SH 82
GRAND AVENUE BRIDGE

JANUARY 9, 2013, PUBLIC OPEN HOUSE SUMMARY

Project:	SH 82 Grand Avenue Bridge Environmental Assessment
Meeting:	Public Open House January 9, 2012

Study Team Attendees:

CDOT:	Josh Cullen, Joe Elsen, Roland Wagner, Mike Vanderhoof
Colorado Bridge Enterprise:	Ken Szeliga
Consultants:	Craig Gaskill, Jim Clarke, George Tsiouvaras, Jeff Simmons, David Woolfall, Pat Noyes, Tom Newland, Mary Speck, Misty Swan

DATE/TIME/LOCATION
January 9, 2013, from 5:00 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. at the Glenwood Springs Community Center.

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. There was updated information on bridge type options under consideration for the Grand Avenue Bridge and a new pedestrian bridge that can also accommodate bicycles, construction traffic impacts, and pedestrian and bicycle connections. Information was also available on related projects (Grand Avenue bypass/alternate route and CDOT's Access Control Plan).

After consideration of the input from this Public Open House, the study team planned to make recommendations for the highway bridge type and narrow the options for a pedestrian bridge type; and for a pedestrian/bicycle connection on the north side and south side of the river.

The presentation, exhibits, and the study team provided:

- Project background information.
- Updates since the August 22 Public Open House.
- Background and results of completed alternatives evaluation
- Alternatives and options still under consideration.
- Results of the bridge type alternatives evaluation and screening.
- New information on:
    - Pedestrian Bridge Type Options
    - Pedestrian/Bicycle Connection Options (North and South Sides)
    - Renderings of the Highway and Pedestrian Bridges from the East and West
    - Constructability and Traffic Impacts During Construction
    - Next Steps in the Process

MEETING NOTICES
The Public Open House was first announced in a CDOT press release and Govdelivery post on December 12, followed by a related article in the Glenwood Springs Post Independent. CDOT

sent out a Govdelivery post on December 20. Also, email and mailed reminders were sent to the project contact lists on December 20. A display ad announcing the Public Open House was placed in The Aspen Times on December 21 that included a contact number for Spanish speakers.

A briefing was held with the Glenwood Springs Post Independent on January 4. On January 7, a study team member was interviewed on the local radio station, KMTS; a reminder email was sent to the project contact lists; and CDOT sent out a reminder on Govdelivery.

A one-page 11- x 17-inch display ad was placed in the Glenwood Springs Post Independent and The Aspen Times on January 7 that contained a reminder about the Public Open House and its purpose, a description of the information that would be displayed, conversation circle topics, examples of some of the visual exhibits, and upcoming dates on the project schedule.

The Glenwood Springs Post Independent and The Aspen Times ran articles about the upcoming Open House on January 8.

MEETING FORMAT
Exhibit boards were displayed starting at 5:00 p.m., and the study team was available to answer questions. A list of exhibits is below.

In addition to the board exhibits, Conversation Circles located throughout the exhibits created the opportunity for group discussion on specific topics and direct feedback to the study team. Attendees could participate or listen in at one or more of the Conversation Circles. Each Conversation Circle overview and discussion started every half-hour at 5:15 p.m., 5:45 p.m., 6:15 p.m., and 6:45 p.m. The agenda was an Overview Presentation (5 to 10 minutes) by study team members, followed by a Group Discussion (15 to 20 minutes). Attendees could continue a discussion past the half-hour, by staying through the next overview presentation and participating in the discussion that followed. A summary of comments received during each Conversation Circle is provided later in this document.

