

## Public Advisory Committee Meeting #1 Notes

Kennebunk-Kennebunkport; Lanigan Bridge / WIN 22504.00

---

Date/Time: August 26, 2014 / 4:00 PM  
Place: Kennebunkport Fire Station  
Next Meeting: TBD – Late October or early November  
Attendees: Leanne Timberlake, Tim Merritt, Dan Taylor, Ashley Padget, Sheila Matthews-Bull, Richard Smith, Thomas Boak, John Kotsonis, Jeffrey Bonney, William Macdonald, Bonnie Clement, Dwight Raymond, Denise Clavette, Chris Osterrieder, Laurie Smith, Michael Claus  
Absentees: Thad Luther, Barry Tibbetts  
Distribution: All absentees and attendees

---

### Item:

### Action:

#### Introduction

Leanne introduced herself (MaineDOT Project Manager) and Stantec (Tim Merritt, Dan Taylor) the Engineering Consultants who will be preparing the Preliminary Design Report (PDR) for the Bridge.

Leanne asked the Committee to introduce themselves and say what their goals are for the project and for the Committee.

Round table introductions:

Laurie Smith, Bonnie Clement, Jeffery Bonney, Denise Clavette, Thomas Boak, Sheila Matthews, Richard Smith, Bill Macdonald, John Kotsonis, Chris Osterrieder, Ashley Padget, Dwight Raymond, Michael Claus, Dan Taylor, Tim Merritt

- Hope to have safe, economical, long-lasting bridge,
- Be a conduit of information to the general public,
- Limit business impacts as much as possible by allowing them to continue to operate and still provide access,
- Limit tourist impacts and be able to convey that the Towns are still open for business,
- Ensure timing of construction is not during peak tourism seasons,
- Limit bus impacts so that cruise ship tourists can still access the area,
- Expeditious bridge construction,
- Make sure everyone on the Committee has the same understanding of the topics discussed
- Strike a balance between everybody's needs and keep cost under control at the same time.

#### Design with community in mind

## Handouts

Leanne discussed the handouts about ground rules. The public meeting minutes are in the email sent out to the committee, but were not printed.

The Town of Kennebunk has a website for the project.

Bridge is programmed for replacement with construction starting in late fall 2016 – Beams are in poor condition and are requiring too much maintenance. Disruption to traffic due to frequent maintenance/repair activities.

Concerns: timing of construction (tourist season). Maintenance of traffic (detour bridge, closure with road detour).

Most Committee Members were at the public meeting.

The Project is in the Preliminary Design Stage until early 2015. Investigate traffic, structure types, how they impact towns, business, traveling public. Stantec will flesh these out and will be looking for committee input as things are narrowed down.

Number of meetings – no specific schedule, depends on how much is accomplished between meetings. Preliminary Design – 3-4 meetings, maybe a couple more during final design.

*Question: Should we have meetings during construction? It was mentioned that John Auger, who will be the Resident on the Sarah Mildred Bridge, provides bi-weekly construction updates.*

- This could likely happen, details will be determined as the project gets closer to construction.

*Question: Do we want to make the existing bridge a walking bridge with permanent bridge off to the side?*

- No good place to put it was the general consensus. The Towns would need to take over ownership and maintenance responsibilities of the existing bridge which could be costly.

*Question: Is it cast in stone that the bridge needs to be replaced?*

- The superstructure (the structural steel, concrete deck, sidewalks, and railings above the foundations) needs to be replaced; the substructure (stacked granite foundations)- may be able to be left in place. This has yet to be determined.

*Concern: If the pier is removed it will increase velocities and cause*

DOT/Committee may post Project information on Kennebunk's Website.

<http://www.kennebunkmaine.us/index.aspx?nid=573>

DOT to look into setting up Committee meetings during construction

*damage to structures up/downstream.*

- The hydraulic analysis will take this into account.

Minimum credible scope is replacing superstructure.

