

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Eagle Residency

P.O. Box 298
714 Grand Avenue
Eagle, Colorado 81631
(970) 328-6385



Project No. FBR 0821-094
Project Code: 18158

SH 82 Grand Avenue Bridge Project Leadership Team Meeting

ATTENDEES:

Joe Elsen, CDOT R3 Program Engineer
Peter Kozinski, CDOT R3 Special Projects Engineer
Siri Roman, CDOT R3 Engineer
Bruce Christensen, City of Glenwood Springs
Eva Wilson, Eagle County
Jeff Nelson, Garfield County
Kjell Mitchell, Glenwood Hot Springs
Doug Harr, Glenwood Springs Chamber Resort Association
Gretchen Ricehill, Historic Preservation Commission
Brian Pettet, Pitkin County
Charlie Trujillo, AECOM

DATE: April 6, 2011

LOCATION: Garfield County Administration Building; BOCC Room

INTRODUCTION

These meeting notes reflect the discussion, decisions and action items agreed to at this meeting. Please advise Siri Roman as soon as possible if your meeting notes reflect any substantial differences from these notes.

AGENDA

The agenda for the meeting is attached and the meeting generally followed this format.

DISCUSSION

Welcome & Introduction

Peter acknowledged that this process is a substantial time commitment and thanked the PLT members for participating. All of the PLT members then introduced themselves and the organizations that they represent.

Charlie Trujillo, of AECOM, stated that his firm was hired to administer the Colorado Bridge Enterprise (CBE) Program and is considered a part of CDOT. Charlie explained that the Grand Ave. Bridge rehabilitation or replacement will be funded by FASTER (*Funding Advancement for Surface Transportation and Economic Recovery*). Joe added that a source of the funding for the FASTER program are vehicle registration fees.

Peter explained that the approach to this project delivery will be different than most people are accustomed to. The leadership team will lead the project, champion context sensitive solution and enable decision making. The PLT

will identify the roadblocks and find a way around them, and if more information is needed then technical teams will be formed.

Project History & Overview

Peter stated that the current State Highway 82 Grand Avenue Bridge is a problematic bridge that is functionally obsolete. The lanes are substandard (less than ten feet wide) and there are no shoulders. Joe added that the bridge has a sufficiency rating of 47.4.

Peter explained that CDOT wants to be good stewards of tax payer money and will therefore research rehabilitation of the existing bridge as the first option. The CBE Program is currently evaluating state-wide criteria to determine when rehabilitation is acceptable. If through a thorough fact-based analysis, it is determined that rehabilitation is not feasible then the next step would be the NEPA process. It is assumed that this project will require an environmental assessment (EA). During the environmental process we will be discussing community impacts, methods of handling traffic, the clearance over the Union Pacific Railroad, tie-down points of the bridge, aesthetics etc. The EA will carry a no-action alternative as well. Once a decision document is prepared, with a recommended alternative, then the design of the bridge will commence.

Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS) Purpose & Process

Peter reviewed the hand-outs and the CSS 6-step process. He asked the PLT members to review the documents, explaining that these documents were developed for the I-70 Corridor, and even though this is not a mountain corridor project it will use the same philosophies. Peter directed the PLT members to the website on the back of the cover explaining that all of the hand-outs as well as additional CSS information are located on the website (www.i70mtncorridorcss.com).

Brian asked if anyone was missing from the PLT. Peter responded that Tammie Smith, the R3 CDOT Environmental Manager, was unable to attend. He inquired if the PLT felt that anyone from the community was missing adding that he had hoped to invite an environmental representative but wanted to keep the group manageable as well. He explained that Colorado Mountain College had expressed interest, and that they would be included in a technical group. Doug mentioned including someone from the rafting community, Bruce added that the rafting community is a large economic contributor to the area. Peter responded that the rafting community is a vested business interest and will be included in a technical group as well. The PLT agreed that they will keep boating considerations in mind throughout the project since there are recreational boaters among the group. Bruce asked if RFTA would be involved. Peter responded that RFTA will be involved.

Peter explained that establishing criteria prior to developing alternatives is very important. He stated that if the PLT follows the process, the alternative should be amenable to the entire team. Bruce stated that he believed, in the context of the community, this is an opportunity to achieve something that works for both CDOT and the community. Peter agreed and said that it is *Context Sensitive Solutions* and we will be following the principles.

Gretchen asked if this process will involve public discussions. Peter responded that it will involve several public forums including meetings, design charrettes and visioning. Peter will be asking the PLT members to post flyers, invite people to meetings and discuss the project with their constituents.

Brian asked if there is funding for planning. Peter responded that there is \$6 million for preliminary engineering including the environmental assessment and the design. Charlie added that the BE Program is looking to spend money wisely but *faster* and that there is an opportunity to pay for construction. Once the design is complete, CDOT will determine which funds to use, either revenue from the vehicle taxes or bond proceeds.

Eva asked if CDOT would be using innovative contracting on this project. Peter responded that they haven't ruled it out and that he is writing the RFP so that at the appropriate milestone CDOT may choose to go that direction. Joe added that CDOT will develop a risk matrix to determine if innovative contracting is appropriate for this project.

Consultant Selection & PLT Roles

Peter said that he will be preparing a qualifications-based Request for Proposal to select a Consultant. It should be finalized by the end of April. He requested that the PLT communicate over the next few weeks and determine if two members would like to be part of the Consultant selection process, he anticipates that it will be a 2 ½ day commitment. The interviews for the selection process will be held in Glenwood Springs. Peter told the PLT members that they may be contacted by Consultants over the next few weeks and it is to their discretion if they choose to speak with them; however, they should be consistent with the information that they share among all Consultants. Peter also requested that they do not disclose the selection committee to the Consultants.

Project Schedule

Peter explained that if the Grand Ave. Bridge is to be reconstructed, the current approximate timeline shows that the reconstruction would occur during the summer of 2014, allowing 6 months to get the Consultant on-board, 18 months for the NEPA process and 12 months for design. Once the NEPA process is underway, the PLT members can anticipate monthly progress meetings. During the design phase the meetings will be scaled back to approximately once every 3 months.

ACTION ITEMS

- Peter will draft the Request for Proposal.
- PLT Members will select two members to participate in the Consultant Selection Committee.