Exhibits were as follows:

Project Background

1. Welcome
2. Purpose of Tonight's Public Open House
3. Please Join Our Conversation Circles
4. Project Overview/Project Background
5. Existing Bridge Conditions
6. Key Public Events/Alternatives Evaluation Process
7. Updates Since August 22 Public Open House – Evaluations Completed
8. 6th & Laurel Signalized Intersection

Alternatives

1. Evaluations In Progress
2. Grand Avenue Bridge Types Evaluated and Screened Out
3. Potential Bicycle/Pedestrian Connections – South Side
4. Potential Bicycle/Pedestrian Connections – North Side

Pedestrian Bridge Type Options

1. Conversation Circle Agenda
2. Context Statement and Critical Success Factors.
3. Pedestrian Bridge Type Options
4. Additional Pedestrian Bridge Type Options
5. Photo Locations for Renderings
6. Visual Renderings Views from West
    - Existing Grand Avenue Bridge and Existing Pedestrian Bridge
    - 3-span Haunched Girder Grand Avenue Bridge + Through Arch Pedestrian Bridge
    - 5-Span Haunched Girder Grand Avenue Bridge + Through Arch Pedestrian Bridge
    - Constant Depth Grand Avenue Bridge + Through Arch Pedestrian Bridge
7. Visual Renderings Views from East
    - Views from Existing Grand Avenue Bridge and Existing Pedestrian Bridge
    - 5-Span Haunched Girder Grand Avenue Bridge + Through Arch Pedestrian Bridge
    - 5-Span Haunched Girder Grand Avenue Bridge + Cable Stay/Slant Leg Pedestrian Bridge
    - 5-Span Haunched Girder Grand Avenue Bridge + Longer Through Arch Pedestrian Bridge
    - 5-Span Haunched Girder Grand Avenue Bridge + Sydney Arch Pedestrian Bridge
    - 5-Span Haunched Girder Grand Avenue Bridge + Single Tower Cable Stay Pedestrian Bridge

Constructability and Traffic Impacts

1. Conversation Circle Agenda
2. Construction Phasing
3. Constructability and Traffic Impacts – Full Closure – Detour Route and Modifications
4. Constructability and Traffic Impacts – Full Closure – Traffic Information

Roadmap for Bypass Study

1. Conversation Circle Agenda
2. Bypass FAQ
3. Roadmap to Initiating the Process for a Bypass
4. Area Map

Environmental Assessment

1. Environmental Resources
2. Environmental Assessment Process

Schedule/Comments

1. Upcoming Milestones
2. When Will a Contractor be Selected?
3. 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 162 people attended - a mixture of business and building owners, area residents, general contractors and consulting firms, and public officials.

SUMMARY OF MEETING
The attendees at the meeting were very engaged and most of them participated in at least one of the Conversation Circles. There was positive discussion surrounding concerns and ideas for the project. There wasn't a consensus on the preference for bridge types, although most thought that the pedestrian bridge could be the bridge with more aesthetic treatments. The renderings of potential two new bridges from two viewpoints helped the public see what they might look like in the context of the existing environment. There was a strong desire to have both bridges compatible with their historic surroundings. There was a lot of interest shown in the potential detour route that was presented, with several attendees provided good suggestions about how to reduce the traffic volumes during the detour and give travelers options to driving through the area. Attendees also had the opportunity to ask questions about the process to support a bypass project or alternate route.

Representatives from CDOT's ongoing Access Control Plan were present to answer questions and concerns. Attendees submitted separate comments to include in that process.

There also was a box to collect questions for the Grand Avenue Bridge Ask the Experts panel, sponsored by the Glenwood Springs Chamber that was to be held on January 10.

COMMENT FORMS
The Comment Form was designed to receive feedback on bridge types, pedestrian connections, and traffic impacts during construction. (A copy of the Comment Form is attached.) There were 18 Comment Forms filled in and left by attendees the day of the Public Open House. There were an additional 1 form submitted to the study team after the Open House.

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

Summary of Comments Received Via Comment Forms
The actual Comment Form is provided at the end of this document.

Which pedestrian bridge types best fit with the Grand Avenue Bridge? (Referencing the bridge types drawn in stick form on one of the exhibit boards.) If there are other types you would like to have considered, please describe or draw.

