

# **FINAL Meeting Minutes**

**Project:** CDOT Region 3 – SH 82 Grand Avenue Bridge

**Purpose:** PLT Meeting #7

**Date Held:** February 9, 2012

**Location:** CDOT Glenwood Springs Maintenance Video Conference Room

CDOT Region 1 Trail Ridge Video Conference Room (Golden) CDOT Region 3 Grand Junction Video Conference Room

**Attendees:** 

FHWA: Stephanie Gibson (conference call)CDOT: Josh Cullen, Joe Elsen, Roland Wagner

Tammie Smith (conference call)

City of Glenwood Springs: Shelley Kaup

**Eagle County:** Eva Wilson

Glenwood Hot Springs: Kjell Mitchell
Glenwood Springs Chamber: Suzanne Stewart
Historic Preservation Commission: Gretchen Ricehill
Downtown Development Authority: Leslie Bethel

Colorado Bridge Enterprise: Art Gurule

Jacobs: Craig Gaskill, Jim Clarke

**TSH:** George Tsiouvaras, David Woolfall

Newland Project Resources: Tom Newland

**Copies:** PLT Members, File

# **SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION:**

#### **INTRODUCTIONS**

#### **UPDATES**

- 1. Public Involvement
  - a. Stakeholder Working Group (SWG) Workshop planned for Monday 2/13, Glenwood Springs Community Center at 1:00 PM
    - i. Reviewed SWG agenda:



- Review of project background for those who weren't at Visioning Workshop.
- Review how comments from the Visioning workshop were incorporated into process.
- Review and confirmation on the decision making process.
- Review Level 1 screening.
- Level 2 criteria breakout session.
- Next steps.
- b. Other upcoming outreach meetings:
  - i. City of Glenwood February 10 to talk about the PI program and social media
  - ii. Nancy Shanks February 13
  - iii. RFTA Packet for February 29 meeting
  - iv. Glenwood City Council March 1, 6:00 p.m.
  - v. City Transportation Commission March 8, 7:30 a.m.
  - vi. RE-1 School District March 14, 6:30 p.m.
  - vii. Elected Officials Transportation Committee Packet for March 12 meeting; will schedule presentation for early summer
  - viii. Garfield County Commissioners March 15, 8:00 a.m.
  - ix. Rotary Club March 19, 6:45 p.m.
  - x. Lions Club TBD
  - xi. Kiwanis Club TBD
- c. Meeting with Glenwood Post Independent on February 10th
  - i. Tom, Joe, and Craig meeting. Purpose is to provide an update and identify how we can best work with the Post on future progress. Providing a regular column or press releases will be discussed. Perhaps the PLT members could rotate providing articles. Coordination with media should also include discussions with Nancy Shanks, Public Information officer for CDOT Region 3. A meeting with Nancy is set up for Monday Feb. 13th.
  - ii. The next Public Open House is scheduled for April 4th, Glenwood Springs Community Center, 4:30 to 7:00 PM.
  - iii. Discussed social media initiatives. Will be meeting with Rosa Silver from the City and Nancy Shanks with CDOT to develop an approach.
  - iv. Regarding article in high school newspaper, perhaps invite a rep to join the Stakeholders Working Group. Tom will follow up on this.



- v. There was also a suggestion about meeting with the Hot Springs Board. Kjell noted that he is providing information back to the Board but will let the project team know if a meeting would be appropriate.
- vi. Based on input from the PLT, a new logo has been developed. There was no clear consensus on the input but consistent ideas were incorporated. The new logo has brownish colors, buildings on one side, and a simple font. This will be used for the first time at the upcoming SWG meeting on 2/13.

## 2. Planning

a. Planning updates covered under main agenda item; Level 2A screening.

#### 3. Environmental

- a. Meeting with SHPO on Area of Potential Effect.
- b. The Area of Potential Effect (APE) will be sent out to Section 106 consulting parties and sent to Gretchen Ricehill.
- c. There was a question about what would happen if the project required large changes in traffic patterns during construction. Could the APE be modified? The answer is yes.
- d. Discussion regarding EA process and level of NEPA documentation:
  - i. EA process might not lead to a Finding of No Significant Impact. If impacts are significant, an Environmental Impact Statement would be required.
  - ii. Joe asked if the possibility of a Categorical Exclusion clearance still exists.
  - iii. Per Stephanie, she wouldn't feel comfortable moving forward with a CatEx at this point, given potential resource impacts.

