

FINAL Meeting Minutes

Project: CDOT Region 3 – SH 82 Grand Avenue Bridge

Purpose: PLT #16/PWG #16 Combined Meeting

Date Held: October 12, 2012

Location: CDOT Region 3 Glenwood (Maintenance Video Conference Room)
CDOT Region 3 Grand Junction (Room 308 Video Conference)
CDOT Golden (Trail Ridge Video Conference Room)

Attendees:

CDOT:	Joe Elsen, Josh Cullen, Roland Wagner; Sean Yeates, Dan Roussin
Colorado Bridge Enterprise:	Josh Laipply
Jacobs:	Steve Pouliot, Jim Clarke, Mary Speck, Jeff Mehle
TSH:	Craig Gaskill, George Tsiouvaras, Jeff Simmons, David Woolfall, Clint Krajnik
Glenwood Springs City Council:	Bruce Christensen
Glenwood Springs Chamber:	Suzanne Stewart
Glenwood Hot Springs:	Kjell Mitchell
Downtown Development Authority:	Leslie Bethel
Newland Project Resources:	Tom Newland
Pat Noyes and Assoc.:	Pat Noyes
Interested Citizen:	Dave Sturges

Copies: PLT Members, PWG Members, Other Attendees, File

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

INTRODUCTIONS

UPDATES

Public Involvement

1. There is a joint Transportation and River Commission meeting tentatively scheduled for October 23 or 24.

Final Meeting Minutes

SH 82 Grand Avenue Bridge PLT #15/PWG #16 Combined Meeting

October 12, 2012

Page 2 of 8

- a. City asked the project team to present at this meeting about pedestrian connectivity issues. Discussion will also include the Access Control Plan.
- b. Leslie Bethel and Dave Sturges would like to know when this meeting is occurring.
2. Public Open House and Stakeholder Working Group (SWG) Meeting.
 - a. Previous plan was for November 14 for both.
 - b. Public Open House postponed until mid-January. There is still a lot of technical information on bridges that would be difficult to prepare for a public meeting this soon.
 - c. We still plan to have an SWG meeting on the 14th, maybe at 3pm.
3. Public meeting may be around January 16. Input on bridge types, input on pedestrian bridge.
4. City Council and Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) workshops will happen after the SWG meeting.
 - a. City Council: November 15th (5:00 to 6:00 p.m.).
 - b. BOCC: November 20 at (8:00 a.m.).
5. Upcoming Milestones – Key Dates
 - a. Still need to determine bridge type, how it looks and how it is built. Still need to resolve the pedestrian bridge and how it affects the highway bridge.
 - i. Early part of 2013 will decide this.
 - b. Draft EA document done early 2014, decision document mid-2014.
 - c. Start of construction early 2015. Length of construction is undetermined.
 - i. Critical part of construction schedule is when you build the downtown section, which requires closure or reduced lanes. Spring or fall were previously thought to be best timeframe if full closure.
 - ii. Other items that drive construction schedule: moving utilities off of existing bridge and seasonal restrictions on work in the river
 - iii. Project team is discussing possible early construction activities, for example, the pedestrian bridge, if replaced, and utilities relocations.
 - iv. Also still getting input from the public on the amount and duration of construction impacts.
6. Dave Sturges indicated that at some point the City Council anticipates an opportunity to take a position on the preferred alternative. Discussion around when it might be a good time to do that.
 - a. Discussions with FHWA are that there would be one build alternative (preferred alignment- not a preferred structure type) carried forward into the Environmental

Final Meeting Minutes

SH 82 Grand Avenue Bridge PLT #15/PWG #16 Combined Meeting

October 12, 2012

Page 3 of 8

Assessment (EA). So far, the Project Working Group (PWG) has only made a recommendation on the alignment.

- b. At the next Public Open House, we will gather input on bridge structure types, how the bridge might look, and pedestrian bridge elements. After that meeting, the PWG will recommend what options will be evaluated in the EA.
 - c. The Decision Document would make the decision on the Preferred Alternative.
 - d. Is it good for public perception for the Council to take a formal action on the alignment, and maybe later a formal action on bridge type. It is not required for NEPA documentation, but it would help support the choices made in the NEPA document.
 - e. There will be an election next April, so it may be preferred for this Council to show support because they have been involved in the process so far.
 - f. There is still the perception that not enough has been done by the City to support or push a bypass.
 - g. Good opportunity for the Council to tie three current projects together – South Bridge, Grand Avenue, and Access Control Plan.
7. Still very important to keep the public process inclusive and clear with check-in points. Explain what the issue is, where we are going, and why. This could prevent opposition or controversy further in the process.
 8. Downtown Partnership Meeting on October 11.
 - a. Purpose was to talk to them about their position statement in the paper. Attended by Joe Elsen and Craig Gaskill.
 - b. Meeting was positive. Partnership is supportive of how the project team is providing good information on the project.
 - c. Craig and Joe explained the reasoning behind the width of the bridge and distance to buildings. Attendees understood and accepted how the decisions were being made.
 - d. For their membership, phasing is important and limiting construction impacts. Their marketing staff attended the meeting and explained their concerns. Communication about timing of construction and closures will be very important.

