

---

Subject: SH 103 ITF Meeting #2

---

Client: CDOT Region 1

---

Project: I-70 Peak Period Shoulder Lane

Project No: 215164

---

Meeting Date: October 24, 2013

Meeting Location: CDOT (Golden)

---

Notes by: Sandy Beazley/Tammy Heffron

---

**ATTENDEES:** CDOT: David Singer, Andria Schmid, Steve Yip  
HDR: Sandy Beazley, Tammy Heffron, Steve Long, Terrance Powers  
THK: Kevin Shanks  
FHWA: Melinda Urban  
ITF Members: Jack Morgan (Idaho Springs)  
Phyllis Adams (Idaho Springs)  
Mike Hillman (Idaho Springs)  
Mary Jane Loevlie (Idaho Springs)  
Cindy Neely (CCC)  
Nicolena Johnson - EMS Director (CCC)

**DISTRIBUTION:** Attendees, ITF Members, Project File

## **SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION:**

(Action items are in **bold**.)

1. Steve began the meeting with a summary of the kickoff meeting findings (see flipcharts), primarily focused on the concept of "front door" and moving the highway towards the south.
2. Jack noted the need to consider westbound improvements, in particular what the widening needs will be. Steve noted that westbound widening would take 10-12 feet of additional widening. Can improvements today be built so as to not preclude future improvements? A new bridge at SH 103 could be built to accommodate future improvements. Roadway improvements would prove more challenging. Idaho Springs does not want to see future improvements go to the north. Jack noted that this project needs to go well as it will set the stage for future cooperation on projects in the corridor. Jack does not want to see 4-6 feet of encroachment into Water Wheel Park and then lose parking on the north as part of a future, westbound project. Jack would rather see more encroachment into Water Wheel Park to accommodate future lanes.
3. Cindy noted that one of the challenges is the sheer number of ideas on the table, such as reversible express lanes. It is impossible to accommodate all of these ideas.
4. Kevin, with the aid of the community maps, spoke about the key issues and areas of Idaho Springs, such as:

- a. Pedestrian movements
  - b. Destinations
  - c. Historic areas
  - d. Schools, recreation centers and other community facilities
  - e. The importance of accommodating all modes of transportation across the SH 103 bridge
  - f. Traffic movement, including large trucks resulting from I-70 closures
5. Mary Jane asked that the football field and bus barn be shown on the map as they are areas of potential future development. Mary Jane noted could be a future transit station.
  6. Nicolena noted the “quagmire” at the eastbound accel/decel lanes as there are 6 roads coming together. This configuration is poor and there are numerous near misses. Georgetown installed a roundabout to fix a similar situation, but they had fewer constraints in terms of ROW.
  7. Jack noted that encouraging bike traffic on SH 103 creates a dangerous situation. Kevin stated that the project was looking to improve local bike and pedestrian circulation, not to encourage these modes to travel on SH 103.
  8. Cindy asked about trail considerations at SH 103. The study team has discussed whether or not the trail can go under SH 103, but no recommendations have been made to date.
  9. Cindy noted that CDOT giving parking to the City at SH 103 (ambulance barn) and/or a change of land ownership would be beneficial. This parking area is used by rafting companies for accessing Clear Creek. CDOT offering this land would be a low cost enhancement. David noted that this is “low hanging fruit” and will see how CDOT views this asset to see if there are other uses that we are unaware of.
  10. Jack noted that the USFS takes “ownership” of the parking lot, although it is in CDOT ROW. Kevin stated that there is a lot of non-CDOT activity on CDOT ROW throughout the corridor.
  11. Park and trail improvements:
    - a. Existing conditions and proposed improvements were shown
    - b. The trail could be lowered 4-6 feet, keeping it at or above the 10-year flood event. Lowering the trail and including a wall with aesthetic treatment was well received.
    - c. There is a historic trail on the south side of Clear Creek, as noted by Mary Jane. It is at the Blue Ribbon Tunnel.
    - d. Kevin walked through the proposed park improvements, including a wall, the lowered trail, plaza, creek access, movement of the existing statue (bust), opportunities for interpretation, walls serving as seating, revegetation, and paving.
    - e. Jack wants to be sure that the design of such a park would not force future widening to the north into Idaho Springs. A majority of the park could be designed to factor for this, but the issue is at the base of the deceleration lane, which is a pinch point. Steve noted that options, such as cantilevered trail, could be a solution.
    - f. Mary Jane asked if the trail beneath the bridge over the creek could be improved. It has not been considered yet, but will be discussed as part of the project.

