

## FINAL Meeting Minutes

- Project:** CDOT Region 3 – SH 82 Grand Avenue Bridge
- Purpose:** Project Leadership Team Meeting #19
- Date/Time:** Wednesday, May 15; 2:00 – 4:30 p.m.
- Location:** CDOT Region 3 Glenwood (Maintenance Video Conference Room), Golden;  
CDOT Trail Ridge Video Conference Room (425 C Corporate Circle, Golden)
- Attendees:**
- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>CDOT:</b>                             | Joe Elsen, Josh Cullen, Roland Wagner, Nancy Shanks,<br>Mike Vanderhoof                    |
| <b>Colorado Bridge Enterprise:</b>       | Matt Cirulli   |
| <b>Jacobs:</b>                           | Jim Clarke, Mary Speck   |
| <b>TSH:</b>                              | Craig Gaskill, George Tsiouvaras, David Woolfall   |
| <b>City of Glenwood Springs:</b>         | Shelley Kaup   |
| <b>Glenwood Hot Springs:</b>             | Kjell Mitchell   |
| <b>Historic Preservation Commission:</b> | Gretchen Ricehill  |
| <b>Pitkin County:</b>                    | Brian Pettet   |
| <b>Downtown Development Authority:</b>   | Leslie Bethel  |
| <b>Newland Project Resources:</b>        | Tom Newland  |
| <b>Pat Noyes and Assoc.:</b>             | Pat Noyes  |
| <b>Interested Citizen:</b>               | Dave Sturges   |
| <b>Granite/RLW</b>                       | Casey Green, Tom Walborn, Maverick Gibbons,<br>Gaylen Stewart, Brigham Latimer, Larry Luke |
- Copies:** PLT Members, PWG Members, Other Attendees, File

---

## SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

### INTRODUCTIONS

1. Maverick Gibbons introduced the Granite/RLW team members.
  - a. Work in Glenwood Springs – Parking garage; Granite and RLW have worked together since 2006. 38 ABC bridges. 27 projects under CM/GC procurement method.
  - b. Joe Elsen gave a brief overview of the CM/GC procurement process.
    - i. Grand Ave Bridge was an ideal candidate for this project delivery method. Challenging project – risk and opportunities.

- ii. CDOT did not want a low bidder – conducted a best value procurement. Listened to capabilities, innovations, understanding of process.
- iii. Granite/RLW team won out on all those.
- iv. Benefit to procuring at this point - we are able to have planning time with contractor who is on the team as a consultant to provide input, listen to concerns, be in tune with the issues so costs are priced accordingly.
- v. Joe indicated there were 7 proposals submitted – Granite/RLW was the only joint venture.

## **BUILD ALTERNATIVE UPDATE**

### **6th & Laurel Intersection**

1. After last public meeting, we received public and stakeholder input on the 6<sup>th</sup> and Laurel intersection (complexity, ability of pedestrians to get through the intersection, impacts to private properties, and ability to redevelop 6<sup>th</sup> Street). The project team developed eight variations of the previously developed Alternatives 3A and 3E with the intent of addressing the input on this intersection. Of these eight variations, one appears to have the potential to compare favorably to the current Build Alternative 3E.
  - a. The revised intersection is a roundabout, similar to original Alternative 3A but better consolidated to minimize impacts. The roundabout option has benefits: it reduces right-of-way impacts and improves traffic operations.
    - i. The intersection has been pushed to the west away from the Glenwood Adventure parcel that was going to be taken completely. No right-of-way is required from Village Inn and Kum and Go. A small sliver, currently landscaped, is required from Subway.
    - ii. Traffic operations are better than the signalized intersection, primarily at the connection between US 6 and 6<sup>th</sup> Street.
  - b. Pedestrian circulation.
    - i. There are tradeoffs with the roundabout. Signalized intersections have controlled pedestrian movements; roundabouts generally are safer because of slower speeds.
    - ii. This alternative better focused pedestrians on the north side of 6<sup>th</sup> Street, where the traffic volumes are very low.
    - iii. The pedestrian underpass under this new alternative has better connectivity to the Two Rivers Trail system. It is shorter than the 3E alternative and crosses Grand Avenue at a reduced skew.
  - c. Question: Should there be a concern about the 6<sup>th</sup>/SH 82 signal being so close to the roundabout? Answer: The turn lanes are sized to store left turn turns and generally keep traffic from backing up into the roundabout.