Of those who answered, Option 1 was favored (Sydney Harbor bridge type). Options 1 through 6 were mentioned most frequently. Comments were that Option 1 fits best with downtown building types; an asymmetrical cable stayed bridge may be more modern than the historic characteristics surrounding it; and a tied arch or basket handle tied arch needs to be the correct scale so the vertical scale is not out of proportion to its span. The haunched girder or a constant depth girder would match the vehicular bridge, complement Glenwood Canyon bridge, and reduce blockage of view sheds. There were no others suggested or drawn; however, examples of good bridges included the Speer Boulevard bridges near Confluence Park in Denver and the Missouri River bridge in Omaha.

Should the pedestrian bridge include stronger aesthetic elements or fewer than the Grand Avenue Bridge?

Of those who answered, most were supportive of the pedestrian bridge having stronger aesthetic treatments. Reasons given for this were to encourage more people (both local and tourist) to use the bridge; it would lessen the impact of the Grand Avenue Bridge on the natural environment; and an iconic bridge worthy of a postcard could be the new symbol for Glenwood Springs; it is the first structure seen by eastbound motorists; pedestrians on the bridge would experience the aesthetic elements up close; and cost was assumed to be lower for aesthetics on this bridge. Comments included that the bridge not look like Denver, that unnecessary superstructure be avoided; that the bridge have a classic style with a lower profile, in harmony with the city's historic image; and the selected style should not be the most exotic looking, the most expense, or the highest-maintenance option.

Suggestions for aesthetic treatments were those that already exist in Glenwood Springs (canyon rock formations, Amtrak pergolas, Colorado Hotel, existing I-70 highway tunnel passes, friendly railings, bulb-outs to take pedestrians out of the way of bikers and through traffic); and that the bridge have visibility-friendly railings. There was one comment that supported keeping the existing bridge.

It was mentioned the highway bridge should be functional and both bridges need to reflect historic elements; and there is a desire to maintain continuity of Glenwood Canyon (constant depth).

Please indicate which pedestrian bridge connection best addresses the criteria shown.

South Side
Of those who answered, most favored Option 2 (new sidewalk along Grand Ave. between railroad and 8th). Suggestions were made for a ramp with spindle railing and to keep pedestrians away from traffic. Option 1 was thought to take the beautiful view of the river, Hotel Colorado, and the Hot Springs away from the downtown area. There is concern that Option 1 would not be good visually, which would negatively impact Restaurant Row and downtown.

SOUTH SIDE	Option 1 ADA Accessible Ramp and Stairs	Option 2 New Sidewalk along Grand between Railroad and 8th	Unanswered
Access to downtown	1	9	9
Visual enhancement	1	7	11
Current and future land use	2	7	10

North Side
Of those who answered, Option 3 (more direct connection to Two Rivers Park) was favored.

NORTH SIDE	Option 1 Keep Existing Connections	Option 2 New Ped Bridge with Ramp and Stairs to Pool	Option 3 New Ped Bridge with Stairs to Pool and Ramp to Two Rivers Park	Unanswered
Access to downtown	0	2	11	6
Visual enhancement	1	1.5	8.5	8
Current and future land use	2	0	6	11

Please provide suggestions on how to mitigate traffic impacts during construction.

Several attendees provided suggestions to mitigate traffic during construction.

- Work with the City and RFTA to provide free or discounted buses, incentives to use buses.
- Complete bicycle amenities first.
- Maintain east-west access across Grand Avenue.
- Corps of Engineers temporary bridges in various locations.
- Remove traffic circle at Exit 114 for entire construction time.
- Minimize construction time, use shoulder season.
- Encourage locals to bike, carpool or walk.
- Use Midland to divert traffic.
- Enforce speed limits on Midland.
- Install a temporary signal at 13th and Midland.
- Consider a temporary signal at Devereaux and Midland for people who use this route~~e~~ instead of 6th.
- Consider a bike incentive program (similar to what the City did for the parking garage/CMC projects).
- Open Blake Avenue between 27th and Walmart.

Additional comments included:

- A business owner in the 700 block of Grand receives complaints about no parking downtown and that transients are congregating below the bridge near the bathroom. Could parking places be provided under the bridge and eliminate the bathrooms there.
- Abandon this project and build a bypass instead.
- Suggestion that the I-70 eastbound acceleration lane be remediated through a variance.
- Opposition to the identified alignment and intersection.

