

FINAL Meeting Minutes

Project:	CDOT Region 3 – SH 82 Grand Avenue Bridge	
Purpose:	PLT Meeting #5	
Date Held:	December 15, 2011	
Location:	Location: CDOT Maintenance Conference Room (Glenwood Springs)	
Attendees:		
	CDOT:	Josh Cullen, Joe Elsen, Roland Wagner
Transportation Commission (City):		Shelley Kaup
-	Eagle County:	Eva Wilson
	Garfield County:	Jeff Nelson
Glenwood Hot Springs:		Kjell Mitchell
Glenwood Springs Chamber:		Doug Harr
Historic Preservation Commission:		Gretchen Ricehill
Downtown Development Authority:		Leslie Bethel
Colorado Bridge Enterprise:		Charlie Trujillo
	Jacobs:	Craig Gaskill, Jim Clarke
	TSH:	George Tsiouvaras
Newland Project Resources:		Tom Newland

Copies: PLT Members, Attendees, File

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION:

VISIONING WORKSHOP SUMMARY

- 1. Pat Noyes summarized the Visioning Workshop. Purpose of the Workshop was to capture community values and vision to develop guidance and to gather approaches and concepts that could be advanced to alternatives.
- 2. Had 40 folks participate from the project team , PLT, PWG, and diverse community representatives- businesses, residents, interest groups, organizations.
- 3. Afternoon meeting Wednesday.
 - a. First step was to ask each person what they really liked about Glenwood Springs to determine common values.
 - b. Reviewed history of bridge through a time line display.



- c. Broke into groups to discuss trends for Tourism, Social, Business that might impact the bridge.
- d. Reviewed work to date on the project draft Context Statement and Critical Success Factors.
- e. Gave a status of the scoping meetings that have occurred so far.
- f. Homework assignment was to come back with one thing about the bridge each person treasured and one thing about the bridge they want to leave behind.
- 4. Morning meeting Thursday
 - a. Recorded homework assignment.
 - b. Broke into focus groups on: Rehabilitation, Replacement options, and Traffic Management. Discussion was to focus on the options for potential scenarios what are the advantages/disadvantages of each, what did the group like and why, concerns, what would make the option viable.
 - c. Facilitators summarized the information from the recorded comments at a very high level into Key Project Objectives and presented back to the whole group.
 - d. Next steps are to take what the project team has heard from the stakeholders (PLT, scoping meetings, and the Visioning Workshop) about what is important and use them to develop and screen alternatives. All comments are tracked and incorporated into the decision-making process.
- 5. Feedback about traffic was that between a week and a month of full closure would be tolerable but not during high season. Public wants to understand what the trade-offs are between different options need to give them more options.
- 6. Federal Bridge Program only covers vehicular bridges. But, it's premature to eliminate options that accommodate pedestrians. Once we have the solution, as a team, we determine what can be funded or not. Federal law must create new opportunities if you are eliminating something (like the ped bridge).
- 7. Shelly Kaup indicated visioning was worthwhile, the study team did a good job, and she received good feedback.

UPDATES

- 1. Public Involvement:
 - a. Visioning group indicated they want to reconvene as a group to see how their comments and concepts are being incorporated. Study Team plan to meet with that group prior to next public open house.
 - b. Shelly Kaup asked if we plan to meet with the Transportation Commission.
 - i. Tom Newland will schedule a workshop working through Dave Betley and Dave Alcott in early February.
 - c. Study Team will send out a link with instructions for use of project FTP-Site used for PLT to download meeting materials.
 - d. Craig discussed plans to create physical model of visual simulations to show existing bridge and alternatives.
 - e. Tom described using "Story Poles" to demonstrate where bridge limits would extend along Grand Avenue near touch down points.
- 2. Planning
 - a. Craig presented the Draft Purpose and Need.



- b. Need is it related to the poor condition of the bridge.
- c. We need to look at what the right solution is today.
- d. Discussed Project Goals. Project Goals help us to meet Purpose and Need and we will be measuring alternatives against the Project Goals.
- e. Sustainability was added as a project goal
- f. Other wording changes were edited in the draft Goals
- g. Screening Criteria will be updated to reflect the changes made to the Purpose and Need and Project Goals
- 3. Engineering
 - a. The project team will be looking at the range of alternatives into January. They will also be further looking into the condition of the bridge and scour data.
 - b. George Tsiouvaras presented findings on the bridge condition.
 - 1. Problems with existing bridge (what should we fix)
 - a. Bridge is too narrow most significant
 - b. Bridge doesn't have adequate vertical clearance over 7th and over RR
 - c. Piers on either side of I-70 creating pinch point and preclude improvements to I-70 and Exit 116
 - d. Girders and deck do not have load carrying capacity
 - e. Bridge contains may contain some fatigue prone details.
 - f. Spread footings may be susceptible to scour
 - g. Spalling and delamination of concrete elements will need to be investigated.
 - h. Inventory rating is controlled by deck
 - 2. Riveted connections on the bridge are Category D (means a low stress rating). Today we would not construct these connections this way.
 - 3. We are trying to rehab an old car and make it into new car.
 - 4. Structure distress likely to accelerate in time.
 - 5. To bring the bridge up to current standards, need to address deck and fatigue, replace bridge rails
- 4. Environmental
 - a. The project historic specialist has researched information at SHPO's office and found that many sites will need to be reevaluated to determine eligibility.
 - b. Need to evaluate if Downtown is truly a historic district. During the I-70 Preliminary EIS, it was proposed as a district, but shot down. There are many well-preserved properties between 7th and 9th that aren't commercial. Gail Keeley will look into this. Gail has copies of the surveys that were done and Gretchen Ricehill of the City of Glenwood has them now.

ACTION ITEMS

1. Study Team will send out a link with instructions for use of project FTP-Site used for PLT to download meeting materials.

J:_Transportation\WVXX1306_GrandAve\meetings\PLT\PLT5\SH 82 Grand Ave Bridge_PLT #5 FINAL_meeting minutes_121511.doc





SH 82 Grand Avenue Bridge Project Leadership Team Meeting #5 CDOT Maintenance Conference Room

AGENDA December 15, 2011

1:30p.m. to 3:30 p.m.

1. Review of Visioning Workshop

2. Updates

- a. Public Involvement
- b. Planning
- c. Engineering
- d. Environmental







Project Leadership Team Meeting #5 December 15, 2011 1:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. CDOT Maintenance Conference Room

Present		Present
Colorado	Department of Transportation, Region 3	FHWA
/	Josh Cullen	Eva LaDow
	Tammie Smith	Jacobs
V	Joe Elsen	Craig Gaskill
V	Roland Wagner	Jim Clarke
City of G	lenwood Springs City Council Representative	Tsiouvaras Simmons Holderness, Inc. (TSH)
÷	Bruce Christensen	George Tsiouvaras
1	Shelley Kaup (alternate)	
City of G	ilenwood Springs	Glenwood Hot Springs
	Dave Betley	Kjell Mitchell
Colorado	o Bridge Enterprise/ AECOM	Glenwood Springs Chamber Resort Association
V	Charlie Trujillo	Doug Harr
Josh Laipply (alternate)		Downtown Development Authority
Eagle County		Leslie Bethel
	Eva Wilson	Historic Preservation Commission
Garfield County		Gretchen Ricehill
	Jeff Nelson	Other (Name/Organization)
Pitkin Co	ounty	City Transportation Commission - Tom Newland - NPRI
	Brian Pettet	



J:\ Transportation\WVXX1306 GrandAve\meetinas\PLT\PLT5\PLT#5 Sian-In Sheet doc

DOT