- d. This alternative will be brought to Project Working Group (PWG) meeting next Tuesday for discussion. This will include the results of the evaluation based on the previously established evaluation criteria.
    - i. If the PWG decides to carry this forward into the Environmental Assessment (EA), there should not be major changes to the EA as the net change in physical impacts appears to be lower with Revised 3A. This should not affect EA schedule but will put some pressure on it.
  - e. More engineering detail will be put into Revised 3A for the PWG review.
2. Leslie Bethel - thank you to design team for taking the step backwards and being flexible enough to reevaluate. This revision creates more opportunities for redevelopment of 6<sup>th</sup> Street – land area to do more. Pedestrian underpass will be important – must be big (wide) enough and light enough.
  3. Question: Can you put skylight on underpass? Answer: There are maintenance issues (highway mag chloride, debris, leaking). Better to focus on solar powered lighting with natural light, minimize the length, and work on optimizing the width so it's a good experience.
    - a. Comment that Boulder's underpasses are wide, which is effective.
    - b. Craig commented that there is extensive research regarding use of underpasses, specifically related to wildlife (length to width ratios) – what works and what doesn't. Project team will take this into consideration during design.

### **South Pedestrian Connection**

1. There is still no formal City Council decision on the 8<sup>th</sup> and Grand intersection related to the Access Control Plan (ACP). However there has been strong direction from Council that they will approve only the full access intersection at 8<sup>th</sup> and Grand. The project team is moving forward with a full access intersection at 8<sup>th</sup> and Grand (same intersection as today).
2. Alternatives for the pedestrian connection still under consideration include a pedestrian ramp and an elevator.
  - a. Had previously screened out a pedestrian walkway on the bridge to minimize width. This was brought back in when looked at right-in/right-out (RIRO) (that walkway ended north of the left turn lane). Now, with full access intersection moving forward, the attached pedestrian walkway is considered screened out.
  - b. The ramp option that we are looking at extends east towards the depot and wraps back towards Grand Avenue.
    - i. DDA has been meeting with Union Pacific; their representative suggested bringing the stairs or ramp down to provide the river front access. Dave W. noted that this connection still would have to be ADA compliant. The design team will consider this in the pedestrian bridge design recognizing it is only a suggestion at this point.
3. Project team still making tweaks to Grand Avenue south of the river. Goal is to create a thinner bridge, lower profile, minimized width.

- a. The curvature across the river now starts beyond the end of buildings at 7<sup>th</sup> Street. This is better aesthetically, easier to build and minimizes impacts. There is a pier (just south of 7<sup>th</sup>) where the curve starts.
  - b. The bridge abutment is just south of the alley to allow access under the bridge and minimize the profile. Here, the width of the bridge is 56 feet.
  - c. Bridge transitions from 56 feet north of the abutment to 60 feet for the curved section across the river. This is a constant 60 feet all the way to where the right turn lane transition begins for US 6.
  - d. South of the abutment at the alley, the section transitions to 64-foot width to allow for a turn lane at 8<sup>th</sup> Street. The cross-section is four 11-foot lanes and a 12-foot turn lane. Turn lane is longer to accommodate future volumes.
  - e. Still evaluating piers on outside vs. piers on inside to provide more space underneath the bridge.
    - i. From a design perspective, it's challenging. Have to span heavier loads, so need a cross member (pier cap) to support it. Looking at variations on number of piers; the more that are used, the thinner they are.
    - ii. Looking at keeping the grade under the bridge relatively flat, rather than the current 3% slanting down toward 8<sup>th</sup>. This creates some challenges because the grade needs to follow existing along the building fronts, requiring either steps or a wall between the sidewalk and the area under the bridge. This would provide more opportunity for events under the bridge.
    - iii. Pedestrian underpass at alleyway - maybe last set of columns is just north of the abutment, resulting in a short span at this location, allowing a thinner bridge deck and a lower profile.
4. How does this compare to the existing bridge?
- a. Bridge is up to 4 feet higher than now (pavement surface to pavement surface) to clear the railroad and end at the abutment south of alley. Depending on bridge type, this could change. Design team is looking at some options to reduce this profile but still address the pedestrian underpass at the alley and provide the required clearances of the railroad and 7<sup>th</sup> Street.
5. What is the distance from outside edge of bridge to the storefronts?
- a. Bridge is up to 8 feet wider on the west side; 3.5 feet wider on the east side. In front of Doc Hollidays, Sacred Grounds (south of abutment), distance is about 18 feet; in front of Rib City, Riviera (north of abutment), distance is about 22 feet.
6. Will use renderings with the model to better explain how the pedestrian connections work.

