

Maine State Library

**Digital Maine**

---

Transportation Documents

Transportation

---

5-10-2011

## **Martin's Point Bridge Advisory Committee : Meeting Minutes, May 10, 2011**

Maine Department of Transportation

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalmaine.com/mdot\\_docs](https://digitalmaine.com/mdot_docs)

---

**Martin's Point Bridge Advisory Committee  
Martin's Point Health Care Center  
Minutes of May 10, 2011 Meeting  
6 to 8 pm**

**Attendees:**

**Committee members**

Richard Weare	Alex Jaegerman
Patrick Costin	Jay Reynolds
Ann Tucker	Kerry Tietjen
Cheri Juniewicz	Sue Ellen Bordwell
Don Gower	

**Other attendees**

Leanne Timberlake, MaineDOT  
Ben Condon, MaineDOT  
Sally Oldham, Consultant to MaineDOT  
Anthony Puntin, The Louis Berger Group  
Matt Hall, The Louis Berger Group  
Jeff McEwen, Federal Highway Administration

Sally Oldham opened the meeting and explained that the goals for the meeting were to hear from Leanne about the Department's judgment on pending issues, to discuss needed skill sets to include in the Request for Qualifications and scoring criteria, and to discuss public involvement recommendations articulated at the April 26 meeting. Sally asked for any comments on the minutes from the April 26, 2011 meeting. There were no comments and the minutes were approved.

Leanne reported on discussions with Bureau Managers at MaineDOT. Regarding the bridge typical section, the Department will allow only the contiguous structure description in the RFP. The RFP will call for a 5' sidewalk, 5' bike lane, 12' lane, 12' lane, 5' bike lane, and 10.5' multi-use path, plus the extra width needed for various traffic and pedestrian rails. Leanne noted that while the RFP will not suggest a bridge structure with a portion of the multi-use path separated from the main deck, the teams could propose such a structure through the alternate technical concept process (ATC) and the Department would allow this concept to be considered.

A question was asked about how the ATC process works. Leanne explained that D-B teams have the option of asking MaineDOT confidentially about design approaches that might deviate from the specifications of the RFP. If a team receives approval for an alternate approach, they are not obligated to propose it, but may do so. Such requests are handled strictly confidentially so that other teams do not know what their competitors' ATC proposals may be. It was largely because of an ATC approved request regarding the bridge alignment that the D-B team won the award for the Veterans Bridge. Leanne explained that the MaineDOT website for the Martin's Point Bridge project is now "live" so D-B teams have access to all Advisory Committee agendas,

minutes and Powerpoint presentations. Tony assured Committee members that D-B teams will take the time to read minutes of the Advisory Committee meetings, because it is in their best interests to understand the Committee's deliberations and recommendations.

Leanne read the Department's lighting policy (see attached). She indicated that the Department in this case likely will not seek to light the roadway but that it would support minimal lighting for the multi-use path if the municipalities were willing to maintain and pay for the ongoing costs of this lighting. Leanne has not yet had a conversation directly with the municipalities on this subject. Jay Reynolds indicated that Falmouth would likely seek lighting for the multi-use path that is minimal and the most energy efficient possible. Richard asked if the department would consider the use of solar lights. Others commented on the discussion from the April 26 meeting about cost and maintenance issues with solar lighting and about including information in the RFP instructing that lighting use the "latest in equipment and technology, be of high quality and be standard enough to allow for routine maintenance." The group at the April 26 meeting suggested lighting from the railing focused downward and toward the center barrier.

Regarding the desire to have a means for pedestrians to cross the road close to the bridge on either side, Leanne showed photos of bridge underpasses that had been suggested at the last meeting as possible models. These included Pride's Bridge across Forest Avenue and Tukey's Bridge. Ben cited another example, the Naples Bay Bridge project where DOT is constructing a walkway under the bridge. The Pride's Bridge photos showed some vandalism. Cheri noted that where she has seen underpasses like this, graffiti often are a problem, although if a rough surface is used there is less likelihood of graffiti. Another Committee member mentioned that it is possible to coat concrete to make it easier to clean graffiti off. In response to a question about who would remove graffiti, Ben said he thought DOT would assume this responsibility. Kerry Tietjen spoke about problems on the Falmouth side late at night with fishermen partying and drinking to excess. She has had to call the police a number of times to deal with this problem. She strongly discouraged the group from considering a pedestrian crossing on the Falmouth side.

