

FINAL Meeting Minutes

Project: CDOT Region 3 – SH 82 Grand Avenue Bridge

Purpose: PLT Meeting #18

Date Held: March 6, 2013

Location: Glenwood Springs Community Center

Attendees:

CDOT:	Joe Elsen, Josh Cullen, Roland Wagner, Mike Vanderhoof
Colorado Bridge Enterprise:	Ken Szeliga
FHWA:	Eva LaDow (conference call)
Jacobs:	Jim Clarke, Mary Speck
TSH:	Craig Gaskill, George Tsiouvaras, Clint Krajnik, David Woolfall
Glenwood Springs Chamber:	Suzanne Stewart
Glenwood Hot Springs:	Kjell Mitchell
Historic Preservation Commission:	Gretchen Ricehill
Eagle County:	Eva Wilson (conference call)
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

REVIEW OF BUILD ALTERNATIVE FOR THE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Alignment 3E and 6th and Laurel Intersection

1. Alignment 3E with a signalized intersection at 6th and Laurel will be the build alternative or preferred alternative in the EA.
2. These basic elements have not changed much since the January 9 Public Open House.
3. The project team is investigating to see if the 6th and Laurel intersection area can be pushed any further west to minimize impacts to the old Dairy Crème property.

Pedestrian Bridge

1. At the pedestrian bridge design workshop held on February 6, there were three general types carried forward:
 - a. Cable stayed symmetric spans – two equal spans.
 - b. Arch bridge spans from south bank to north of River Road.
 - i. Single rib minimizes bird perching issues.
 - ii. Arches with canting of the structure. Canting offers the ability of the structure to be visible as you drive north on Grand Avenue.
 - iii. There is also a center arch configuration with a vertical arch in the middle of the bridge with pedestrian movements around both sides.
 - c. Single tower-asymmetric, cable stayed.
 - i. Some feedback from public meeting was that it might block view of the mountains. This version moved the tower to the north bank helping to minimize this potential effect on the view.
 2. Clint introduced the concept of a curved pedestrian bridge to improve the pedestrian experience and eliminate the “Bowling Alley” effect. This option came out of the pedestrian bridge workshop and would be used for all bridge types except for the center arch configuration.
 3. The three bridges have options of incorporating bulb-outs and view locations on the pedestrian bridge. There was discussion of the City developing a water-park in the river, in the location of the old bridge pier. City will find out if this idea is moving forward.
 4. Discussed fencing requirements over railroad and I-70. This fencing can be made more attractive materials and incorporated into the structure.
 5. Pedestrian bridge width of 16 feet was determined at the pedestrian bridge workshop. Width is in line with other similar pedestrian facilities in US, Canada and Europe. Original idea of 20 feet was considered too wide, as it might appear to be like a vehicle bridge and detract from the pedestrian experience. No designation for separating pedestrians /bikes was recommended at the pedestrian bridge workshop. The pedestrian bridge is not a current bike route or planned for one in the future, although it is used by bicyclists.
 6. Question about the pedestrian bridge pier to the north of the I-70 envelope. This is not yet designed and will depend upon bridge type and geotechnical work.
 7. What is status of geotechnical and seismic work for foundations?
 - a. Draft report was provided in early March and it is under review by project team.
 8. Utilities on pedestrian bridge – how to hide.
 - a. The project team is coordinating with the utility companies on specific needs and requirement to both construct and maintain. There is a desire to hide utilities to the extent feasible given maintenance needs.
-

FINAL Meeting Minutes

SH 82 Grand Avenue Bridge EA - PLT Meeting #18

March 6, 2013

Page 3 of 4

9. Discussion of historic attributes and the different opinions as to what historic means. The existing Grand Avenue Bridge is historic but not because of unique design elements.
 - a. Ongoing discussion has been that a modern looking structure may be the right approach. Historic elements could be incorporated into the details.