### **North Pedestrian Connection**

1. The north side of the pedestrian bridge will connect with 6<sup>th</sup> Street.

### **Construction Access**

1. Craig mentioned that one idea on the north side of the river is to leave in the construction access road starting at Exit 114 to provide river access and a trail from the Two Rivers Park along the river bank. If this can be done, it would only provide the platform – others would need to complete. Pedestrian Bridge
2. Intent to keep in same location where it is.
3. Physical models are being built for three pedestrian bridge types: Through Arch; Symmetrical Cable-Stayed and Asymmetrical Cable-stayed bridges.
  - a. The focus is on the bridge form at this point; for example, the arch concept is shown with one arch rib, but future versions may have two arch ribs.
4. Pedestrian bridge options have a curved, not a straight alignment to break up line of sight.
5. Cables will look narrower than in the renderings.
6. At what angle will a pigeon not perch? There is a CDOT report that covers this and will be used in the design process. With current bridge types, there won't be anything but cables above pedestrians. Elaborate structures are more prone to pigeon perching.

### **Area Under the Bridge Downtown**

1. Leslie Bethel indicated the City Council provided direction to the DDA to direct to get out in front of the Grand Avenue project and integrate the project into the Downtown.
  - a. The project team is working closely to find the best solutions.

### **Discussion**

1. Dave Sturges question about the degree of information available to the public.
  - a. Where is the best place and the most current information? ACP and DDA have been producing a lot of information. He also indicated that Nancy Shanks had done a good job with the press release.
    - i. People want to hear about design details for the bridge.
  - b. Websites
    - i. How do we link the various websites? DDA is developing a new website.
    - ii. Desire to have the CDOT website puts all the moving parts together in a coherent form. And, to make it clear where we are in the process.
    - iii. Maybe provide links to each partner website.
    - iv. Concern – DDA has a separate process – we want to work with them but it needs to be separated.
  - c. Sharepoint site is an internal team site – should only be accessible to PLT and PWG.
  - d. Physical model is good for certain needs, but provides a birds-eye, vs. a pedestrian, perspective. Renderings and photo simulations are more effective for that.

- e. Shelley Kaup thought the fly through perspectives at previous public meetings were effective; maybe we could do something similar.

## **PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT UPDATE**

1. Craig restated the role of PLT - to make sure the project is following the CSS process, being open, responsive, following decision-making process, listening to people.
2. We are now working on the EA and have handed the build alternative over to the EA team to evaluate.
3. We still want input, but not at the level that it would change the alternatives being evaluated and change the environmental process or delay the schedule. Challenge is to keep public process going without getting a whole of input that would change the environmental document.
4. In our case, we are gathering input on preliminary design details - architectural details, colors, landscape, etc. - earlier than we normally would so that they are ready to be incorporated into the design after a public hearing early 2014. No design decisions can be made until a decision document is signed.
  - a. The SWG will be providing much of the input we need. The team has informed the SWG explaining that, because we are now in the EA phase, the type of input we're requesting from the SWG has changed.
5. Focus of public outreach is maintenance of trust, which changes what we do for the public process.
  - a. Will communicate through the SWG, FAQs, and press releases.
  - b. Focus of information will be the EA process - how long, what is being done (agencies review, complete ready for public review - in January 2014).
  - c. No additional public meetings currently planned until the Public Hearing in December.

## **SWG Workshop on May 30**

1. Same format as before.
2. Purpose:
  - a. Introduce the Granite/RLW CMGC team.
  - b. Gain input on three topic areas.
    - i. Three pedestrian bridge types.
    - ii. Highway structure architectural features.
      - Nationally recognized project architect Fred Gottemoeller will lead the discussion based on same topics he discussed with stakeholders in Glenwood Springs three weeks ago - lighting, pier shapes, bridge rail, monumentation, side of bridge, textures (historical, how to tie bridges together).

