

Maine State Library

Digital Maine

Transportation Documents

Transportation

8-16-2011

**Martin's Point Bridge Advisory Committee : Meeting Minutes,
August 16, 2011**

Maine Department of Transportation

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalmaine.com/mdot_docs

**Martin's Point Bridge Advisory Committee
Martin's Point Health Care Center
Minutes of August 16, 2011 Meeting
6 to 8 pm**

Attendees:

Committee members

Kerry Tietjen	Sue Ellen Bordwell
Patrick Costin	Suzanne Foley Ferguson
Ann Tucker	John Woodcock
Cheri Juniewicz	Alex Jaegerman
Nathan Poore	Jay Reynolds
Holly Winger	Richard Weare
Mike Bobinsky	Paul Niehoff
Don Hamilton	Julie MacDonald

Other attendees

Leanne Timberlake, MaineDOT
Wayne Frankhauser, MaineDOT
Ben Condon, MaineDOT
Sally Oldham, Consultant to MaineDOT
Anthony Puntin, The Louis Berger Group
Paul DeStefano, The Louis Berger Group
Jeff McEwen, Federal Highway Administration

Sally Oldham opened the meeting and explained that the goals for the meeting were to review and comment on draft Request for Proposal (RFP) excerpts that Leanne had provided to Advisory Committee (AC) members. She emphasized that because this was expected to be the final meeting of the committee prior to issuing the RFP in early September, the group had a lot of material to cover. Sally asked for any comments on the minutes from the July 19 meeting. There were no comments and the minutes were approved as distributed.

Sally asked Leanne to provide an update on the status of the project. Leanne explained that she has been very busy beginning review of the Statement of Qualifications packages received by the Department and completing the draft RFP for internal review. The Department expects to make a decision by the end of the month about which teams will qualify to prepare a proposal for the bridge replacement project. Five teams submitted qualifications packages: Reed and Reed with TY Lin; Cianbro with AECOM; Lane Construction with URS; Figg, Figg and Prock Marine; CPM Constructors and VHB. Leanne explained that although she had agreed to include in the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) the Problem, Needs and Vision statements, she had to take these out because they are not considered to be contractual language by the Department and the RFQ and RFP are contractual documents. She did, however, revise the project goals in the RFQ to incorporate language from the Needs Statement and the same language will appear in the RFP. She also has placed documents from the Advisory Committee prominently on the website.

Leanne explained that the RFP excerpts sent to the Advisory Committee members have been reviewed by MaineDOT's Bureau of Management. There could be some further minor tweaking of the language based on comments at this meeting but she hoped that AC members would see their recommendations reflected in many areas.

Sally spoke briefly about the public involvement meeting held August 9. She said there was a good turnout of about 35 people and that she felt the participation of seven Advisory Committee members was a great help in answering questions and discussion AC recommendations that are reflected in the RFQ and will be reflected in the RFP. She asked if anyone had questions about the meeting minutes from the August 9 meeting or about any of the content of the meeting. Kerry Tietjen asked a question to clarify whether the bridge will be open to pedestrian and bicycle traffic throughout the construction period. Leanne indicated that she thinks it should be open to bicycle and pedestrian traffic, because she thinks it would be too long a time for it to be closed to these modes.

Sally asked if there were any questions about the RFP excerpts prior to breaking into groups for specific discussion of them. She asked Leanne to show several Power Point slides of bridges that would illustrate what is meant by the slenderness ratio language included in the draft. She explained that the higher the ratio achieved, the more slender the appearance of the bridge superstructure. Paul DeStefano asked if the RFP will include a minimum span length. Leanne indicated the Department is not planning to do this.

Sally asked those present to divide into four groups, each to review the technical proposal evaluation criteria for the Community Context and Public Involvement section including submittal requirements and evaluation criteria, and then each group to start with a different section for review and comment so that all the excerpts would get a complete review by at least one group.

The groups were as follows:

Group 1: Paul Niehoff, Ann Tucker, Cheri Juniewicz, Holly Winger

Group 2: Don Hamilton, Richard Weare, Sue Ellen Bordwell, Julie MacDonald

Group 3: Jay Reynolds, Suzanne Foley Ferguson, John Woodcock, Patrick Costin

Group 4: Kerry Tietjen, Nathan Poore, Alex Jaegerman, Mike Bobinsky

The order of review is attached.

Reports by all groups on 3.2.3. Community Context and Public Involvement

Group 1:

3.2.3.1 Number 6 Add to photorealistic renderings requirement that these should be 3D.

3.2.3.2 Number 5 There is a concern that "fishing platforms" makes this sound more massive than desired. Perhaps use the term "bumpouts." "Green spaces" should say Portland green spaces. Note: In later discussion about the platforms vs bumpouts language, another

suggestion was “appropriately sized platforms.” The sense of the group was that these should not be too large.

