

53 Regional Drive  
Concord, NH 03301



Tel: (603) 225-2978  
Fax: (603)225-0095

## **McFARLAND JOHNSON**

Established 1946

---

---

# MEETING NOTES

---

---

**PROJECT:** Winooski/Burlington Bridge over Winooski River      **DATE OF MEETING:** July 25, 2017

Scoping Study

**LOCATION:** Chittenden County RPC Conference Room      **TIME:** 1:00 PM – 2:30 PM

**SUBJECT:** Advisory Committee Meeting #2

---

### **ATTENDED BY:**

CCRPC:	Peter Keating, Eleni Churchill, Marshall Distel
McFarland Johnson (MJ):	Wade Brown, Brian Colburn
VTrans	Richard Hosking, Jonathan Griffin
Burlington Ward 1 NPA	Wayne Senville, Richard Hillyard
Burlington Public Works	Nicole Losch
Winooski Public Works	Ryan Lambert
City of Winooski	Heather Carrington
CATMA	Sandy Thibault

---

### **AGENDA ITEMS:**

1. Welcome / Introductions
2. Meeting Notes from AC Mtg. #1
3. 2025 Traffic Impact Maps
4. Three versus Four-Lane Bridge Model Analysis
5. Draft Purpose & Need Statement
6. Public Outreach
7. Archeological and Historic Resource Assessment
8. Members / Other Items / Next Steps / Next Mtg.

### **NOTES ON MEETING:**

This was the second of four planned Advisory Committee meetings. Peter Keating began the meeting with a welcome followed by introduction of the attendees. There were no comments from the committee on the meeting notes from the first AC Meeting. Peter, Brian and Wade led discussion with the committee on the remaining agenda items.

## 2025 Traffic Impact Maps

- The Chittenden County RPC used the regional model to evaluate regional traffic impact results for future bridge lane closure scenarios during construction. Three scenarios were evaluated for this bridge that normally carries four lanes of traffic (two lanes each direction): 1) Two lane bridge (one lane each direction) 2) One lane bridge (alternating one-way traffic) 3) Complete closure at bridge. The model results, in terms of traffic volume affects, were prepared on maps for AM and PM peak periods based on the year 2025.
- In general traffic volumes decreased nearest the bridge and increased away from the bridge for routes expected to receive detour traffic. Logically, the impacts were less for scenario 1 (two lane bridge) and worse for scenario 3 (complete closure).
- Suggestions to help in the future to deal with the traffic impacts during construction, regardless of the scenario, included a robust public outreach and use of public transport. Sandy offered that CATMA could help with planning and management of public transport support.
- It was also suggested that future studies of traffic impacts may be advanced to include travel delays.

## Three versus Four-Lane Bridge Model Analysis

- A traffic study was prepared by RSG (subconsultant to McFarland Johnson) to compare a three-lane and four-lane bridge. The study included results for current year (2017) and the year 2040. The purpose of the comparison was to determine whether the reconstructed future bridge could be suited for three lanes or whether it should remain as a four-lane bridge. The three-lane alternative consisted of two lanes north and one lane south.
- The analysis results indicated the three-lane bridge would have significant back-ups and delays associated with reduction in capacity south across the bridge on just a single lane. The committee agreed, that moving forward, the scoping study should only consider bridge build alternatives with four lanes.

## Draft Purpose & Need Statement

- The draft Purpose & Need Statement was discussed by the group and there were several suggestions for improvement, though it generally was accepted as a guide to steer the development of the various bridge alternatives.
- Based upon the group's comments and suggestions, the final P&N Statement will be modified from the draft version as follows:
  - Add emphasis to safety and emergency service in the purpose.
  - Modify language in purpose to emphasize bike/ pedestrian/ motor vehicle mobility for "People" .
  - Aesthetics of both the main bridge and a parallel permanent bike/ped bridge (if selected) would be considered a complimentary pair.
  - Clarify the priority and further specify some of the needs.

## Public Outreach

- This included a general discussion around the upcoming Stakeholder Outreach program and the Draft Alternatives Workshop / Local Concerns meeting.
- Suggestions included:
  - Provide the right information to receive valuable input back, including the approximate timelines for the bridge alternatives.
  - Remain open to potential construction options for the various alternatives (staged construction and ABC techniques) as this is typically more thoroughly evaluated during the design phase. Instead use the public outreach process to share and receive input on the build alternatives, with less focus on the many potential options to construct each.

## Archeological and Historic Resource Assessment

- Hartgen Archeological Consultants recently issued their project report. Three areas were identified which could be within the potential limits of project construction. If within the limits of construction, a Phase 1B archeological reconnaissance survey would be required early in the design phase. Such areas include the vicinity of the former grist mill at the southwest corner of the bridge and current lawn areas at the bridge's northwest corner and between 467 and 475 Colchester Ave.

## Other Items and Next Steps

- The committee agreed on moving ahead to study the four bridge alternatives, as defined in the project scope of services.
- The committee recommended that some development and evaluation of these alternatives occur to share during the public outreach process (Stakeholder Outreach and Draft Alternatives Workshop / Local Concerns meeting)
- McFarland Johnson will look at the current scope and schedule, based upon commencing the alternative development task sooner than originally planned, and recommend revised dates for the next three meetings (AC Mtg. #3, draft alternatives meeting with VTrans, and the Alternatives Workshop / Local Concerns meeting).
- The Draft P&N Statement will be revised as Final and submitted for review.

Submitted by:

Wade Brown  
McFarland Johnson, Inc.

cc: Attendees