Bridge Connections South End

1. 8th and Grand intersection options developed for the Access Control Plan will dictate bridge width in this area. A decision on the Access Control Plan is being decided upon by the City Council at an April 11 meeting. Options in the 7th Street to 8th Street area include:
 - a. Full Movement at 8th (with left-turn) includes 6-foot walk that lands close to current Grand Avenue touchdown point.
 - b. Full Movement at 8th (with left turn) lane includes Scissor Ramp at 7th and no sidewalk on Grand. (A variation to the scissor ramp is an elevator on the south side of the pedestrian bridge.
 - c. Right-in/Right Out (RIRO) with attached 8-foot sidewalk on east side.
 - d. Right-in/Right Out (RIRO) with no attached sidewalk (with either a scissors ramp or an elevator).
 2. Minimum bridge width option would be RIRO with scissor ramp or elevator.
 3. Story pole event March 7 will demonstrate height, width, and depth of bridge structure between 7th and 8th under the different intersection and pedestrian connection options.
 4. Perception of downtown business owners is that a signal at 8th will slow people down, which in their mind is a good thing.
 5. Modern design standards for width, truck accommodation, sight distance, snow storage, etc., push lane widths and shoulders larger on the bridge.
 6. The overall project needs to consider traffic calming from the point that motorist's exit I-70. Maybe incorporate speed information signs. Another technique would be speed feedback. Enforcement is the biggest deterrent. It would be good to discuss with Terry Wilson.
 7. Speed into downtown is a context sensitive issue and needs to be looked at holistically - and include the experience from exiting I-70, crossing the river, and entering downtown. Consider visual cues that will indicate to drivers they are entering an urban environment.
 8. Question to the PLT: Is the Grand Avenue Bridge project team providing enough information about the bridge to help the public and City Council make determinations about the Access Control Plan. Is the information the bridge project providing appropriate, and will it help the City Council make a decision on the ACP?
 - a. PLT indicated that the team is being very accommodating and providing the correct level of information.
 9. DDA consultant will show design options they are developing at a March 21 City Council Workshop.
-

10. Could ACP elements, like removal of left turns at 8th Street, be done if there were not an ACP? We could incorporate ACP analysis within our EA to help justify decision.
11. Mike Vanderhoof indicated the EA process should supersede the ACP in decisions on 8th and Grand, as the Grand Avenue bridge project has been found to affect that intersection. Question: if there were no ACP, what decision would this project have reached for the 8th and Grand intersection? This would be determined through the Grand Avenue bridge alternatives evaluation and selection process.

Bridge Connections North End

1. River Commission Meeting was held on February 25.
2. The group agreed to evaluate an off-street bike improvement to connect to Two Rivers Trail. This includes an underpass of the new bridge at the north abutment.
3. Since the workshop, the project team came up with a new idea to put a tunnel diagonally under the SH 82/US 6 intersection. This could be considered part of mitigation for pedestrian -bike connectivity. In most cases, this particular culvert might not be funded by the Colorado Bridge Enterprise because FASTER program law is basically to reconstruct old bridges. However, any mitigation identified in the EA is justified.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

1. Tom and Craig visited approximately 70 businesses on Grand Avenue between 7th and 9th Streets on February 26. They distributed an FAQ on downtown issues and an invite to the March 7 story poling event.
 - a. Most of the people were appreciative of the information.
 - b. The walk-around is summarized in meeting minutes.
2. March 7 story poling event.
 - a. Being held to assist the City Council in determining differences and tradeoffs for the Access Control Plan intersection options for 8th and Grand.
 - b. Three sessions - two for the public and one for City Council.
3. Potential Public Open House to be held mid-June.
 - a. Purpose is to gather input on pedestrian bridge options and to update on project. Will also introduce CM/GC to public.

NEXT MEETING

1. Mid-May as potential next PLT meeting to introduce CMGC contractor and provide project update
2. Josh to look at dates at CDOT conference room.

ACTION ITEMS

1. Set up next PLT meeting in Mid-May