Environmental

1. Still researching seasonal restrictions for working in the river. We have contacted the Parks and Wildlife staff and will get more information from them.
2. Draft of Historical Report is being reviewed by Mike Vanderhoof.

PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE

1. Factors affecting decisions:

Final Meeting Minutes

SH 82 Grand Avenue Bridge PLT #15/PWG #16 Combined Meeting

October 12, 2012

Page 4 of 8

- a. Utility relocations. Utility companies are aware of project and are considering their options. Ideal for them if a structure were in place first to allow a single move of utilities. Using existing pedestrian bridge may not be feasible – may not be able to accommodate utilities and would interrupt pedestrians. Issues: distances to other bridges (river crossings) are relatively far from Grand Avenue.
 - i. Utilities could drive the decision about whether or not to replace the existing pedestrian bridge.
- b. Potential for detour travel lane on new pedestrian bridge during construction.
 - i. Would be used for the peak traffic direction. Evaluating if we need this and if it is even possible to provide this during phasing.
- c. Best pedestrian connection location (landing point) on the north end.
 - i. When we remove the SH 82 bridge, there will be a large fill remaining on the north end abutment area. If this were removed, it would affect the pedestrian bridge abutment.. Is there a better location for the north end of the pedestrian bridge - possibly closer to 6th Street?
- d. Current width of pedestrian bridge.
 - i. Project team has spoken to CDOT's Bike & Pedestrian Coordinator. Current peak hour counts are around 300 people. Future (2035 planning horizon) pedestrian volumes will be higher. Current standards show a 14-foot minimum width for these volumes. If you were to build a new bridge, it would be built to that standard.
- e. Clearance to future I-70 eastbound acceleration lane.
 - i. Improvements to the existing Exit 116 as identified in the I-70 Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) are assumed to include a new eastbound acceleration lane. However the existing Grand Avenue pier is directly in the way. In addition, the existing pedestrian bridge structure also runs into the clearance area of the new acceleration lane shoulder.. A new pedestrian bridge would provide the clearance necessary to accommodate this improvement. There is funding identified in the STIP for interchange improvements in 2015 or 2016.
- f. Existing grade on pedestrian bridge.
 - i. There are several ways to determine ADA requirements. 5% on pedestrian ramps generally meets code, except under some cases a platform may be needed to provide a break from a long grade.. The current 5% grade is probably undesirable and could be improved with a new pedestrian bridge.
- g. Aesthetics of new pedestrian bridge related to new a Grand Avenue bridge.
 - i. If you rebuild the highway bridge with a nice-looking bridge, the pedestrian bridge may block potential view. If you needed a new pedestrian bridge, could design together in context. Maybe the highway bridge is simpler, pedestrian bridge nicer.

- ii. Leslie Bethel indicated the Downtown Development Authority has discussed this. Alternative 3 has a curved alignment – the existing pedestrian bridge has the opportunity to reinforce historic grid of Glenwood. The combination creates a great solution.
- h. Question: Shared cost to replace the pedestrian bridge.
 - i. If the pedestrian bridge replacement is a necessary element in order to fix/replace the existing bridge, then it may be eligible to be funded as part of the project.
 - ii. The pedestrian bridge belongs to the City – need to be sensitive to its replacement. Community wants to have a separate bridge. Must involve City, Downtown Development Authority, Downtown Partnership, and others downtown in the discussions.
 - iii. With the potential for redevelopment on 6th Street, the pedestrian bridge solution must be compatible with those plans.

ENGINEERING BRIDGE TYPE EVALUATION

1. Site constraints and lack of alternative routes to use during construction make it difficult to construct an aesthetic bridge.
2. For purposes of evaluation and comparison, we have divided the bridge into three segments representing three construction zones with different constraints.
 - a. North end over the Hot Springs Pool parking lot and frontage road to area near Shell. This section can be constructed without direct impacts to Grand Avenue, and has the most flexibility for construction phasing.
 - b. Part over river. Construction of this section conflicts with Grand Avenue, utilities, and I-70.
 - c. Downtown. This is a tight area with buildings and sidewalk conflicts.
3. For each segment, as applicable, we need to consider constraints/opportunities for each of the following:
 - a. Colorado River.
 - b. Railroad.
 - c. 7th/River Road.
 - d. I-70.
 - e. Pier locations.