- iii. Entrance to Glenwood – change in character from coming off interstate to entering Glenwood Springs (downtown, Hot Springs, hotel district, 6<sup>th</sup> Street).
  - What can we do to relay the character of the community? Look at what elements could help to change people with visual design cues.
  - Key objectives, tools, techniques, etc.
  - Based on what people have been asking. High-speed bridge coming into town.
  - Very contextual. Human scale vs. highway scale.
3. One comment is that the SWG is a good approach because people have been involved, understand the process, and can provide meaningful input.
4. Date for next meeting was in the paper. Not sure who else might show up. Will need to plan for numbers and messaging when they arrive as to what the SWG is and if they want to participate.

### **Focus Groups**

1. Craig explained the role of Focus Groups in the process and asked if there is a need for additional Focus Groups. They can be formed as needed. The Visioning Workshop was initially set up as a Focus Group. This was subsequently transitioned into the SWG. PLT's role is to make recommendations on focus groups.

### **Physical Model**

1. The plan is to have the physical model done in early June and meet with City Council to preview and possibly leave it at City Hall for viewing. We also would take the physical model to different meetings.
2. The model includes:
  - a. Build alternative for the highway bridge.
  - b. Existing pedestrian bridge. The three pedestrian bridge options will be part of, but in front of the base model.
  - c. Revised 3A intersection.
3. High level of expectation regarding the model. There will be a lot of questions. Need to think about how it's announced and displayed.
  - a. In a NEPA process, things change – as soon as we put something out there, it will change (don't want to put detail we don't know).
  - b. Story boards will be with the model to explain the assumptions and status of the project and the additional input that is still needed. Suggestion was made for a "rolling video" to help explain the model.
  - c. Concern about leaving the model at City Hall without anyone to explain it.
  - d. Roland indicated that model will only be one piece and the issue with the model is that folks are a giant and to really bring it to a human scale we will need modeling.

Fred Gottemoeller's input – models aren't the best perspective to show what the pedestrians are experiencing. Shows form, alignment.

- e. Must recognize limitations of the model.
  - f. Make sure the City Council sees the model before anyone else.
4. The model will have a clear Plexiglas cover.

## **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT UPDATE**

1. General schedule.
  - a. Some draft resource sections completed this week. Draft to go to Mike for interdisciplinary review midsummer. Then, it goes to CDOT HQ and FHWA.
    - i. We may need to go quiet for a while – we need to communicate what is going on. Difficult and time-consuming reviews. Comments are provided and revisions take weeks.
  - b. Early next year - signed decision document.
2. Content.
  - a. Description of transportation needs – Purpose and Need.
  - b. Alternatives development and evaluation process.
  - c. Impacts
    - i. Broad definition of 'environmental impacts'. – natural and business.
    - ii. Minimize and avoid where we can.
  - d. Public involvement process.
3. Concise, reader-friendly document.
4. Granite/RLW input to the project.
  - a. Will be assisting the design team with input on alternatives and their constructability – the more information provided, the better the project will be.
  - b. There are several design elements we are working on with the CM/GC contractor. Can we build the proposed designs? How expensive are they? Do architectural elements have different construction impacts? Risk of design elements?
  - c. Once the document is signed, we will have many preliminary design elements worked out – and can move directly into design. This process maintains trust and keeps project moving.

## **OTHER**

1. Craig asked for the Granite/RLW team's input to what they had observed so far.
  - a. Surprised at level of effort taking in public input.

## FINAL Meeting Minutes

### SH 82 Grand Avenue Bridge EA - PLT Meeting #19

May 15, 2013

Page 9 of 9

---

- b. Opportunity for everyone to collaborate to minimize impacts. Consulting constructability really gives a chance for a very successful project. Tight urban project makes it difficult to avoid/minimize impacts.
  - c. Understanding the process is important - so we are addressing all the critical concerns. Avoids surprises, delays, etc.
2. DDA is preparing a TIGER application (due June 1) on behalf of the City for the 8<sup>th</sup> Street Connection.
3. DDA is also working on developing cost estimates for fencing around the Depot. May need historic, wrought-iron look.
  - a. It will be important to coordinate with the Grand Avenue bridge team for architectural details and construction phasing.