Leanne said the Department would not specify that a pedestrian crossing be provided on the Portland side, but the committee meeting minutes could indicate this as a preference of the committee if in fact this is the case. Ann explained that the light at the Veranda Street west entrance to Martin's Point Health Care Center was put in that location because DOT staff had safety concerns with installing it at the east entrance due to the close proximity to the bridge. Jeff McEwen suggested that if a crosswalk of some type is not constructed, he hoped the plans would be drawn in a manner not to preclude addition of a means to cross the street in the future as part of a trail system. Alex echoed this preference, saying he has worked with Portland Trails a lot and would want to see in the plans a means to provide continuity in future trail systems even if it is not built at this time.

An Advisory Committee member asked if DOT staff or the consultants would look at the projected height of the bridge at the Portland side to see if it would be feasible to construct a passage under the bridge. Patrick cautioned that the context will change in major ways given the new bridge construction so this would need to be factored in. There will be a new environment at the end of the bridge. Note: Cheri emailed following the meeting to suggest the possibility of an overpass crossing for pedestrians and bicyclists.

Leanne reported that the Department is comfortable with including in the RFQ the requirement that the team include an aesthetic design professional. She showed on the screen the qualification description of this team member that Sally had prepared at her request (see attached). A discussion ensued about what level of qualifications description is reasonable to include in the RFQ when many positions are indicated just by a title. Leanne showed a section of the Veterans Bridge RFQ that described in a short paragraph what was expected of the public communications professional since the description of this role was not typically included in bridge RFQs and suggested it would be appropriate to include some additional description in a parallel fashion. Jeff McEwen suggested that the aesthetic design professional be listed fairly high in the list of required personnel skills to indicate its integral importance in MaineDOT's requirements.

Sally turned the group's attention to other qualifications that Committee members have discussed as very important for the D-B teams to include. These include five skills:

- Aesthetic Design Professional: qualifications, role within team
- Context Sensitive Solutions qualifications
- Landscape architect qualifications
- Public involvement professional qualifications
- Public information professional qualifications

Sally shared an email from Hilary Bassett conveying her thoughts about the importance of having a landscape architect on the team (see attached). Richard asked for an explanation of the difference between the public involvement professional qualifications and the public information qualifications. Sally indicated that the set of skills for public involvement include service as a resource person on the team for the recommendations that have come out of the Advisory Committee process and facilitating ongoing Advisory Committee or other public engagement. The public information skills would be to provide information about the project to the public through a website, email and media communications, etc. Sally asked whether the group was in consensus on recommending to MaineDOT this list of five professional qualifications to include in the RFQ. All members of the group indicated they supported this list of qualifications.

The discussion turned to scoring criteria for the RFQ submissions. Leanne indicated that members of the Advisory Committee will not be included directly in the scoring process. Leanne indicated that the Department will likely choose 4 teams to establish a short list of teams that may submit a full proposal in response to the RFP to be issued in draft in September. Leanne indicated that based on past design-build projects, there might be on the order of 5 or 6 teams (possibly more) that would submit a Statement of Qualifications in response to the RFQ. Tony explained how much effort goes into preparing a proposal for a project the scale of this bridge and, though a small stipend is given to responsive teams that are not selected for the project, it costs teams a substantial amount to compete and only firms with capacity to absorb the financial loss if they are not successful will choose to complete. A comment was made about the importance of emphasizing design excellence in reviewing the team qualifications. Ben explained that the Department has a fair amount of experience now with Design-Build projects and will apply to this project lessons learned from other projects, including those regarding qualifications.

Cheri asked whose role it would be among professionals required on the team to focus on issues of connecting movements through the entire corridor. Ben responded that this knowledge will be generated by the make up of the entire team and their collaboration together. Jeff responded that he recognizes that Cheri, representing her neighborhood association, has concerns about movements beyond the traffic light at the Martin's Point Health Care Center entrance, but that this area will not be a part of the project. Nevertheless, he pointed out that the design for the route up to the light should be done keeping in mind what needs to be addressed in the future beyond the light so it won't preclude future changes that the neighborhood would like to see. There was a question about whether it is the intent of PACTS to bring the sidewalk on the Rt 295 side from the bridge to the light.