Comments related to the Access Control Plan included:

- A pedestrian (ADA) overpass on 9th Street is an essential component of any access control plan.
- Imperative to maintain a traffic signal at 8th.
- If there is no left turn off the bridge onto 8th Street, 9th cannot be closed to accommodate the weekly Farmers Market.

CONVERATION CIRCLES
There were three Conversation Circles. Their specific agenda and the feedback received is as follows.

Pedestrian Bridge Type Options

Overview Presentation (5 to 10 minutes)
- Pedestrian bridge type options to consider.

Group Discussion (15 to 20 minutes)
- What are the visual and aesthetic differences between the options?
- Which best fit the context and meet the project's critical success factors?
- What is important to consider in selecting a pedestrian bridge type?

Feedback Recorded
- More contemporary with structure above is appealing.
- Make ped bridge a "Post Card" for City.
- Bridge elements above grade can disrupt views of mountains.
- Tower – cable structure seems less visually obstructive than arch, etc.
- Use bridge as light feature with different displays.
- How does ped/bike connectivity work? (Explained)
- Make as visually attractive and as transparent as possible.
- What is visual impact of ADA bridge access down Grand Ave (7th to 8th Street)?
- Alignment down Grand (7th to 8th Street) has less visual impact.
- It seems that the design at the bridge has been simplified to promote easy installation. Please look at a more iconic bridge for vehicles.
- Should have parking (angle) under bridge on south side.
- People who see the ped bridge the most are on highway bridge.
- Auto bridge should have better aesthetics, not ped bridge.
- Like #8 – looks like mountains (peaked).
- #1 – looks like it fits in best with Glenwood.
- Keep grade usable on ramp up to bridge (south side).
- Not looking at aesthetics when going fast.
- Many want ped bridge to be something memorable to people who first see Glenwood.
- Put all this on web.
- Some more people like #9.
- Don't close both bridges at once!
- Putting additional ped/bike through Hot Springs parking lot has safety concerns.

- Why focus on ped bridge for design element.
- Why not have an elevator for access on south side?
- Modern style bridge with historic element (handrail, façade, lighting).
- Take ped bridge over river and below railroad tracks.
- Use historic railroad bridges as design model.
- Four and Three fit in more with context of community.
- Why not have two ped bridges – keep the old one.
- Geothermal snow melt.
- Prefer number two over number one (south side) and smooth out the jut in sidewalk.
- Both bridges should relate to each other architecturally.
- Make the skin of the new vehicle bridge and ped bridge fit with historic look of Glenwood.
- Likes arches – Look like they would fit with context of community.

Constructability and Traffic Impacts

Overview Presentation (5 to 10 minutes)

- Traffic demand and construction impacts to roadway capacity.

Group Discussion (15 to 20 minutes)

- Critical concerns about impacts.
- Strategies to reduce traffic demand during construction.

Feedback Recorded

General concerns/comments:

- Concern about tourists, trucks, adjacent businesses downtown (can we provide mitigation, direct or indirect impacts).
- What happens at 6th and Laurel? Need to minimize closures there; show construction schedule for that area.
- 7th Street Bridge over Roading Fork River connecting Midland Bridge and Downtown – kept open; Midland Ave. residents recognized it was necessary to have traffic on it – access a concern, how to get around. Impacts both during closure and total construction time.
- Maintain 25 mph speed limit on Midland.
- Concerned about traffic impacts during entire construction, not just during closure.
- Is detour the same whether we have a longer or shorter closure?
- Is detour the same for all bridge types?
- How to access to the pool from the south side if bridge is closed.

Suggestions on how to mitigate traffic:

- Widen Midland – concerns about impacts. Maybe it's widened northwest of 8th Street only. Maybe the widening is for transit use.
- Consider other bridge crossings? Colorado River at Devereaux Road.
- Build a new bridge at 8th St (under railroad)? 8th St. connection.
- Transit only lane on Midland; transit connection at Confluence Area also.

