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 Scoping Study **DATE OF MEETING**: 02/06/2018

LOCATION: UVM McClure Conference Room, Burlington, VT **TIME:** 6:00 PM – 9:00 PM

SUBJECT: Public Informational Meeting

HOSTED BY:
CCRPC: Peter Keating, Marshall Distel, Eleni Churchill, Jason Charest
McFarland Johnson (MJ): Dave Kull, Brian Colburn, Dan White

ATTENDED BY:
See attached sign in sheet.

AGENDA ITEMS:

1. Welcome / Introductions – Peter Keating
2. Elements of Scoping Process – Peter Keating
3. Background – MJ remainder of presentation
4. Advisory Committee
5. Existing Conditions
6. Bridge Alternatives
7. Public Comments
8. What's Next?
9. Final Questions, Comments

NOTES ON MEETING:

The goal of this meeting was to inform the public of the ongoing Scoping Study for the rehabilitation/replacement of the Winooski/Burlington Main Street Bridge and receive public comments and feedback on proposed alternatives. Peter Keating began the meeting with a welcome followed by an introduction of the project and the scoping study process. Dave Kull then presented an overview of the significant project information following the agenda above. Questions and comments were encouraged throughout the presentation. Once the presentation was complete and there were no more questions, the attendees were then allowed to move to different stations around the room which showed the four presented alternatives. MJ and CCRPC staff were available to discuss and answer any additional questions. Attendees were asked to write down any additional comments/questions/concerns for each alternative on notepads, and also place a sticker on their preferred alternative.

The following is a summary of questions asked during the presentation:

Q: What is the resource summary website?
A: The website can be located at the link below:
https://www.ccrpcvt.org/our-work/transportation/current-projects/scoping/winooski-river-bridge-scoping-study/

Alternative 1
No specific questions

Alternative 2
Q: Once construction is started and traffic lanes are reduced, can the bridge be opened to four lanes when it is not construction season?
A: It may be possible to have four traffic lanes outside of construction season.

Alternative 3
Q: There is a hotel proposal for the northeast corner of the bridge (Winooski upstream corner), will the proposed roadway shift impact this?
A: There should be no impacts (per Winooski City staff).

Alternative 4
Q: Will there be access to Mill Street during construction?
A: There will be temporary impacts during construction, but residents will still have access.

Q: What if everything goes wrong during slide/construction? What will be the closure impacts?
A: Cannot really answer this…

Q: What will be the impact to residents if the bridge is constructed upstream?
A: There will be construction activity, equipment, temporary works and staging area with any replacement alternative. The ABC option would be no different besides a reduction in time it is there.

Q: There is a tree on the Burlington upstream bank that residents would like to keep, is this possible?
A: We will do our best to limit impacts to existing landscaping. There will be provisions to repair damage from construction in contract.

Q: What will be the traffic impact of full closure? Where will traffic go?
A: Traffic will likely use I-89 to go around. A traffic plan and detours would be included in final design.

Q: When will closure occur?
A: Traffic counts will be performed and the closure will occur during time of year of lowest volume, likely during summer when school is not in session.

Q: A recommendation to consider community impacts during closure. Businesses will lose business. Recommend funding public transport during closure.
A: All these will be considered during the design and public outreach process.

Q: Does the lateral slide construction need to be upstream?
A: Yes, there is no room downstream because of the dam.

Q: What are the environmental impacts and impacts to fish?
A: All alternatives will follow the same permitting processes through the proper channels. Any impacts to the environment will attempt to be mitigated and repaired as necessary.

Q: Will the walking trails be maintained?
A: Walking trails will be maintained. There may be temporary impacts during construction.

Q: Is there any impacts to the existing piers?
A: Alternatives 3 and 4 would require widening of the existing piers. They are in overall good condition and would require minor repairs, but no major demolition.

Q: Are all alternatives compatible with improvements to the Burlington intersection of Colchester Ave and Riverside Ave?
A: All alternatives will marry into any improvements.

Q: There are concerns about the bike lane ending on Riverside Ave with no easy/safe way to cross the street. Would recommend maintaining the multi-use path on the downstream side of the bridge.
A: This project aims to improve access and safety for bike and pedestrian traffic. This will be considered.