Don Gower asked if the issue as to whether providing a means to carry natural gas across the bridge is still being considered. Jay Reynolds reported that Tony Payne met with Unitil recently about this, and stated that Unitil reported it doesn't have the pressure now to accomplish this and is currently looking to other options such as Westbrook.

Sally turned the discussion to the additional public involvement that is expected prior to awarding the project to a D-B team. The group first discussed plans for a Public Information Meeting to be held in mid-July, likely the week of July 11, 2011. Leanne led off with a description of how such meetings are generally conducted. The interested design-build teams may very well be present at the meeting. There will be a court reporter to record the discussion. We will want the meeting to be widely publicized so all interested parties know they have an opportunity to learn first hand about the current plans and schedule for the project.

Sally explained we'll want the attendees to understand the role the Advisory Committee has played as a group chosen to represent a wide diversity of interests and perspectives in the project area. It was suggested that we have a handout with names of Advisory Committee members and whom they represent. We'll want to show the alignment in general terms and display the Advisory Committee's consensus Problem, Needs and Vision statements. Cheri suggested that the meeting include a panel of Advisory Committee members with Sally as moderator. This would provide a good way to allow several committee members to participate. The meeting will provide a good opportunity to manage people's expectations about the project, so they feel well informed and have a reasonable understanding of what the project will and won't address.

Sally asked for ideas of how best to publicize the meeting. The following were suggested:  
Letters to abutters, town officials, political representatives  
Ad in the papers  
Cable TV notice if possible  
Information in the Forecaster, both in Falmouth and Portland

In response to a question about how best to provide information to a broad audience, Leanne suggested we should list the project website in all public meeting notices.

Sally asked the question as to whether the Advisory Committee given those who generally attend the meetings is missing any important voices or constituencies. A question was raised as to

whether the group includes someone representing fishing interests. Sally responded that Richard Weare has been helpful speaking from this perspective and explained also that even though he is no longer attending committee meetings, she has consulted John Swan about this subject by phone and email in his capacity as a Board member of the Coastal Conservation Association of Maine. John consulted with his Board and provided input to Leanne and Sally at the time that the Committee was discussing fishing needs.

Leanne explained that during the proposal period it is very important that Advisory Committee members not have conversations with D-B team members. It is essential to the integrity of the process that all teams work with the same information. The language in the RFP should convey all information needed by the teams. Leanne explained the Department will have a one-on-one meeting with each of the short listed teams to allow them to ask questions of Departmental officials in confidence.

The Department believes it would not be especially beneficial to hold a meeting as requested by Advisory Committee members where the Department explains the Advisory Committee process and recommendations and establishes the Department's expectations for public involvement post bid award. All of this information should be included in the RFP.

Sally turned the discussion for the brief remaining minutes of the meeting to the topic of how to handle in the RFQ the question of design details that impact the bridge aesthetics. As there was no consensus on this approach at the April meeting, she wanted to get on the table a better understanding of the pros and cons of each approach to provide a starting point for discussing this topic in more depth at the June 14 meeting. Three options have been suggested:

1. Require single option for design details.
2. Require 2 or 3 holistic aesthetic design packages to be considered by Advisory Committee post bid award. Each package would fit within bidders offered price.
3. Require bidders to state price for superstructure with a financial allowance for design details (railing, lighting, etc.). Work with Advisory Committee in post bid award period to select a single holistic package of design elements.

Tony explained that given the economics to teams preparing their proposals with little compensation if they don't succeed, it is unlikely that any team will put much time into refining the design for aesthetic design elements, so those who expected that requiring a single design option would result in a more refined proposal might well be disappointed with the results.

Leanne explained that for 3. it would be possible that the Department specify an allowance for aesthetic design elements but it would not make sense to have each team specify this allowance themselves because price proposals are opened only after the scoring of the technical proposals is completed. The price proposal is sealed until this time.

