

*NOTE: THE NEXT DESIGN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (DAC) MEETING HAS BEEN RESCHEDULED - FROM WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 12, 2016 TO WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 19, 2016. SAME TIME, SAME LOCATION – SEE LAST PAGE OF MINUTES BELOW.*

DESIGN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (DAC)  
Brunswick Town Hall, Conference Room #206

6pm WED 2016-09-14

MINUTES

**APPROVED 10-19-2016**

### ATTENDING

- **DAC:** Doug Bennett, Ann Carroll, Larissa Darcy, Natasha Goldman, Jim Howard, Deb King, Margo Knight, Cathy Lamb, Victor Langelo, Nancy Randolph, Don Spann, Sande Updegraph, Bruce Van Note
- **Absent:** Mike Lyne, Gary Massanek, Gary Smart, Will Wilkoff
- **Staff:** John Shattuck, Linda Smith

### CALL TO ORDER @ 6:10pm

- Chair Bruce Van Note welcomed all the Committee members and asked that the members introduce themselves.
- The Chair then introduced and welcomed representatives from the Maine Department of Transportation (MDOT) and TY Lin, the Department's consulting engineers on the Brunswick-Topsham Bridge project:

William Pulver, PE  
Jeff Folsom,  
Norman Baker

MDOT Director of Project Development  
MDOT, Senior Bridge Engineer  
TY Lin International Senior Project Manager

- Members of the audience were also asked to introduce themselves and included Jeanette MacNeille, Topsham citizen; Chip Wesley, Phippsburg citizen; George and Martha Gilmore, Brunswick citizens; Sarah Brayman and Alison Harris, Brunswick citizens and Town Council representatives; Doug McIntire, Times Record and Jim Bleikamp, Radio 9, WCME.

### MINUTES

- **VOTED:** Chair Van Note suggested a change to the second hollow bullet on page 3 under the header "Response to Requests for Information (RFI)" that reflects that the final decision on the bridge is determined by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). Deb King moved, Don Spann seconded and the Committee voted unanimously to approve / amend the Committee's August 22, 2016 minutes.

## COMMUNICATION PROTOCOLS

- **Communication with the Committee:** The Chair reiterated his request from the 8-22-2016 DAC Meeting that communications to the committee be directed to both of the supporting staffers, copying the Chair or the entire Committee.
- **Communication with MDOT:** Similarly, the Chair noted again that it was important that the Committee speak with a single voice in its communications with MDOT, and asked that all requests for information and recommendations should be forwarded to MDOT only after the Committee has acted to authorize or delegate the communication.
- **Website:** Staff will be creating a webpage to provide Committee members, and the public, access to the DAC's agendas, minutes, documents and other information. This DAC webpage, which will be linked from the municipal websites of both Towns, is anticipated to be online within the next two weeks.
- **Anticipated DAC schedule:** These are the dates and location for the remaining DAC meetings:

WED 10-12-16	Topsham	Donald Russell Meeting Room
WED 11-09-16	Brunswick	Room 206 Conference Room
WED 12-07-16	Topsham	Donald Russell Meeting Room

## RESPONSES TO REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION (RFI)

- **MDOT responses to previous RFIs:** The municipal staff worked with MDOT to provide the materials requested at the 8-22-2016 meeting, as follows:
  - Examples of railing design, if possible that would meet crash barrier requirements. Included in the Committee's meeting packet is an "Online Guide to Bridge Railings" (16 pages) and several visuals of bridge railings from that Guide as well as other websites and from Committee members (4 pages). Jeff Folsom, MDOT staff, also mentioned that the "Online Guide" has a column labeled "Test Level" and that for the Topsham-Brunswick bridge a "2" would likely meet required standards (and any higher number will as well e.g. 3, 4 and 5).
  - Examples of light pole designs (7 pages).
  - Examples of glare mitigation products (1 page in the Committee meeting handouts).

## AESTHETICS ISSUES

- The Chair indicated that this meeting and the next will continue to solicit public input on a variety of issues concerning the bridge design. After the October meeting, the Committee will be more focused on discussing the information and input received and developing recommendations.
- At this point, the Chair invited members of the audience to share their concerns and suggestions with the Committee during this scheduled public input portion of the meeting. The following shared their suggestions and concerns with the Committee:

- **Jeanette MacNeille**, citizen - [Topsham](#)
- **Chip Wesley**, citizen - [Phippsburg](#)
- The following is a summary of the public's and DAC members comments, arranged by topic:
  - **Graffiti**
    - Concerns were raised that large blank areas on abutments and other surfaces may be an invitation for graffiti defacement.
    - Requests were made to look at minimizing graffiti through methods such as making surfaces uninviting (texture, retardants, etc.), having local art in place which has been proven to reduce graffiti, exploring methods to remove it when it happens, having motion triggered lighting, providing no publicity about any incident and removing it immediately, and so forth.
    - Some resources to consider – Jim Dyer, Dyer Soda Blasting, a Bowdoin business that removes graffiti by soda blasting it way; Philadelphia mural program [www.muralarts.org](http://www.muralarts.org) ; Portland and Auburn community artist program <http://www.pressherald.com/2011/10/14/portland-mural-its-a-wall-marked-card/>; Bath viaduct columns; etc.
  - **Art and history**
    - There were several ideas for combining art and history, such as:
      - Reaching out to local artists and photographers to ask if their materials might be incorporated in to the bridge design; some resources might include Mark Wethli, Art Professor at Bowdoin College, whose students did a semester project on the Riverwalk; Michael Kolster, Art Professor at Bowdoin College, who is a photographer with expertise on rivers, including the Androscoggin River; and, Matt Klingle, Professor of History and Environmental Studies.
  - **Parks and memorials**
    - Existing parks
      - On the Brunswick side, the 250<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Park ([www.brunswickme.org/departments/parks-recreation/parks-facilities/parks-natural-areas/](http://www.brunswickme.org/departments/parks-recreation/parks-facilities/parks-natural-areas/)) could be a great location for commemorative – informational plaques, sculptures using the old bridge's materials and viewing spots of the new bridge.
      - On both the Brunswick and Topsham sides, the Androscoggin Riverwalk ([www.androscogginriverwalk.org/riverwalk-plan.html](http://www.androscogginriverwalk.org/riverwalk-plan.html)) affords opportunities for showcasing natural and historic features of the two communities and the bridges that have preceded the new bridge.
    - Proposed Parks –