#### 4. Engineering

- a. Have been discussing how to integrate bridge architect and other expertise in the process.
- b. Study team working on a clear summary to functional and structural issues with bridge.
- c. Sufficiency rating has limitations when explaining problems to the public.
- d. Joe asked about the status of formalizing the bridge condition report and the development of a straight-forward bridge condition message.
- e. The team is developing a simple paragraph on the existing condition, a more detailed explanation if more detail is needed and graphic that will help describe the problem.
- f. Stephanie recommended that we avoid too much discussion about bridge sufficiency.
- g. Joe discussed the need for an "eighth grade level" explanation that might include a semi weights 80,000 lbs and has this many axles.
- h. Kjell indicated that we need come up with the reasons that the bridge needs to be replaced to help the public understand.



i. Joe mentioned that the several years ago the Maroon Creek Bridge went from a sufficiency rating of 41 to 9 and really concerned the public. Stephanie indicated that is one of the issues with sufficiency rating, people compare it to school grades and can't relate to the meaning of the low sufficiency.

## SCREENING PROCESS AND CRITERIA

1. PLT reviewed a new process diagram. No comments were received.

## LEVEL 2(A) COMPARATIVE SCREENING

- Dave Woolfall provided an overview of design considerations and criteria considered for screening. This included a review of Level 1 screening and a review of Level 2 screening criteria.
  - a. There was a discussion regarding travel speeds, traffic calming, etc. Suggestions on keeping speeds low included photo tickets, and electronic speed signs.
    - i. There was a suggestion to provide a median between 8th and 9th by removing parking. This could provide traffic calming and reduce speeds entering downtown.
    - ii. Another idea was to reduce the lane width through striping.
    - iii. Joe pointed out that the access control plan is starting up and will consider some of these ideas.
    - iv. There was concern about limiting design speed to 40 mph or greater. Dave noted that this provides guidance for mainline design parameters during alternatives development. At intersections, design speeds will likely be much less. Also, once alternatives are reviewed they could be modified if a lower design speed was more appropriate in meeting the criteria.
    - v. Stephanie noted that design speed has only vague relevance to travel speed.
  - b. There was a discussion if orienting traffic away from Hot Springs area is an advantage or a disadvantage. Kjell indicated it's hard to say from the Hot Springs perspective at this point. Leslie noted that having landscape architects on board early would help in evaluating alternatives and their relative merits and limitations for visual change to places like the Hot Springs.
  - c. Shelly initiated discussion regarding when the public would have input on when alternatives are screened. The PWG is responsible for making recommendations for screening based on technical considerations as well as input from PLT, SWG, and public. Since additional input will be received after recommendations are made the PWG is responsible for revising those recommendations, if appropriate.
  - d. Concern about screening out bike plans on bridge at this point. PLT discussed and team will bring up concerns at the PWG meeting on February 10th.

e. Other project team recommendations of the Level 2a screening were acceptable as presented.

#### **ACTION ITEMS**

- 1. Provide input on bike lanes and urban design elements to PWG.
- 2. Suggest a regular Grand Avenue column to the Post Independent.

#### **Attachments**

Presentation – too large to email – is posted on the ftp site Screening Process Sign-in sheet





# SH 82 Grand Avenue Bridge Project Leadership Team Meeting #7

CDOT Region 3 (Glenwood) Maintenance (Monument Video Conference Room) CDOT Region 1 (Trail Ridge Video Conference Room)

#### **AGENDA**

Thursday, February 9, 2012

1:30 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.

- 1. Updates
  - a. Public Involvement
  - b. Planning
  - c. Environmental
  - d. Engineering
- 2. Screening Process and Criteria
- 3. Level 2(a) Comparative Screening
- 4. Recommendations



# Project Leadership Team Meeting #7 Thursday, February 9, 2012

1:30 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.
CDOT Region 3 (Glenwood) Maintenance Video Conference Room
CDOT Region 1 (Trail Ridge Video Conference Room)

Colorado City of Gid	Colorado Department of Transportation, Region 3  Josh Cullen  Tammie Smith (via WebEx/conference call)  Joe Elsen  Roland Wagner  City of Glenwood Springs City Council Representative  Bruce Christensen  Shelley Kaup (alternate)
City of Giv	City of Glenwood Springs  Dave Betley  Colorado Bridge Enterprise/ AECOM  Art Gurule
Eagle County Eva	Eva Wilson
Ditkin County  Brian F	Jeff Nelson  Unty  Brian Pettet

FHWA	
	EVEL STOPENE COSSEN (JOHN
Jacobs	
	Craig Gaskill
7	Jim Clarke
	Mary Speck
Tsiouvar	Tsiouvaras Simmons Holderness, Inc. (TSH)
//	George Tsiouvaras (via WebEx/conference call)
>	David Woolfall
Glenwoo	Glenwood Hot Springs
	Kjell Mitchell
Glenwoo	Glenwood Springs Chamber Resort Association
7	Suzanne Stewart
Downtoy	Downtown Development Authority
	Leslie Bethel
Historic	Historic Preservation Commission
7	Gretchen Ricehill
Other (N	(Name/Organization)
	Tom Newland — Newland Project Resources
	Pat Noyes — Pat Noyes & Associates