*Suggestion: Keep substructure and do rapid construction in the off-season.*

## **Roles, Responsibilities, Ground rules**

They were taken from another project. Put together as a starting point. Suggestions/input to format is welcome.

Everyone said they were fine with the ground rules.

*Question: What's the detour going to look like if full replacement is required? How long will it take?*

- It's difficult at this point to say. Still gathering info. Utility Relocation (aerial lines above the bridge) will greatly affect schedule. Potentially scour critical bridge with undermined foundations. May have in-stream work time restrictions (environmental regulations).

Committee can also contribute to what the final product will look like. Lane, shoulder, sidewalk widths. Delivery truck needs, detour alternatives. Approach roadway work.

Until subsurface boring info is known at bridge foundations everything's hypothetical on whether we can narrow the scope to just superstructure replacement.

*Comment: This is a quaint town. Want to keep the "shack" and the way it looks now. Don't want it to look like a city bridge.*

*Comment: 9 month tourist season. Keep a temporary pedestrian bridge, not a temporary roadway bridge. Make the approach roadways walking areas for tourists during construction.*

*Comment: Committee is used to reacting to situations. Involved too early in this case. Need things to react to, lack of detailed information to date.*

*Question: Why can't we put sister beams next to the existing ones?*

- The repair has already been done in 2011 with considerable steel stringer and end connection reinforcement. Because of the structure type we can't put sister beams next to the existing ones without really removing the deck. A repair would be too costly for what would be gained in remaining service life. We need to replace the bridge or

Future discussion topic:  
What to do with  
Operator's House?

we can face a load posting. It will be just as costly to repair the bridge as it would to replace when you factor in the need for continued long term repairs.

The MaineDOT load posting committee knows the project is scheduled for replacement so they will hold off on additional load rating and consideration for load posting at this point in time. If the project is delayed that would change though, with considerable trucking and business impacts due to load restrictions. The existing bridge is also a through-girder system (only 2 main beams) is non-redundant and "fracture critical" by today's standards.

There are many different legal load postings. It is not fixed. We generally load rate for 8 different MaineDOT legal loads which represent different types of truck sizes, lengths, weights, and axle configurations and spacings.

*Comment: People should know what the PDR is.*

It's a matrix of alternatives with one recommended alternative. The PDR will outline all possible considerations including the "do nothing" and repair alternatives. Some drop out immediately. Some will be carried through to the end before a decision is made. MaineDOT will review and approve the recommended alternative which will be carried through into final design and construction. There would be a Formal Public Meeting near the conclusion of the PDR effort (spring 2015), prior to final design (spring 2015-spring 2016).

Environmental considerations – in-stream work window.

Utility relocation – not performed by contractor. If you have 4 or 5 companies that need to relocate there could be a delay to construction.

MaineDOT may need  
to request more  
budget for the project

Budget – Going to have to get more money. Currently \$2.15 Million with a temporary bridge, which is not enough.

*Comment: Temporary bridge is going to take a long time. Tripling the hurt to the community with a temporary bridge. Prefer short term construction. Even with full bridge replacement, don't like a detour bridge.*

*Temporary walking bridge if possible.*

*Question: Could MaineDOT acquire land for temporary parking nearby during construction?*

- It is an option.
- Biddeford-Saco. Cadillac bridge -1996. MaineDOT provided bus

service to/from satellite parking.

## Roadway Detour

Need permission from Towns (including Arundel) to detour the traffic across Durrell's Bridge. This was done in the 90s from April-May for a MaineDOT Kennebunkport roadway approach project

Need to know what we're detouring. Need to look at truck sizes and turning movements.

Are the bridges posted along the detour route? Are roadway and shoulder widths and pavement condition adequate for increased traffic.

What would we have to do to close the bridge? How to still get delivery trucks, buses, emergency services through. Need input from committee.

Need to get pedestrians across the river.

Some businesses can only get deliveries at certain times. So they have to go back and forth across the bridge.

Stantec is concerned about tractor-trailer trucks usually going straight through making deliveries that never had to turn around before, that would have to turn around in a closure situation.