- There was a suggestion that we have both a new and the current bridge. The current bridge could be converted to a park with bicycle and pedestrian access provided through this option rather than on the proposed new bridge.
- There was discussion about the abutment “stubs” of the existing bridge creating platforms for viewing and commemorative – informational plaques; see meeting hand-out with Waldo-Hancock bridge information and images which include an image of the existing bridge with the proposed bridge in gold and red circles for where the abutment parks might be located. [NOTE: MDOT staff were questioned as to the viability of the “stubs” when the bridge is gone; MDOT said the Topsham side would need some work, but could likely be used; the Brunswick side might need substantive work before it could be used.]
- Interpretative Panels – MDOT has staff who has worked with communities to create interpretative panels for other MDOT projects; they will share the contact information for the staff who could work the DAC.
- **Railing design**
  - After reviewing the Online Guide to Bridge Railings and other photos, several members discussed colors (and whether that treatment would survive the winter rigors of plowing); shapes – keep it simple and “invisible” or make it stand out with shapes; whether they railing could have a concrete base with a metal railing above; and other possibilities. As noted above, Jeff Folsom, MDOT staff, mentioned that the “Online Guide” has a column labeled “Test Level” and that for the Topsham-Brunswick bridge a “2” would likely meet required standards (and any higher number will as well e.g. 3, 4 and 5).
  - The discussion around railings also touched on whether there would be an exterior and interior railing, which will impact design and costs.
  - Committee members requested that images from Martin’s Point Bridge be provided.
- **Lighting**
  - The lighting images provided are “traditional” to complement the existing Topsham – Brunswick Main/e Streets designs. There was discussion about whether to have a more contemporary look since the bridge itself will be more contemporary in design. There was also a request that the light poles include the opportunity to hang banners. The Committee requested more images for lighting.
  - There was general agreement that the lights need to be LED to save costs and directional limited to shining on the roadway not in to the sky.
  - There was also talk about crisp blue white to warm yellow - white options for the light tones.

- **Use of Colors**
  - There was a general discussion about whether the substructure should have highly visible colors (red, cobalt blue, etc.) to “make a statement” or have colors that rendered it “invisible (greys, gray blues, etc.). There seemed to be initial agreement that the substructure should have colors that make it “invisible” (neutral shades).
  - The discussion of other sections of the bridge and colors were tied to those items (such as railings, lighting, etc.).
- **Glare Mitigation**
  - A few options were discussed for glare mitigation, especially as it impacts the Summer Street, Topsham neighborhood. Glare mitigation needs to be linked to the railing choices.
  - There was some discussion as to whether the two sides (upstream and downstream) needed the same treatment, particularly as it relates to glare mitigation. Committee members were intrigued with the possibility that it be limited to the upstream treatment.
  - The Committee needs more examples on this topic.
- **Other**
  - There was mention of the observation “bump outs” and whether there needed to be a midpoint flag pole on the bridge.
  - Concern was expressed that we had not heard from as many artists as hoped in the Public Comment section. The Chair noted that once the Committee had made enough decisions to generate a visual rendering, people would very likely react to that rendering and provide input at that time.

## **WRAP-UP & NEXT STEPS**

- **New RFIs for MDOT:**
  - Please provide materials or links to documents that would assist Committee members who want to better understand bridge design standards.
  - Please provide examples of materials that might minimize graffiti as well as examples of other state, town & city efforts to reduce graffiti on public surfaces such as invitations to local artists to create colorful images and how costs might be built in to the overall bridge design. Examples might include retardants and textures that don’t lend themselves to paint.
  - Please provide examples of materials or methods used to reduce road glare spillover into residential areas.
  - Please provide exemplars of commemorative signs/panels.
- **New RFIs for municipal staff & Committee members**

- Graffiti removal: soda blasting - John Dyer, Town of Bowdoin, <http://www.dyersodablast.com/>
- Graffiti avoidance - public murals - imagery: [www.muralarts.org](http://www.muralarts.org), Auburn retaining wall, etc.
- Signage & imagery – photographers & sign makers, etc:
  - Note - subcommittee: Doug & Natasha
  - Mike Kolster photographer - <http://michaelkolster.com/>
  - Mark Wethli, Bowdoin art professor - <https://www.bowdoin.edu/faculty/m/mwethli/>
  - JRS links:
    - ✓ <https://www.facebook.com/nancymontgomerydesign/>
    - ✓ <http://www.panniergraphics.com/>
- More railing exemplars – with:
  - Open visibility
  - Glare mitigation (maybe hybrid concrete lower & open metal top?)
- More lamp/light exemplars
  - Fauxtique v modern
- **Next agenda:** The DAC's next meeting has been rescheduled from WED 2016-10-12 to WED 2016-10-19 at 6 PM in the Donald Russell Meeting Room at Topsham Town Office. The public input portion (starting at 6:30 PM) of the meeting is focused on input from the Water Street, Brunswick residents and Main/e Street businesses. [NOTE: Municipal Public Works representatives will be invited for the Wednesday, November 9, 2016 meeting.].

**ADJOURNED: 7:35 PM**