

DRAFT Meeting Minutes

Project: CDOT Region 3 – SH 82 Grand Avenue Bridge

Purpose: PLT Meeting #14

Date Held: August 10, 2012

Location: CDOT Region 3 Glenwood (Maintenance Video Conference Room)
CDOT Golden (Trail Ridge Video Conference Room)

Attendees:

CDOT:	Joe Elsen, Josh Cullen, Roland Wagner
City of Glenwood Springs:	Bruce Christensen
Glenwood Springs Chamber:	Suzanne Stewart
Colorado Bridge Enterprise:	Charlie Trujillo
Jacobs:	Craig Gaskill, Mary Speck
Glenwood Hot Springs:	Kjell Mitchell
Downtown Development Authority:	Leslie Bethel
Newland Project Resources:	Tom Newland
Pat Noyes and Assoc.	Pat Noyes
TSH:	George Tsiouvaras, David Woolfall

Copies: PLT Members, Other Attendees, File

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION:

UPDATES

Public Involvement

1. DDA Open House.
 - a. Over 100 people attended, a lot of interest. Could have been more there who didn't sign in.
 - b. 3 business owners – concerned about potential loss of Wing St. Craig will meet with them one on one. Their concerns relate to emergency/fire access.
 - c. A lot of feedback that pedestrian access is important

- d. Mary will find out if we can provide a link to the DDA Open House website from the CDOT Grand Avenue site.
2. Downtown Market.
 - a. Tom Newland has been attending the Downtown Market every week since 6/19; talked to approximately 450 people, average 80 per day. Attendance is tapering off with 62 last week. It is a good venue for public communication and outreach.
 - b. Alternative 3A was the predominant favorite of those who indicated a preference.
 - c. Alternative 1 not popular. Alternative 1B removing pedestrian bridge was not preferred.
 3. BOCC.
 - a. BOCC meeting on August 7th went well. One Commissioner reported in paper as supporting Alternative 3.
 4. RFTA Board and other meetings will be scheduled after selection of recommended alignment.
 5. Leslie – meeting August 9 with David Hauter, architect for Cushman and shoe repair shop building that will be torn down.
 - a. Talked about how new building would be designed and work with the alley. Also a concern regarding the Access Control Plan. In a newly designed building, how would access work? Are there funds to improve the alley? Desire to consolidate trash collection that currently occurs in the alley
 - b. Craig and team to talk to Fire Chief about alley and Wing Street emergency access.
 6. These was discussion about coordination of City, DDA, CDOT and CBE resources to develop a better plan for the 8th Street area..
 - a. DDA has a Sonora Institute grant (supported by the Gates Family Foundation). The DDA presented to City Council about how to use the grant funds, perhaps considering if the funds can be shifted to 6th Street if Alternative 3 is selected.
 7. SWG Meeting.
 - a. Holding prior to Open House. Similar format to other SWG workshops.
 - b. Goals similar to Open House. Review process, show differences between 1 and 3, go over new information, obtain input.
 - i. Simulations and visuals – stills, traffic simulation, and drive-throughs.
 - Maps will show pedestrian connections.
 - Intent with drive-throughs – how to get from Point A to Point B; to hotels, to Hot Springs.
 - Still photos
 - c. Breakout groups:

- i. Visual, urban design, land use - DDA group, view sheds.
 - ii. Pedestrian and bike network connections.
 - iii. Traffic operations - simulations, drive-throughs.
 - d. How do we present DDA information?
 - i. SWG - talked about Leslie presenting it. Leslie can't be there, but someone else will be. Explain - not part of the project.
- 8. Additional Advertising for Open House
 - a. Interview next Friday with GSPI. Will prepare a press release with information to use in writing articles.

Engineering

- 1. CBE Funding.
 - a. Charlie thought clarification was needed after the questions about money that came up during development of the PLT letter and question.
 - b. CBE meeting on August 8 clarified limits/extent of funding.
 - c. CBE Funding Responsibility.
 - i. Preferred alternative outlined by the NEPA process.
 - ii. CBE indifferent on preferred alternative. CBE is participating as part of PLT/PWG - not determining alternative. Don't want surprises at end of project - weighing in during process about what would be eligible and non-eligible. Alignments right now are fit within parameters.
 - iii. Program limitations on structure aesthetics and roadway improvements.
 - d. Non-transportation related enhancements.
 - i. For example, 6th St improvements, CBE can't fund. They can be part of the project if there is an agreement with someone to do it.
 - ii. Bike/pedestrian - if it's is an existing use and it is impacted, funding may be appropriate for mitigation.
 - iii. Pedestrian/bike connection with Alt. 3? Possibly could be funded. Must go through evaluation and be justified. Can't guarantee until details are worked out.
 - e. Depending on final work scope other funding sources may be necessary
 - i. - Most CBE projects have multiple funding sources
 - f. Allow NEPA process to identify preferred alternative
 - i. - Then determine CBE eligibility
- 2. Right-of-Way