Even with detour bridge alternatives, we need to pass trucks through the area.

*Concern: Snow plow access and snow removal?*

- MaineDOT will discuss with local public works to make sure there are no maintenance concerns.

*Question: If the bridge was closed how much would stay open?*

- This will be discussed more later in final design. We'll need to keep enough open to maintain access to businesses. Also need enough room for contractor's equipment.

Document "How to thrive during construction" was mentioned as a source to be used.

Contractor's employee parking. Item for discussion. Committee would

MaineDOT to perform traffic detour evaluation to see if a bridge closure is feasible.

Stantec to evaluate truck-turning movements along the detour route.

River Road is posted for 23 tons, but Arundel Road could potentially be used instead.

Stantec to investigate type, size, frequency of delivery trucks, bus, and emergency access requirements.

Stantec to look into turn-around areas for trucks that ignore detour signage.

Once design has progressed further, DOT to consult with Town Public works regarding snow removal, if req'd.

Business access requirements to be placed in the construction bid documents. Add contract restrictions relating to maintaining business access as a future Committee meeting topic.

like to be involved in contract restrictions.

*Comment: Road closure from safety and cost looks good. But need public to buy into it.*

This is an unusual situation. Usually 2 (min) public meetings. Prelim, like we had, then one near the conclusion of the PDR with the recommended alternative. We are trying to get input ahead of time for this small community, Committee will need to be patient as things develop, we have a formal process to follow and a lot of information gathering and analysis to do before making an decisions.

We need to take each alternative far enough to identify the cost, pros, cons in the PDR.

*The committee was hoping to have a decision of what alternative is recommended sooner than later.*

Stantec/MaineDOT needs to perform a river tidal hydraulics analysis to determine needs for the waterway opening below the bridge. Collecting subsurface geotechnical information (borings) on the foundations is a critical task, in addition to utility relocation coordination.

Hydraulic analysis is currently being performed, Stantec is doing some calibrations with tidal stage recorders. Utility coordination is under way.

*Question: Could they take the borings at night? Leanne will talk to Geotechnical Engineer.*

*Question: Should we not have a meeting until the PDR is done?*

- There are many other things we need input on. We would like input from committee on the proposed bridge section – sidewalk widths, roadway widths, etc. We need assistance in identifying delivery truck needs to area businesses. We can discuss what to do with the operator's house. It is beneficial to have meetings during the progression of the PDR. We should proceed assuming that a full bridge replacement and detour bridge may be necessary as a worst case, while other options are evaluated further.

Next meeting: want to know if trucks can make the turns for the roadway detour alternative. Want to know if we'll have a traffic analysis for the detour. If hydraulics show substructure can't be reused schedule a meeting. If not wait until borings are done.

*Question: Can we improve the hydraulics for this bridge?*

- To some degree, but can't affect FEMA flood mapping. We have an

MaineDOT to discuss accelerating the Subsurface Exploration Program.

MaineDOT to schedule the next meeting after detour traffic analysis, subsurface exploration, and hydraulic analysis are complete.

Develop a specific list of topics, other than the detour, that need Committee input on for the next meeting.



incoming tide to factor in as well.

**Target late October for the next meeting.**

*Question from Stantec: If Stantec/DOT has more specific questions, can they email the committee as a whole in between meetings?*

- Yes.

**List on board for future committee discussion items included:**

- **Maintenance of Traffic**
- **Timing of Construction**
- **Alternate Detour**
- **Construction Contract Criteria/Limits**
- **Future of Operator's House (added after meeting)**

The meeting adjourned at 6:15 PM

The foregoing is considered to be a true and accurate record of all items discussed. If any discrepancies or inconsistencies are noted, please contact the writer immediately.

**Stantec Consulting Services Inc.**

Daniel D. Taylor, P.E.  
Structural Engineer  
Phone: (207) 887-3448  
Fax: (207) 883-3376  
Daniel.Taylor@stantec.com

Attachment: None

c. Attendees & Absentees