- Stripe narrower lanes on Midland bridge (Exit 114) to create additional lanes on Midland during detour.
- Improvements along Grand Avenue between 7th and 8th (planters/sidewalks) to mitigate business impacts.
- Minimize time bridge is closed.
- Provide free buses during construction.
- Provide free parking downtown.
- Vouchers for people at hotels.
- Put traffic on ped bridge.
- Mitigation improvements during construction that could stay long term (Grand Ave.)
- Conduct significant media campaign. Visitors also must understand what is happening.
- Hunting season in fall – consider closure in spring.
- Give contractors a bonus to finish early.
- Retime signals at 8th and Grand during closure.
- Enforce local routes during construction.

Roadmap for Bypass Study

Overview Presentation (5 to 10 minutes)

- How a bypass study relates to current Grand Avenue Bridge project.
- Roadmap and process for initiating bypass study.

Group Discussion (15 to 20 minutes)

- Questions and Answers

Feedback Recorded

Questions asked and answered during the discussion period were:

- How does the current bridge project account for or accommodate a bypass?
- What is the motivation for CDOT to study a bypass if they put $60 million into a new bridge?
- Why can't you just rehabilitate the existing bridge?
- When could a bypass study start?
- What will trigger the access plan?
- Has CDOT considered the "Centennial Study" to build a 2-lane limited access road parallel the railroad?
- Why can't we just keep the existing bridge as a 2-lane bridge and build a bypass?
- Can we show bypass options and how they work on the model?
- If there is a bypass does the Grand Avenue Bridge still need 4 lanes?
- Should a bypass even be considered?
- Can demand management reduce or remove the need for a bypass?
- At what point in the future will more capacity be needed?
- What is the timeframe for the steps on the roadmap?
- How do you keep from presupposing a bypass in pursuit of establishing funding for the study?
- If only local traffic used the existing bridge, would it still need to be rebuilt?

- How can we make the bypass study move quicker?
- Would the Grand Avenue Bridge be designed differently if a bypass is built?
- What funding sources are available to study the bypass?

SH 82
GRAND AVENUE BRIDGE

SH 82 Grand Avenue Bridge Environmental Assessment

Public Open House, Wednesday, January 9, 2013

COMMENT FORM

Which pedestrian bridge types best fit with the Grand Avenue Bridge? Please list the numbers shown on the Pedestrian Bridge Type Options exhibits or describe.

If there are other types you would like to have considered, please describe or draw.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Should the pedestrian bridge include stronger aesthetic elements or fewer aesthetic elements than the Grand Avenue Bridge? Why?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Please indicate which pedestrian bridge connection best addresses the criteria below.

SOUTH SIDE	Option 1 : ADA Accessible Ramp and Stairs	Option 2: New Sidewalk Along Grand Ave. between Railroad and 8th
Access to downtown	☐	☐
Visual enhancement	☐	☐
Current and future land use	☐	☐
Other (please describe)	☐	☐

Please indicate which pedestrian bridge connection best addresses the criteria below.

NORTH SIDE	Option 1 : Keep Existing Connections	Option 2: New Pedestrian Bridge with Ramp and Stairs to Hot Springs Pool	Option 3: New Pedestrian Bridge with Stairs to Hot Springs Pool and Ramp to Two Rivers Park Trail
Pedestrian and bicycle access	☐	☐	☐
Visual enhancement	☐	☐	☐
Current and future land use	☐	☐	☐
Other (please describe)	☐	☐	☐

Please provide suggestions on how to mitigate traffic impacts during construction.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Please leave completed comment sheet in the drop box located at the exit/entrance. You may also submit comments by January 18, 2013, via mail, email, fax, or on line. If you submit comments other than on this form, please indicate that they are related to this information from the January 9 Public Open House.

- **Mail** your comments to: Joe Elsen, CDOT, 202 Centennial Street, Glenwood Springs, CO 81601.
- **Email** your comments to: Joseph.Elsen@state.co.us.
- **Fax** your comments to: Joe Elsen at 970.384.3332.

Please PRINT your email or mailing address to be notified of project updates and meetings:

Name:_____

E-mail:_____

Address:_____