Group 2:

3.2.3.2 Add Number 6 The Proposal demonstrates that construction will have minimal impact to the public during construction. (Note: Leanne’s response was that this topic will be handled in the technical proposal evaluation criteria for the Project Management for Design and Construction section.)

Group 3:

3.2.3 and 3.2.6 Because wetlands are amongst the most highly regulated resources in the state and compliance with regulatory requirements is mandatory, the points system should not reward mandatory compliance. We recommend assigning the 10 points in this category to 3.2.3 (at a minimum reassign 5 points to CC and PI).

3.2.3.1 Number 1 Change “Provide general landscape plans” to “Provide detailed landscape and planting plans” that will be more specific in terms of plant materials, path materials, benches, trail amenities, etc.

3.2.3.1 Number 9 Add “Define any deviations from proposal requirements.” (Note: Leanne responded that no deviations are allowed so this statement would not be needed.)

Group 4:

1.3 Number 8 Add to this project goal to say, “to minimize impacts to the traveling public, local businesses, local communities, impacted abutting landowners and adjacent neighborhoods.”

3.2.3 and 3.2.6 Reduce 3.2.6 from 10 points to 5 points and add these points to Community Context and Public Involvement to make this section 20 points.

3.2.3 Add to the introductory paragraph a requirement that when notice is given of a public meeting, direct notice will be given to property owners in the areas included in the notice sent for the August 9, 2011 public information meeting.

3.2.3.1 Number 1 Add to “Provide general landscape plans” “and associated maintenance requirements.”

3.2.3.1 Add Number 6 Proposal demonstrates facilities and landscape features that are economical and efficient to maintain.

Group Reports on Additional Excerpts:

Group 1: 6.8.1 Add that the design shall consider appropriate transitions for bicycle and pedestrian modes from the bridge, its sidewalk and multi-use path to bicycle and pedestrian facilities on either end of the bridge. (Note: Additional specific modifications were suggested following the meeting by Cheri Juniewicz and are included at the end of the minutes.)

Group 2: 6.9.6 Regarding lighting, the group asked whether lights will be on a timer of some sort. Mike Bobinsky responded that the lights will only be activated at night, from dusk to dawn.

6/11/1 The group asked if the concrete will be required to be tolerant of salt water action. Wayne responded that yes, this is a Maine requirement. A further question was to explain why concrete piles are being disallowed. Wayne said the Department has concerns that once corrosion starts the system begins to fail and it is difficult to build in redundancy. It would be possible for a team to ask for a ATC (Alternate Technical Concept) on this issue.

6.11.1 Number 9 Specify here or where appropriate that bridge drains be bike and pedestrian friendly.

Group 3: 12.2 Require a dynamic 3D digital model of the bridge design as well as placing this model of the final design in context from the viewpoints requested. Modify views number 3 and 4 to provide views from the north and south from the shore of the estuary.

Group 4: 6.8.2 The group suggested MDOT add something that requires the contractor to take into consideration negative impacts during construction and to submit a plan that minimizes the impact on neighboring properties. These negative impacts could involve the following: headlight glare; noise of heavy equipment, pile driving, etc.; and construction hours of operation including number of days worked during the week and hours of work.

12.1 Public Information Plan – Change last sentence to require participating in “informational public meetings” (making meetings plural) periodically and at critical milestones. Add “Use mailings, websites, social media and local media to inform the interested and affected public.”

12.2 Number 1 Delete “physical or” so that electronic 3D mock-ups are required.

Regarding realistic renderings add a sentence, “All renderings shall be presented in a medium and using methodology that is visually accurate and verifiable.”

Following these reports, Sally returned to issues raised that needed resolution either among Advisory Committee members or needed MaineDOT response to resolve.

Allocation of Points for Evaluation Criteria: Leanne does not think she can change this allocation. The Department has had difficulty in past Design-Build competitions in getting D-B teams to focus adequately on the wetlands impacts, because of how their best value score formula is calculated

Level of detail required for landscape plans: This is a challenging subject. The towns think it is important to see a landscape plan that shows how transitions from the bridge and roadway to existing road sections will be handled and transitions between the multi-use path and sidewalk and existing facilities will be handled. They want to know that the landscape proposed can be

easily and successfully maintained. Holly wondered if we can steer the D-B teams to use local indigenous plant materials

Handling green space within the right of way: The description of handling green spaces within the right of way should include green spaces related to both communities.

Use of 3D graphic images: Leanne said that the Department would only require photorealistic renderings. Patrick reiterated his belief that requiring a dynamic 3D digital model should not be considered an onerous requirement. He said that then this model can be put in a photographic context with the views listed in 12.2. Leanne agreed that in 3.2.3.2 Number 5 the list of enhancements that would exceed requirements identified in the RFP could include dynamic 3D modeling.

Requirements to participate at public information meetings: Leanne agreed that language could include the requirement to participate in public information meetings at MaineDOT's request.

