternative 3 Intersection Options.

There are three options for the intersection at Exit 116/Laurel/6th.
Please choose one option that best addresses the criteria below.

	Option 3A : Roundabout at 6 th /Laurel	Option 3D: T-intersection at 6th/Pine	Option 3E: Local access intersection to 6th
Traffic and Access:			
• Traffic flow/ minimized delay			
• Ease of navigation			
• Minimized out-of-direction travel	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Traffic safety			
• Access to downtown			
• Access to the hotel area			
• Access to the Hot Springs Pool			
Bike/Pedestrian:			
• Pedestrian safety			
• Bicycle safety	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Connectivity to existing and planned networks			
Visual and Land Use:			
• View from Hot Springs Pool	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Compatibility with community			
Other (please describe below)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please provide any explanation or additional comments on the options.

Please leave completed comment sheet in the drop box located at the exit/entrance. You may also submit comments by August 31, 2012, via mail, email, or fax. If you submit comments other than on this form, please indicate that they are related to information from this Public Open House.

- **Mail** your comments to: Joe Elsen, CDOT, 202 Centennial Street, Glenwood Springs, CO 81601.
- **Email** your comments to: Joseph.Elsen@dot.state.co.us.
- **Fax** your comments to: Joe Elsen at 970.947.5133.

Please provide your email or mailing address to be notified of project updates and meeting:

Name: _____

E-mail: _____

Address: _____