

The Stakeholder Working Group Workshop was held on November 14, 2012, at the Glenwood Springs Community Center. There were 23 members of the community in attendance, in addition to study team members. The workshop focused on bridge type options, including visual and aesthetic considerations and their implications for construction timing and traffic impacts; and opportunities for retaining, improving, or replacing the pedestrian bridge.

After an update on the project status, small groups addressed three topics:

### **Visual and Aesthetics**

Consider the different bridge types presented and discuss:

- How the bridge would look with different structure types
- What are the aesthetic advantages of the different bridge types
- What aspects of the different structure types are consistent with the context
- What aspects of the different structure types are inconsistent with the context

### **Constructability and Impacts**

Consider what is important about the different bridge types in terms of construction and impacts to traffic and the community and discuss:

- Construction phasing by bridge type
- Lane/bridge/I-70 closures by bridge type
- Detours during construction phases
- Traffic changes during construction phases

### **Pedestrian Bridge**

Consider what is important about the pedestrian bridge and discuss:

- Issues with current bridge
- Objectives and desired outcomes
- Options for providing pedestrian access
- What are the advantages of the different options
- What are the concerns with the different options

### **Breakout Group Discussion Points**

The discussion points were recorded as follows:

#### **Visual and Aesthetics**

- Is it possible to reduce number of spans downtown by including superstructure in that segment?
- Bridge should not dominate.
- Should have character of Glenwood Springs rather than interstate.
- Architectural elements will provide local character.
- Massing from pedestrian perspective should be minimized.
- Minimize pillars/amount of structure.
- Design for community not just drivers.
- Less obstructive/more view with features that define community.
- Pillars should not block views.
- Variable depth spans more interesting.
- Minimal superstructure allows/preserves views.
- Make the bridge:
  - “disappear.”
  - Simple is good.
- Graceful, elegant-hunches.

#### **Constructability and Impacts**

- Consider building the new the 8<sup>th</sup> Street connection before construction.
- Consider load capacity of 27<sup>th</sup> street bridge or 8<sup>th</sup> possible if 27<sup>th</sup> can't. 14<sup>th</sup> hold trucks. Or fix 27<sup>th</sup> first.
- The shopping/dining/vacation/recreational trips are the most likely to stay away when bridge is closed but they spend money downtown, commuters don't spend downtown.
- Public information campaign – structure roll in becomes an event.
- Publicity for business-event based.
- Potential mud slides on Midland in spring.
- Prefer fall closure. If construction lasts too long it is better to run overtime into December, rather than June.
- If 27<sup>th</sup> does not work, consider building a bridge at 14<sup>th</sup>.
- Prefer roll-in concept??
- Consider one-way on River Road to mitigate pool parking (add parallel parking)?
- Concern about hammering bridge foundations in downtown (piling).

## Pedestrian Bridge

- Aesthetic pedestrian bridge and simpler highway bridge makes sense.
- Complementary/similar bridges make sense.
- Graphics needed for pedestrian access on south side.
- How the pedestrian bridge fits into the transportation grid is important.
  - The current alignment is good.
  - The current alignment supports the historic character.
- New pedestrian bridge provides aesthetic opportunities.
- Pedestrian bridge design shouldn't compete with or obstruct bridge views.
- Aesthetic treatments should be placed at the ends of the pedestrian bridge and the middle should be simple.
- Consider place-making on the pedestrian bridge (as shown in DDA sketches).
- Overlooks on the pedestrian bridge would be appropriate.
- Need for bike/pedestrian connections(s) between 2-Rivers, 6<sup>th</sup> Street and Canyon Trail.
- Look at ways to minimize pedestrian conflict with highway traffic.
- Wide enough pedestrian bridge (e.g. 20') and separation between bike and ped is preferable.
- Bring pedestrian bridge down to 8<sup>th</sup> (no switchbacks).
- Consider opportunities to tweak existing ped bridge
- New pedestrian bridge would provide more aesthetic opportunity than highway bridge.
- Separation needed between pedestrian bridge and vehicle traffic
- Is there another city use for the existing pedestrian bridge?
- Complementary aesthetics between highway and pedestrian bridges would be good.
- Extending the I-70 acceleration lane would be a plus (and would be allowed by rebuilding the pedestrian bridge).
- Like idea of ramp connection down to Grand Ave between 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup>, versus ramp structure to 7<sup>th</sup>.
- People go to see the Golden Gate bridge – it is sometimes the destination. Can pedestrian bridge be a destination?
- Consider utilitarian – less is best.
- Consider more refined, eloquent.