Bridge Forms Under Evaluation

1. Bridge types can be categorized by form and construction materials.

2. George presented cross-sections for the various bridge forms and explained opportunities and constraints of each. He also had photos of built bridges to show as examples of the bridge forms.
3. Part over the river and the Hot Springs Pool parking lot.
 - a. Tied arch (1 span for the arch, 3 spans to the north) – arches not constructed on a curve very easily and would need to be wider than the roadway cross section to accommodate the curvature.
 - b. Five-span constant depth box girder.
 - c. 3-span and 5-span haunched girder bridge. These have a variable depth and are considered a more elegant solution. They also allow for a longer span length. An example is the Hanging Lake Viaduct. At 300 feet it's a little longer than our site. More expensive than a constant depth girder.
 - d. 3-span and 4-span extra doped box girder. Cables to outside have a structural function. Significantly more expensive.
4. Downtown.
 - a. Box girders/slabs/spread boxes.
 - b. Small box cells.
 - c. Slab with variable depth.
 - d. Three larger box cells.

Constructability

1. Evaluation includes looking at how to build the bridges. Some of the techniques include:
 - a. Constructing in place.
 - b. Accelerated Bridge Construction (ABC). Precast and build components off site.
 - i. All alternatives have some version of this. Some can be built off alignment while traffic is maintained on Grand. Then, you tear down Grand and roll/slide the new bridge into place.
2. Schedule
 - a. Have started developing detailed schedules for ABC. What happens on each day to get each alternative built. The goal is to be able to discern differences between alternatives – so some can be screened prior to the EA.
 - b. Most work needs to be planned for a closure up to two months, probably in the fall.
 - c. Contractor can implement some things that ensure that when the short closure times are finally here, everything works.
 - i. CM/GC (Construction Manager/ General Contractor)– involved for a longer period of time – lots of interaction with the owner and designers, look at risks

jointly, come to meetings; understanding of job – so pricing is based on a more complete understanding.

- CM/GC contractor will be on line by February; Letter of Interest from contractors due by October 18; preproposal meetings first week of November; RFP end of November.
 - ii. Under a traditional design-bid-build, the designer gives the means and methodology to the contractor. The contractor lots of times does it their own way. May or may not be consistent with the goals of the project.
 - d. A constrained site means there needs to be some work in the river so the project team is looking at ways to minimize or shorten impacts to river.
 - e. How do we take down the existing bridge? The challenge is doing it in the window we have.
3. After Evaluation
- a. We plan to have identified which bridge type alternatives best meet project goals, Purpose and Need, etc., by January/February. We will present all the alternatives evaluated (with impacts) at the January Public Open House.

DISCUSSION

1. Question – Is there a cost comparison that tells us if the roadway bridge were simpler, could those funds be directed to make the pedestrian bridge better? Answer. These will be part of the evaluation criteria.
2. Comment - If a tunnel were built under the railroad, perhaps it have a use during construction and be used in the future for pedestrian/bike connections. There is a door to an access on the south side of the river. This could have historic impacts.
3. Other potential City projects or enhancements and connections to the river can be considered.
 - a. For example, the City already has an agreement with Denver Water board on proposed uses on Roaring Fork River. There are two water features allowed on the Western Slope. One will be above the Roaring Fork River. The second isn't determined yet. If the design work is done on this project, the City can file to have it incorporated in the agreement.
 - i. Gary Lacy is working with the City to fix the existing water park near Exit 114.
 - ii. Jim Clarke indicated that with any structures in river, Section 404 permitting is required. We need to avoid triggers that would kick this into an individual permit, rather than a nationwide one.
4. Access Control Plan – how does this relate to the Grand Ave project?
 - a. Affects the length of the south-bound left turn lane at 8th Street.
5. Traffic during discussion:

Final Meeting Minutes

SH 82 Grand Avenue Bridge PLT #15/PWG #16 Combined Meeting

October 12, 2012

Page 8 of 8

- a. Traffic impacts are different with different bridge types.
- b. Work in river could impact how long and when traffic is rerouted.
- c. How do trucks make downtown deliveries?
 - i. Need to work with City on allowing trucks on Midland to get access from Midland to below 8th Street? Midland Avenue possible widening. There may be triggers as part of the Glenwood Meadows development that get it widened. Dave Betley will provide us the annexation agreement.
 - ii. Also examine 8th Street extension for a connection. The extension is not being addressed right now. An at-grade crossing at the wye could help facilitate traffic. Any discussions with UP about construction staging should be coordinated with the City (Dave Betley).
 - iii. Old wastewater plant site is big parcel of land next to river.
6. DDA Budget for 2013
 - a. Leslie Bethel indicated that the more than half of budget proposed for 2013 is allocated for Grand Avenue Bridge off-site improvements.
 - i. Improvements on 6th, 7th, 8th, and 9th Streets.
 - b. This budget still needs to get approved.
 - c. The DDA will work with the Grand Avenue project team on the bridge touchdown points, how to fund them realistically.
 - d. Demonstrates that local community is at the table.

\\DENFIL06\jobs_Transportation\WVXX1306_GrandAve\meetings\PLT-PWG Combined\Combined PWG16_PLT16_Oct 12 2012\SH 82 Grand Ave Bridge PLT16-PWG16 Combined FINAL meeting minutes_101212.docx



JACOBS