

FINAL Meeting Minutes

Project: CDOT Region 3 – SH 82 Grand Avenue Bridge

Purpose: PLT Meeting #3

Date Held: September 30, 2011

Location: CDOT Conference Room (Glenwood Springs)

Attendees:

CDOT: Josh Cullen, Joe Elsen, Tammie Smith, Roland Wagner

City of Glenwood Springs: Bruce Christensen, Shelley Kaup (alternate)

Eagle County: Eva Wilson **Glenwood Hot Springs:** Kjell Mitchell, **Glenwood Springs Chamber:** Doug Harr

Historic Preservation Commission: Gretchen Ricehill

Pitkin County: Brian Pettet

Downtown Development Authority: Leslie Bethel **Colorado Bridge Enterprise:** Charlie Trujillo

Jacobs: Craig Gaskill, Jim Clarke,

TSH: George Tsiouvaras, Jeff Simmons

Pat Noyes and Associates: Pat Noyes **Newland Project Resources**: Tom Newland

Other Attendees: Dave Sturgis (concerned citizen)

Copies: PLT Members, File

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION:

PLT CHARTERING

Pat Noyes led a chartering session. The chartering process included an understanding of PLT roles, PLT values and PLT critical success factors.

- 1. PLT roles were discussed:
 - The PLT will help keep the project on task.
 - Doug Harr expressed concerned that the PLT will not have input. Pat clarified that PLT will provide considerable input, but it's not a decision-making body.
 - The PLT will ensure the CSS process is followed.



- The PLT helps set up the way decisions get made.
- Pat discussed commitment and consistency for involvement of PLT members.
- 2. How frequently will we meet? maybe monthly for 5 to 6 months, then taper back to maybe every 3 months during environmental process. Future meetings will likely be longer.
- 3. Does the PLT have the right membership?

The group discussed having Shelley Kaup be a full-time PLT member, representing the Transportation Commission. Shelley will confirm with the Commission that she can serve that role. (Note: the Commission subsequently voted in favor of having Shelley represent them on the PLT).

- 4. PLT Values and critical success factors were discussed.
- 5. Values and critical success factors are used to create the context statement. The context statement defines what is important about the bridge in the community.
- 6. Values were framed through the question: What's important to the community and this environment? Values identified by the PLT include:
 - Tourism
 - Aesthetics
 - Gateway/market
 - Employment life line for Upper Valley and local
 - Emergency services critical link
 - Connects downtown/river
 - Natural beauty/hotel/pool
 - Heart of town connection
 - Mountain Valley
- 7. Critical Success Factors were identified by the question: What are the success factors needed to make this a successful project?. Critical success factors identified by the PLT include:
 - Iconic structure
 - Safety

- Connection to 6th St.
- Minimize construction impacts
- Provide for activity under the bridge vital
- Minimize environmental impacts
- Accommodate traffic flow/demand
- Design for sustainability
- Looks like it grew out of history of Glenwood Springs
- Positive economic impact (short- and long-term)
- Invigorates activity on the two 'wing' streets
- Accommodates flow of traffic on I-70
- Enhance recreation on river
- Affordable
- Doesn't impact aquifer/hot springs
- Source of community pride
- Maintains appropriate speeds on Grand Avenue
- Improves pedestrian/ bicycle/ ADA accessibility
- Engage public/community
- Meet current design standards
- 8. Following input from the PLT on values and critical success factors, Pat presented a draft context statement as follows:

"The Grand Avenue bridge over the Colorado River, Interstate 70 and the railroad tracks, connects north and south Glenwood Springs, I-70 and State Highway 82, and the historic districts of downtown and the Glenwood Hot Springs.

The bridge stands as a gateway to the city of Glenwood Springs, Glenwood Canyon, the Roaring Fork Valley, and Colorado's western slope communities. It serves local, regional and state travel, local commuters, emergency response, bicyclists and pedestrians.

The soaring walls of Glenwood Canyon; the rich history of Glenwood Springs, built at the confluence of the Colorado and Roaring Fork Rivers; mining; tourism and recreation define a splendid and vivid context for the Grand Avenue bridge."

COMMUNICATION

Consider an information type of web site, such as *Sharepoint* for information sharing.

If the PLT needs to review materials prior to meetings, provide the information at least 1 week prior.

BRIDGE SUFFICIENCY

George Tsiouvaras presented the current understanding of the bridge condition.

