

FINAL Meeting Minutes

Project: CDOT Region 3 – SH 82 Grand Avenue Bridge

Purpose: Project Leadership Team Meeting #21

Date/Time: Wednesday, April 30; 9:00 a.m. – 11:30 p.m.

Location: CDOT Region 3 Glenwood Maintenance Conference Room and Web Meeting

Attendees:

CDOT:	Joe Elsen, Roland Wagner (phone), Behrooz Far (phone), Mike Vanderhoof (phone),
Colorado Bridge Enterprise:	Matt Cirulli
Jacobs:	Steve Pouliot, Jim Clarke, Mary Speck (all phone)
TSH:	Craig Gaskill, Randall Lapsley
Glenwood Springs City Council:	Bruce Christensen
City of Glenwood Springs:	Dave Betley, Kathy Trauger
Glenwood Springs Chamber:	Suzanne Stewart
Glenwood Hot Springs:	Kjell Mitchell
Pitkin County:	Brian Pettet
Granite/RLW:	Rich Henderson (phone)
Newland Project Resources:	Tom Newland
Pat Noyes and Assoc.:	Pat Noyes (phone)
Interested Citizen:	Dave Sturges

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

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

INTRODUCTIONS

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT STATUS

1. Jim Clarke provided an overview of the EA and sections. There's an executive summary, five chapters, and technical appendices.
2. EA review schedule:
 - a. Began review November 26, 2013.
 - b. Review in process.
 - i. Reviewed by CDOT - two rounds.

Meeting Minutes

SH 82 Grand Avenue Bridge EA - PLT Meeting #21

April 30, 2014

Page 2 of 2

- ii. Reviewed by FHWA – two rounds.
 - iii. Next round of review mid-May.
 - Will include City of Glenwood Springs review.
 - iv. Draft EA was not expected to be provided to City Council, but some input may be okay and reasonable as long as confidentiality is maintained.
 - v. Concern was expressed about the risk of providing to Council for review at this stage. This would not be considered typical.
 - vi. Review by Council members will be left to the City's discretion.
 - vii. The City needs to determine number of copies needed.
 - viii. Comments expected back in 10 working days.
 - ix. Comments should come back through a single point of contact at the City.
 - x. When the document goes out to the public, there will be a 30-day review period.
 - xi. A public hearing will also be held during this time frame. There will be a court reporter to record oral comments.
- c. Decision Document.
- i. Will respond to comments.
 - ii. FHWA will develop recommendation.
 - iii. FHWA will determine if a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI), or an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is required.
 - iv. Assuming a FONSI, the current schedule shows completing the process in early 2015.

DESIGN OVERVIEW

1. Major elements of the design were reviewed, including the Grand Avenue Bridge, the new pedestrian bridge, roadway connections, the new bike/pedestrian underpass, the elevators and stairs, surface treatments and replacement parking for Glenwood Hot Springs.
2. The design also includes three detours – a SH 82 Detour on 8th Street and Exit 114 during the maximum two-month Grand Avenue Bridge closure, a nighttime detour using 6th Street for I-70 closures, and a pedestrian bridge detour on or attached to the existing Grand Avenue Bridge.
 - a. SH 82 Detour on 8th Street:
 - i. The SH 82 Detour is being coordinated with the City's 8th Street Extension project. The City has not yet made a decision of their 8th Street alignment. The detour also includes improvements at Exit 114.
 - ii. If the City's project does not occur, the Grand Avenue Bridge SH 82 Detour will be constructed on a shallower profile.

Meeting Minutes

SH 82 Grand Avenue Bridge EA - PLT Meeting #21

April 30, 2014

Page 3 of 3

- iii. Concern was raised over how the SH 82 Detour or connection would affect rail banking. RFTA has been very involved in the process and is considering the rail banking issue as part of the discussions.
3. Other elements of the project funded by other sources include the I-70 Exit 116 eastbound on-ramp and westbound off-ramp improvements, and new signals at 8th Street and Grand Avenue.