Holly asked a question about the boundaries of the historic property owned by the Tietjens. Wayne indicated that the boundary of the historic resource may not be the same as the entire property boundary and that this is a question that MaineDOT is currently working through with the Maine Historic Preservation Commission and the FHWA.

Leanne then explained how MaineDOT will form RFP evaluation teams. There will be 6 teams, one for each of the evaluation criteria. There will be 4 to 8 persons on each team. For the Community Context and Public Involvement section Portland and Falmouth will each have one vote out of the 4 to 8 votes for this criterion. Each municipality can have as many people as they like involved in the scoring but they will still constitute just one vote for each municipal committee on the scoring team. People interested in serving on the scoring team should contact Mike Bobinsky or Nathan Poore. Abutting property owners cannot participate.

One AC member asked if it is possible to nominate others to serve on the scoring team. Leanne said yes. Sally asked if it is possible AC members could serve on scoring teams other than that for Community Context and Public Involvement if they have the expertise required to evaluate the submission in another category. Leanne responded that she would consider this. Jeff McEwen asked if scoring team members would need to sign conflict of interest statements. Leanne responded yes and reiterated that it would be critically important that anyone involved in scoring have no contact with members of Design-Build teams preparing proposals. Mike asked when teams need to be in place. Leanne said this should be done by December. Leanne will send out guidance to Mike and Nathan about what is expected of those serving on scoring teams and further information about the conflict of interest rules. In response to a question about who else might serve on a scoring team, Leanne said it would be people with a particular expertise in that category. Some categories may have only 4 or 5 people scoring them.

Sally thanked everyone for their comments on the RFP excerpts. She explained that while this meeting will be the last Advisory Committee meeting prior to issuing the RFP, Leanne has suggested that we hold a meeting for Advisory Committee members in October to update people on the RFP process. MaineDOT staff would bring the Statements of Qualifications for the

qualified teams for Advisory Committee members to peruse and discuss the final form of the RFP once the Department has issued it in early October. Sally indicated that once a Design-Build team is chosen MaineDOT anticipates bringing the Advisory Committee back together, seeing if people want to continue and if they don't, recruiting others as needed to represent similar interests to those represented by current AC members. Sally urged AC members to watch the MaineDOT website on the bridge because it will reflect an ongoing dialogue about the project process. Any amendments to the draft RFP will be posted here. Also Design Build teams can ask questions and once these are answered, Leanne will post the answers to the site.

Sally called for adjournment stating again how much she and MaineDOT appreciate the commitment, hard work and substantive input of the Advisory Committee. She said she felt AC members should feel very good about the extent to which they've influenced the content in the RFQ and RFP.

Added Note: Cheri Junieciwz expanded on the comments of Group 1 to suggest the following language about trail connections:

From Cheri: My suggestions are to delete the portions in red and add the paragraphs as written below.

1. 6.8 Highway Design Features

6.8.1 Sidewalks and Multi-Use Path

The Town of Falmouth currently has a three-phase plan for constructing a sidewalk along the east side of US Route 1 that will connect to the sidewalk on the north approach of this Project. **Coordination by the Design-Builder with the Town of Falmouth to assure a smooth connection is required.** The Falmouth sidewalk is expected to be five feet (5') wide, with a possible esplanade (width not yet known) between the sidewalk and the shoulder.

The multi-use path on the downstream (east) side of the new bridge shall continue from the north end of the new bridge to the south side of the Bay Shore Drive intersection, **and from the south end of the new bridge to the north side of the northern drive entrance to the MPH facility.**

The five foot (5') sidewalk on the upstream (west) side of the bridge shall continue north on the approach up to the Bay Shore Drive intersection location **and south from the bridge to tie into the end of the existing sidewalk near the traffic light location.** A five foot (5') sidewalk shall begin on the north side of the Bay Shore Drive intersection on the downstream (east) side and continue north to the end of the Project. A crosswalk shall be constructed across US Route 1 at the Bay Shore Drive intersection location and across Bay Shore Drive.

"The City of Portland is currently working to improve multi use pathway, sidewalk and bike lane connections.

The multi use pathway that runs along the downstream of the bridge will continue south from the end of the bridge and connect into an existing or planned multi use pathway.

The bike lanes that run along the east and west sides of the bridge will continue south from the south end of the bridge and connect smoothly to improvements being implemented/planned along Veranda Street.

The 5' sidewalk that runs along the west side of the bridge will continue south from the south end of the bridge and connect to the existing sidewalk on the west side of Veranda Street/Rt1 at the traffic light and crosswalk located across from the southernmost entrance to Martin's Point Health Facility.

Coordination between the design/build team, the Town of Falmouth, the City of Portland and PACTS is required to assure a smooth connection to create continuous multi use paths, sidewalks, and bike lanes on both the Falmouth and Portland ends of the bridge.