A comment was made that as part of the public involvement effort after the D-B award is made, the D-B team could be required to prepare specific visuals including 3-D renderings, etc. but it would not likely be reasonable to require this level of visualization as part of the technical proposal due to the added cost required.

A comment was made that with Option 1 you would be given only one design option and therefore would be stuck with it, while Option 2 would allow more room for the Advisory Committee to influence the final aesthetic design choices in their meetings after the D-B team is chosen.

Sally thanked everyone for their input throughout the meeting. She discussed the choice of meeting date for the Advisory Committee in July. July 19 was chosen as the best date because it will be after the Public Information Meeting and immediately prior to issuing the RFQ which is scheduled for July 20.

**Action Items:** Louis Berger staff should look at the projected height of the bridge at the Portland side to see if it would be feasible to construct a passage under the bridge.  
Sally should find out if it is the intent of PACTS to bring the sidewalk on the Rt 295 side from the bridge to the light.

**Next meeting:** Tuesday, June 14, 2011  
Time: 6:00-8:00 pm  
Location: Martin's Point Health Care center, 331 Veranda Street, Marine Hospital Building, 2<sup>nd</sup> floor

**Future meetings:** Tuesday, July 19, 2011

### **MaineDOT Policy for Lighting of Bridges**

In general, the Department's policy as it relates to the lighting of bridges is as follows:

- A. Compact Areas. A bridge in a compact area will be lighted when:
  - 1) Both approaches are lighted, or
  - 2) There is a pedestrian sidewalk on the approaches to the bridge, or
  - 3) Requested by the municipality.
- B. Non-compact areas. A bridge in a non-compact area will only be lighted when requested by the municipality.
- C. Controlled Access Highway. Bridges on controlled access highways will only be lighted when they are part of an interchange.

The cost of the installation and maintenance of the light poles, foundations and conduits is borne by the state on all bridges.

The cost of electricity and the maintenance of the electrical components are the responsibility of the municipality except on controlled access highways where the state is responsible.

The installation and maintenance of the wiring and the luminaires is the responsibility of the municipality, except on controlled access highways where the state is responsible.

The Department will recommend to a municipality that a bridge should be lighted when it determines it would be in the public's best interest.

All lighting shall have full IES cut-off fixtures. MaineDOT will pay for the installation of standard mongoose/shoe-box/cobra-head type lighting. If the municipality requests ornamental lighting, the municipality shall be responsible for paying the price difference between the ornamental and standard lighting. This may require bid-options to determine the price difference.

**Draft statement of qualifications for Aesthetic Design Professional:** Licensed professional in the fields of architecture, landscape architecture, urban design or related field with a focus on aesthetic design who will play a role on the Design-Build team to partner with civil engineers to create a design that is simple and elegant and will complement the landscape and environment. This professional should have demonstrated success regarding aesthetic design for bridges of similar size and scope and/or have been recognized through awards for outstanding aesthetic bridge design. This professional's role should include serving as a leader within the team to ensure that the aesthetics of the entire bridge design from initial design to final design will be based on a holistic concept that complements the scenic context. This aesthetic design professional should be available to participate in all public information and public involvement meetings.

**Statement from Hilary Bassett, Executive Director, Greater Portland Landmarks:**

After Diana Balmori's recent lecture on landscape architecture for Architalx, Patrick Costin and I were impressed with her discussion of projects that successfully integrate landscape and urban design on a larger scale. I'm writing a few notes based on my subsequent meeting with Patrick for tonight's meeting. I am sorry that I will be unable to attend.

At the last Martin's Point advisory meeting, there was discussion about the importance of the land areas at either end of the bridge and the causeways – that the landscape design is an essential element of the project. Therefore, we thought that the landscape architecture component is actually more important for the Martin's Point bridge, and that there would be a great opportunity to provide incentives for the integration of the design of the landscape and urban infrastructure elements.

Since the vast majority of the cost is in the actual bridge structure, developing a point scoring system that encourages a high quality landscape architecture component (landscape architecture incorporating the best infrastructure) would have a big impact on the aesthetics without necessarily a great increase in cost. Rewarding design excellence in this component of the project would have a positive effect on the entire project.