SCHEDULE

1. Project scoping occurred in the fall of 2011.
2. Project alternatives development and evaluation went through the end of 2013.
3. 30% plans were submitted in February 2014.
4. 60% plans are scheduled for submittal in June 2014.
5. 90% plans are scheduled for submittal in October 2014.
6. Final plans and the decision document are scheduled for late January 2015.
7. Construction could commence by July 2015 with the bridge closure and SH 82 Detour around spring of 2016.
8. Project could be complete by early spring 2017.
9. Before the contractor can start they need to agree on a price. This is done through the use of an Independent Cost Estimator (ICE). To proceed with a construction contract, the contractor cost and the ICE cost need to be within a certain percentage.

DESIGN ELEMENTS INPUT AND REVISIONS MADE

1. Overall priority areas of architectural design elements as a result of the input process:
 - a. Pedestrian bridge.
 - b. Downtown area (under and around the Grand Avenue bridge, including the elevators and stairs).
 - c. Entry to Glenwood Springs area.
 - d. Other architectural design elements had support but not at the same level of priority as the areas listed above.
2. The design elements input process included two Design Elements Issue Task Force meetings, three Stakeholder Working Group meetings, two City Council workshops, and a Transportation Commission meeting.
3. General agreement was obtained on almost all of the design elements. Additional work, based on the input is being done on the pedestrian bridge rail, the Grand Avenue Bridge overhead lighting, and the gateway (traffic calming) treatments.
4. One person noted concern that what stakeholders saw during this process has not been definitively funded. While this was not a concern by others, it was suggested that the project team needs to manage public expectations of these improvements.

Meeting Minutes

SH 82 Grand Avenue Bridge EA - PLT Meeting #21

April 30, 2014

Page 4 of 4

- a. This will be done through ongoing outreach, including the use of renderings showing what will be constructed, once funding is determined. This should also explain why.
- b. It's also important to communicate that this is resulting in a better product.
5. Regarding funding, several sources were mentioned as potential funding options, including Bureau of Land Management (BLM) access funds, transit funds, energy funds, and county funds.
 - a. The City also needs to know what and when funding shortfalls are anticipated for any potential City-supported funding.
6. A question was raised by one person about the transparent barrier being considered mitigation.
 - a. It does not meet the criteria for noise mitigation, which is based on cost and effectiveness, but it may be eligible for economic or historic mitigation. This has yet to be determined.

PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE ALIGNMENT

1. A new pedestrian bridge alignment has been selected for the design.
 - a. The previous alignment was found to have high construction risks resulting in higher construction costs. This was primarily due to the previous alignment being so tightly squeezed between the existing Grand Avenue Bridge and existing pedestrian bridge.
 - b. To address this, pedestrians will first be placed on a detour, allowing the existing pedestrian bridge to be removed. Once the existing bridge is removed, the new pedestrian bridge can be constructed with an alignment shifted to the east.
 - c. The new alignment of the pedestrian bridge allows for a much improved elevators/ stairs layout. The elevators would be on the east side of the landing and the stairs would be on the west side.
 - d. The pedestrian detour would be done by either a new 5-foot walkway attached to the existing Grand Avenue Bridge or by removing a northbound traffic lane on the Grand Avenue Bridge and replacing it with a traffic barrier and pedestrian walkway.
 - e. One person expressed concern about the second option, primarily as this was not seen as consistent with public expectations on construction impacts to traffic. This decision on the pedestrian detour has not yet been made, but will consider traffic impacts, costs, and other relevant comparisons.

PUBLIC OUTREACH GOING FORWARD

1. Moving forward, the focus will be on public education rather than input. This will include press releases, meetings as needed or requested, e-mails to interested stakeholders, web page updates, a public hearing (as part of the EA review), and public information during construction.
 - a. It was suggested that local organizations could help in getting this information out to the public.

Meeting Minutes

SH 82 Grand Avenue Bridge EA - PLT Meeting #21

April 30, 2014

Page 5 of 5

- b. The Sonoran Institute has also conducted public involvement training to many key stakeholders. These resources could also be used. Kathy Trauger was considered a good contact for this.
- c. Also consider more but smaller meetings to reach out to the public.
- d. The City can help facilitate information for the Glenwood Springs Post Independent.
- e. The physical model will be updated this summer
- f. Renderings will also be developed this summer to help show stakeholders what to expect.

NEXT PLT MEETINGS

1. The next two PLT meetings are proposed for fall 2014 and early 2015 before construction starts.