Q: It was stated that the bike/ped. Bridge associated with Alternatives 1 and 2 will not be included in the overall cost of the bridge rehab. If this cost is not included, doesn't that put Alternatives 3 and 4 at a disadvantage?
A: The total cost of all improvements will be considered when selecting a preferred alternative so all choices will be compared "apples to apples" (there may have been some confusion on this during the meeting).

Q: What is the ball park cost of replacing the bridge?
A: There are a lot of moving parts and things to consider in the replacement. Exact calculations have not been performed for the Scoping Study, so providing a cost would only be conjecture.

Q: Does a lateral slide bridge have the same service life as conventional construction?
A: Yes, the lateral slide bridge is built of the same materials using the same methods. The only difference is that is slid into place after construction, which does not impact its service life.

Q: How long has the "lateral slide" concept been used?
A: It was used 20-30 years ago in Utah. MJ has successfully designed a lateral slide in Maine, and currently is designing one in NH. Vermont is a national leader in using ABC projects and has an excellent track record.

Q: How long does a lateral slide take?
A: We have seen slide projects where the slide time ranges between 2-12 hours.

Q: It has been emphasized that this project will not happen for another 5-10 years due to funding issues. Is the existing structure safe until construction begins?
A: The existing bridge has been load rated and does not require a posting. There is a project in the design process for repairing the deteriorated eastern rail. This scoping study is being proactive to get the ball rolling on replacement before major issues and safety concerns occur.

Q: (Directed at Peter Keating) What is the expected fiscal year for funding?
A: There is no way to know as of now, but it will definitely require federal funding.

Q: What is MJ's role in the design process?
A: MJ is under contract to perform the Scoping Study. Once a preferred alternative is chosen, it will be up to VTrans to assign the design contract.

Q: Why are beams higher in replacement alternatives?
A: The existing structure is only a four-girder system. By decreasing the girder spacing and increasing the number of girders, can use shallower girders. Also, this raises the bridge higher above the flood plain.

The following is a summary of questions/comments that were written at the different Alternative Stations, as well as the number of votes as preferred alternative:

Alternatives 1 and 2: Votes = 0

- "Ped/Bike alignment A (downstream) is better because it connects with the multi-use path."
- "For any ped/bike model look to connect to multi-use path. To connect to bike lane in the intersection from BTV side warrants a new bike lane design coming from both Riverside and Colchester Ave."
    - "Also, I would challenge the planning commission to do a study of bike use coming from BTV in regard to multi-use vs. traffic lane bike lanes."
- "It would improve the bridge if we added a bump-out for viewing the dam (downstream) and perhaps the cascades (upstream). The current bridge, especially on Burlington side, pays little regard to landscape. I hope aesthetics can be considered, and maybe a place to fish."
- A bike only lane is a bad idea, as people will still walk on it regardless. Recommend having only sidewalks or have a barrier to separate the lane from traffic.

Alternative 3: Votes = 0

- No specific comments

Alternative 4: Votes = 18

- "Concerning Mill Street:
    - Concern for business and resident access

  - Use of parking lot at mill, where do those existing cars go?
  - PLEASE present this to this neighborhood so they can give DIRECT input"
- "Expanding the sidewalks to 10' is better than separate bike lanes."
- "Ability for cyclists to ride from Riverside path continuing to cross bridge on same side safely!"
- "Wide multi-use on downstream side, and 8' pedestrian sidewalk on upstream side."
- "Alignment of bridge to roads is a little less straight in this option, which is good. I think it would help calm traffic and improve aesthetics."
- "Essential that funding is readily available for permanent redesign of the Mill/Barrett/Colchester/Riverside/Bridge junction."
- "Consideration: Reduce shoulders to 2-3ft. Widen downstream path to include multi-use path to connect from BTV to Winooski. From the Winooski side please consider main bike path use on Weaver and this being a main connection to Burlington from Weaver route."
- "Build 12' downstream (2-way) sidewalk/bike path. Conceptually draw riverside ped/bike access on Burlington side of river even though this is not part of bridge plan itself."
- "Ped/bike path angled along Burlington side of river from the parking area on Riverside (Salmon Hole Parking) down under bridge toward Chase Mill. Peds and Bikes can take this route then come up around on Mill Street to get on upstream side of the road without crossing traffic at bridge."

Submitted by:

Dan White
McFarland Johnson, Inc.

cc: Attendees