- Structurally, it's fairly average for its age, but no detailed inspections have been made.
- The bridge was originally designed for 2 lanes and 25 tons. It is now 4 lanes and design standards are for 45 tons.
- It is rated down due to functional obsolescence. While there are many factors here, the more obvious ones are the 9-foot 4-inch lanes, the lack of system redundancy, lack of adequate clearance for I-70 lanes and less than required vertical clearance for both the railroad and 7th Street.
- There are known scour issues. A 1992 event resulted in scour two feet below the bottom of the bridge footer.
- Water currently leaches through the bridge deck creating icicles under the bridge in the winter.
- Bridge Enterprise sees this bridge as a poor condition bridge.
- There is concern over the age of the bridge and how this might affect fatigue in the steel members.
- There is concern over condition of concrete in deck. There is no waterproofing membrane in the deck.
- Upcoming tasks will be to conduct additional research and engineering studies on the bridge to answer these questions. This is scheduled within the next 3 months.
- The project needs to look beyond the bridge sufficiency rating and consider what is the best solution given the actual condition and problems with the bridge.
- The project needs to consider beyond what will increase rating, and what is the future life of bridge
- Kjell Mitchell expressed concern about the safety of patrons from falling concrete off bridge. Concrete has fallen off the bridge in the past and landed on vehicles parked underneath.

NEPA 101

Due to time constraints, the NEPA 101 presentation will be scheduled for next meeting. The handout will be provided to the PLT prior to the meeting.

UPCOMING ACTIVITIES (NEAR TERM)

- 1. A Visioning session is being planned. An issues task force was set up to help plan for the visioning session. PLT participants include Shell Kaup and Kjell Mitchell. This will involve one or two planning meetings.
- 2. Further bridge analysis will be conducted over the next 2 to 3 months.
- 3. A project website will be set up and the project team will begin meeting with project stakeholders.

COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

1. A question was raised about developing success factors. Developing success factors implies judgments. We want folks and decision-makers to make their own judgments. Criteria will be developed that will be used to evaluate the alternatives.

ACTION ITEMS

- 1. Consider an information type of web site, such as Sharepoint for information sharing.
- 2. NEPA 101 presentation will be scheduled for next meeting. The handout will be provided to the PLT prior to the meeting.

J:_Transportation\WVXX1306_GrandAve\meetings\PLT\PLT3\SH 82 Grand Ave Bridge_PLT #3 FINAL_meeting minutes_093011.doc

Grand Avenue Bridge from PLT meeting September 29, 2011

Context Statement

The Grand Avenue bridge over the Colorado River, Interstate 70 and the railroad tracks, connects north and south Glenwood Springs, I-70 and State Highway 82, and the historic districts of downtown and the Glenwood Hot Springs.

The bridge stands as a gateway to the city of Glenwood Springs, Glenwood Canyon, the Roaring Fork Valley, and Colorado's western slope communities. It serves local, regional and state travel, local commuters, emergency response, bicyclists and pedestrians.

The soaring walls of Glenwood Canyon; the rich history of Glenwood Springs, built at the confluence of the Colorado and Roaring Fork Rivers; mining; tourism and recreation define a splendid and vivid context for the Grand Avenue bridge.

Critical Success Factors

- Meet current design standards
- Safety
- Pedestrian, bicycle, and ADA access
- Iconic structure
- Promote appropriate speeds
- Connection to 6th Street
- Minimize construction impacts
- Solve problems into the future
- Provide for activities and vibrant street life under the bridge
- Avoid and minimize environmental impacts
- Accommodate traffic flow and demand
- Design for sustainability
- Looks like it grew out of the history of Glenwood Springs
- Positive economic impact, short and long-term
- Invigorates activity on Wing Street
- Accommodates traffic flow on I-70
- Maintain and enhance recreation on the river
- Affordable
- Doesn't impact aquifer and hot springs
- Source of community pride
- Engaged public and community

Date: 9/30	/11	Meeting Purpose:	CARAND AVE BRAZE		The March	
Hosted By (need location&host name) Conferenced With (need locations): Name (Last, First):			PIT # 3	If video conference not available, would you	If video conference not available, would you stays, location of stay and per	
			COUT REGION Z	(a) travel (b) phone in or (c) cancel	diem?	
		st, First):	Title:			
CULLEN,	Jose	/	COOT PE			
Bruce Christensen		sen	city 165			
Tom Newland			Newland projet Resource	か		
EVA WILSON			EAGLE COUNTY ENGR			
PRETCHEN RICCHILL		.L	SR. PLANNER, CITY G	<u>w</u> s		
LESTIE BETHEL			DIRGOR DALVIOUN DEU.			
Joe Elsen			COOT			
BROTAN PETTER			Pitkin Connty			
Charlie Truillo		.10	BE/COOT			
SHELLEY KAMP		P	City Council - Liapson			
DOUG HARR			CHAMBER			
George Tsionvavas		NS	Design Tsibuvaras Simmy	Holdiness		
Jeff Simmons			Design / Tsicougressimmons H	loldemen		
Craix Gaskill)	Project Wabayer Lace	25		
Pat Myes		4	CSS Process/ Rishe bu	she		
Ju dole			Env. Lead-Jacobs.			
ROLAND WAGNER			COOT RE			
Tamara Smith For more attendees, ple			COOT R3-Env.			

Kjell Mitchell Genwood Hot Springs