## 12. SH 103 Bridge

- a. Tammy led a discussion of construction.
- b. Phasing
  - i) Can the roadway be closed (SH 103)
    - (1) The closure would be a few months. The detour would be 2-miles of out of direction travel.
    - (2) Nicolena noted the residents who lack transportation who crosses the bridge daily on bike or foot. Also, snow removal forces pedestrians into the roadway.
    - (3) One lane option—keeping only one lane open at all times during construction
  - ii) Two lane option—keeping two lanes open at all times during construction, which would result in the longest construction time
- c. Jack noted the desire for a gateway bridge—aesthetics are critical
- d. Bridge type (see summary of Flip Chart Sheets at bottom these minutes)
  - i) Reuse of existing.
    - (1) This will result in a “Frankenstein” bridge—a.k.a. the Frankenbridge—as noted by Mary Jane, as it will be a mix of existing and new bridge. Terrance noted that this option results in the least opportunity for aesthetic treatments.
    - (2) This option would only allow one lane on SH 103 to be open during construction.
    - (3) Would have to match the existing width, so sidewalks would not be improved.
    - (4) North half would be weaker, south side stronger. Does not meet any future need, would require future improvements further try to retrofit the bridge.
    - (5) Lowering I-70 to meet clearance needs would result in potential water ponding on interstate.
    - (6) Construction: 2 months with full closure, phased approach 6-9 months
  - ii) Clear span bridge
    - (1) Requires a deeper structure to carry the load, which would raise the elevation and result in a thicker bridge to carry the load. May require additional changes at the ramps and potentially the SH 103 bridge over the creek
    - (2) Requires full closure of SH 103
    - (3) 5X more cost compared to reuse of existing
    - (4) ~9-12 months to construct
    - (5) Does not fit with the throwaway concept and would be costly to build offsite and move into place (Accelerated Bridge Construction (ABC)).
  - iii) Two span bridge
    - (1) Allows SH 103 to stay open as the first phase could be built next to the existing bridge
    - (2) Includes an auxiliary/turning lane

- (3) Minimize ramp impacts
  - (4) There would be one pier in the center of the highway, allowing for flexibility for future improvements.
  - (5) Can improve bicycle/pedestrian facilities, with a 10-foot sidewalk
  - (6) Construction: 2 months with full closure, phased approach six to nine months. The accelerated construction approach would use pre-cast elements, minimizing the amount of construction done on site and limits the disruption to I-70.
  - (7) In the event of a full closure, construction could be completed in the shoulder season, minimizing traffic disruption. March is the busiest time of the year from a ski perspective, with Monday-Friday being commonly used for ski trips due to spring breaks. I-70 impacts would be minimized by doing night work, as possible. Starting after spring break and being done before July 4<sup>th</sup> would be ideal.
  - (8) This bridge would cost approximately the same as retrofitting and reusing the existing bridge.
  - (9) The group likes the 2-span bridge with a full closure. Aesthetics TBD, but could incorporate elements such as the city name and seal.
  - (10) Nicolena asked where the sidewalk should be on the new bridge, as people need to cross SH 103 to get to Water Wheel Park. Existing conditions move pedestrians east, west and back east of SH 103. This will be part of a discussion regarding pedestrian movements north and south of SH 103, as well as existing conditions of accel/decel lanes.
13. The SH 103 ITF has agreed their mission is complete and not need meet again. Options like sidewalks and aesthetics will be part of the future Tech Team Meetings.

## FLIPCHART NOTES ON BRIDGE OPTIONS

1. Reuse of existing bridge
  - a. Width: Inadequate sidewalk and shoulders; phasing challenges—only one lane; dangerous pedestrian movements.
  - b. Structure: North half is older and weaker than the new, south half.
  - c. Lower I-70: Sump condition is lower than 100-year flood event.
  - d. “Band-Aid” look: Not aesthetically appealing.
  - e. Full closure: two months.
  - f. Phased construction: six to nine months
  - g. Increased construction duration risks: retrofits; more traffic control
2. Clear span
  - a. Raise the elevation of SH 103 profile 1 foot (+) more than two-span—more impacts to ramps and bridge over the creek.
  - b. Requires full closure of SH 103.
  - c. Costs five times more.
  - d. Increase construction time twice as long (9 to 12 months)
3. Two-span
  - a. Meets current load and safety standards.
  - b. Allows SH 103 to remain open during construction.
  - c. Improved pedestrian movements and safety.

- d. Improved shoulders and added turning lane—facilitates future development (access to AGS)
- e. Improved aesthetics (future discussions)
- f. New span configuration allows for future flexibility.
- g. Full closure of the bridge for two months.
- h. Phased construction (six to nine months)
- i. Aesthetic Ideas: city seal and name
- j. Trail connectivity