- a. Subject to TABOR – CBE purchases ROW in CDOT’s name, titled to CDOT. CBE owns bridge, but not the real estate.
3. Bonds issued – subject to the BR Federal program – flow to project.
 - a. BR program is strictly to address bridge and some amenities according to what FHWA has said.
 - b. Current BR funding is for identification/selection of alternative and to get to the decision document.
4. Discussion.
 - a. Initial estimates of probable costs - \$60 million; \$45 is actual construction. Those are budgeted/planned. Actual budget appropriated is \$7.5 million for this phase. Now thinking about next budget number to go to the Board. Can’t tie up all the money up front.
 - i. Question: If we need more budget, would there be more?
 - Possibly, depending on what it is for.
 - Are there additional CDOT funds? This would depend on if the element meets P&N? It would also depend on if the element is for mitigation.
 - b. With Alternative 3 there are lots of directional needs. Are those connections part of the project?
 - i. Charlie: Roundabouts and stubouts probably not funded by CBE. Touchdown to touchdown is. Connections to 82 and 6 – are okay.
 - ii. Bridge must be operational.
 - iii. Bridge, touchdowns and mitigation items – will determine later what is above and beyond.
 - c. The knowledge of writing EAs and getting the language right is a key reason we chose this team. How the language is framed is critical to get us to the end result.
 - i. The Purpose and Need and criteria are important to defining the context of the project and subsequent environment mitigation needs.
 - d. CBE can’t solve all the problems. Community needs to set aside money for the bridge for additional items.
 - e. Mitigation in the document may not all meet CBE criteria and may have to be funded with other sources.
 5. This information will be presented at the City Council Workshop on August 16. The workshop will include a CBE representative.

Engineering

1. Design workshop related to the bridge was held August 2nd and 3rd in Denver. Attendees: CBE, CDOT PMT, Staff Bridge, Consultant structural team (TSH, AMEC, Jacobs), Fred Gottemoeller.
 - a. Objective: more specific bridge type alternatives to be developed as part of the process. Talked about both alignments. Stressed constructability, maintenance of traffic, project schedule, how might alts work.
 - b. Complex site, no redundancy.
 - c. Bridge can be looked at in two segments: downtown (narrower), and span across river and parking lots.
 - d. Aesthetics hand in hand with the structure types. Over the next 4 to 6 weeks will develop the concepts for bridge types. With both alignments, can build bridge to meet requirements of the project and be aesthetically pleasing.
 - e. Considering presenting concepts to public before Thanksgiving.
 - f. After preferred alignment - will start on NEPA documentation. NEPA doc may have alternatives for bridge types. Would differ in constructability and aesthetics.
 - g. Multiple bridge types are feasible.
 - h. How much costing is being done?
 - i. Right now: How are you going to build it? How long is it going to take? Costing information is being developed as part of the bridge types evaluation.
2. Discussion
 - a. Is the team looking at how to mitigate traffic impacts during construction?
 - i. We're starting to look at this.
 - ii. Suggested that a new bridge be built at 13th or 14th across the Roaring Fork to help mitigate traffic. There could be a long-term benefit in using Midland to divert traffic. If it's part of the city plan and it's part of the NEPA project, it's a stronger idea.
 - iii. Will need to gauge public's level of pain for construction - high for short time, or lower for longer time?
 - b. Potential Open House in November - November 14.
 - i. Early Sept - alignment decision; 60 days after that will have developed bridge concepts with constructability, phasing, maintenance traffic and schedule.
 - Is that enough time?
 - Will need to evaluate if what we have is enough to present to the public.

- Would get public input back on aesthetics and duration of construction impacts.
3. CM/GC.
 - a. CDOT is contracting an expert (Stanton Constructability, from Utah) to provide input into the bridge construction. CDOT is starting to finalize timing for CM/GC contract and final design contract.

PUBLIC MEETING PLANNING

1. Intent is to provide information on all the evaluations we have done for Alternatives 1 and 3.
 - a. Areas:
 - i. Visual, land use, urban design.
 - ii. Traffic simulations and drive throughs.
 - iii. Bicycle/pedestrian connections.
 - Connections and where route goes.
 - Take out existing – shadowed back.
 - What about those that aren't approved? We will only show if it's been adopted/approved.
 - Colored would be those changed or new with project.
 - iv. Previous evaluations.
2. Comment sheet.
 - a. Information back – questionnaire similar to last time. Focus on the criteria – what is important in each of those areas?
 - b. At each station, remind everyone to fill out questionnaire.
 - c. Will have a greeter this time to specifically ask for feedback.
3. Do we have DDA boards at meeting?
 - a. Discussed pros and cons of having the visuals at the Open House.
 - b. Decision was not to present the boards at the meeting but have the boards available in 11 X 17 format for use by a DDA representative is anyone wanted to know more.

ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION

1. Kjell asked about the status of Wright Water's report.
 - a. We reported this is in progress but didn't have a completion date.
 - b. We will update the PLT once we have a date.

2. It was reported at the meeting that the City's Wayfinding Plan had been adopted. This is different than earlier information that it wasn't. This will be checked as it will affect some of the pedestrian connections shown on the meeting exhibits.

UPCOMING MEETING DATES

1. Combined PLT/PWG: Aug 23 - 8:30 to 11:30 a.m. (note time change).
2. Public Open House: November 14.
 - a. Tom will reserve Community Center.
3. Combined PWG/ PLT meeting, October 12, 8:30 to 12:00.
4. Combined PWG/PLT meeting, November 14, 8:30 to 11:30.

Attachments

Presentation