

## MINUTES

*DRAFT*

### ATTENDING

- **DAC:** Doug Bennett, Cathy Lamb, Victor Langelo, Nancy Randolph, Gary Smart, Don Spann & Bruce Van Note **Absent:** Jim Howard
- **Staff:** John Shattuck

### CALL TO ORDER 5:35pm

- The Committee welcomed its newest member, Ann Carroll. Ann was appointed by the Selectmen at their 2016-07-07 meeting as a representative of riverside Summer Street neighborhood, which is comprised of the Topsham residences most likely to be impacted by any changes to the bridge.

### MINUTES

- **VOTED:** On a motion by Don Spann and a second by Nancy Randolph, the Committee voted unanimously (Ann Carroll & Cathy Lamb abstaining due to absence) to approve/amend minutes of last meeting on: 2016-06-27

### ROLE OF DAC

- Chair Bruce Van Note noted the DAC mission remains focused on recommendations for the design of a new bridge, but also remarked that while a new bridge is currently MDOT's preferred alternative, no final decision regarding replacement or rehabilitation has yet been made by MDOT.
- At Bruce's request, John updated the Committee regarding Brunswick's appointments to the DAC. John reported that Brunswick has not yet appointed representatives to either the DAC or the §106 process. Because the DAC will benefit from having input from Brunswick residents, businesses and other constituencies, Bruce asked for the Committee's thoughts on contacting the Brunswick Council respectfully requesting that they appoint Brunswick representatives.
- **VOTED:** On a motion by Nancy Randolph, and a second by Doug Bennett, the Committee voted unanimously to authorize the Chair to send a letter to the Brunswick council respectfully requesting that they appoint Brunswick representatives to the DAC or, if no appointments are made, to provide guidance regarding whom the DAC should contact for informal input.
- By consensus, the Committee agreed to move the start time of future meetings to 6pm.

### REVIEW & PRIORITIZATION OF DESIGN ISSUES

- After discussion by the full Committee, the following list of design issues or goals was adopted by consensus for further consideration. Next steps in developing

recommendations will include prioritizing the goals and seeking input from MDOT regarding the methods for, or barriers to, dealing with these issues.

- **Traffic & roadway function**
  - Traffic calming – speed control
  - Road and traffic noise
  - Headlight glare mitigation
  - Economic impacts: bridge should function as a Main Street for our businesses and not like not a fast bypass
- **Bicyclists & pedestrians**
  - Bike paths
  - Sidewalk width
  - Interior crash barrier
  - Location & enhancement of crosswalk at both ends – pedestrian underpass in Topsham
  - Access to river edge – eg: for fishing
  - Handicapped accessibility
- **Aesthetics, environmental & memorialization**
  - Appearance of the bridge from the shore
  - Paint color for steel
  - Style of light poles – Brunswick & Topsham styles differ
  - Memorialization of bridge/site history, including possible park at old abutment
  - Bridge name: deferred for later consideration
  - Incorporation of art, photography

## **REVIEW OF STAKEHOLDERS & OUTREACH**

- Summer Street residents
- Bicyclists & pedestrians
  - Merrymeeting Wheelers, Bicycle Coalition of Maine, Brunswick Bike-Ped Advisory Committee, Riverwalk Committee, handicapped access advocates
- Brunswick residents, businesses and other constituencies
- Business owners on or near Main/Maine Streets
- Historic organizations
- Town officials: Public Works, Public Safety, Managers
- Architects, landscape architects & artists

## **STAKEHOLDER INPUT SESSION: SUMMER STREET RESIDENTS**

- The following Summer Street residents shared their suggestions and concerns with the Committee:
  - Maynard McCorkle
  - Claudia McCorkle

- Jodie Moore
- Allison Brigham
- Charles Carroll
- The following is a summary of their comments, arranged by topic:
  - Proposed location/alignment of new bridge
    - Proposed new bridge covers lower falls, which should be left fully exposed and visible
    - Lower falls are last vestiges of Pejepscot Falls, which attracted early use and settlements by both Native Americans and Europeans
    - Lower falls are part of the area's historical birthright
    - Covering lower falls could adversely affect birds that nest and fish in the area
    - Covering lower falls ruins upstream view, which is the interesting perspective – little of interest in the downstream view
    - Request renderings showing view of bridge from different on-shore perspectives
    - Upstream alignment will adversely affect Summer Street residents – especially in connection with view, road noise & glare
    - Proposed location will be subject to greater hydraulic stress
    - Water will be closer to bottom off the bridge at proposed location
    - Stay as close as possible to location of existing bridge
  - Road function
    - Proposed design is too wide and will encourage higher speeds
    - Sidewalk does not need to be wider
    - Second sidewalk is not needed
    - Observatory bump-outs are not needed
    - There needs to be a barrier between the travel lane and the sidewalk

**INFORMATION TO BE REQUESTED FROM MDOT – per Committee & public comments**

- Depth/height of supporting structural steel understructure
- Total height of bridge from bottom of substructure to top of deck/sidewalk, and top of railing
- Elevation of bottom of new bridge superstructure in relation to bottom of old bridge,
- Plan view of new bridge showing ledge, electric pole, and proposed abutments in relation to existing improvements
- Vertical clearance from 100 and 500 year storm river elevation to bottom of the proposed and existing bridges
- Hydrological report

**ADJOURNED: 7:10pm**

