Minutes of the Meeting held on January 26, 2012

Meeting Location: MVC Offices

Members Present: Melinda Loberg (Chairman), Mark London, Fred LaPiana, Chris Fried, and Tristan Israel

MassDOT and Parsons Engineering: Steve McLaughlin (MassDOT-District Engineer), Andrew Schlenker (MassDOT-Landscape Architect), Jocelyn Dewire (MassDOT-Engineer), Leslie Haines (Parsons-Project Manager), and Bill Lockwood (Parsons-Architect)

Observers: Henry Stephenson (Tisbury Planning Board), Fred Hancock (MVC Commissioner), Richard Combra Jr. (OB Highway Dept.), Jay Wilbur (VH Harbormaster), Nell Coogan (Rep. Tim Madden), Kathy Burton (OB), Bob Whritenour (OB), Paul Cotter (Tisbury), Ron Mechur (OB), Peter Brannen (Vineyard Gazette), Steve Myrick (MV Times), Patrick King (OB), Bill Veno (MVC Staff), and Mike Mauro (MVC Staff).

The meeting was called to order at 10:35 a.m.

1. Project Status
   - Steve McLaughlin said that the project must be advertised by September 2012. The latest cost estimates are within the budget. The 100 percent plans are now being completed. There are still a few easements to be finalized, and details of removal of a structure. They are about to start the value engineering of the project, looking at ways to reduce the life cycle costs. They are awaiting the Coast Guard permit and anticipate that the Coast Guard will hold a public hearing on this in the spring. They also need approval from the Army Corps of Engineers.
   - Leslie Haines passed around a booklet of photographs to show what types of treatments have been done on bridges in other locations that might fit in here on the Vineyard.

2. Tender’s House
   - The tender’s house will be a 17’ square on a stone tower with a concrete base, with cedar shingles, a hip-roof, and double-hung windows.
   - A ventilated pipe will protrude for the emergency generator. The pipe will be covered so it will look like a chimney. The bridge tender will have to rely on video
cameras for some angles of view that are not directly visible from the tender’s house. The chimney will partially obstruct the bridge tender’s view but that wall will accommodate a flat screen monitor that will visible between the windows placed above desk height.

- The house is set back about 4 to 5 feet from the sidewalk with access at grade.
- Amenities include, heat, air conditioning, microwave, refrigerator, and a television.
- The mechanical equipment below the tender’s house will be encased and is well above the 100-year flood elevation.

3. Railing

- The railing will be custom made and will be very similar to what was there before.
- There will be a low crash-resistant railing between the roadway and sidewalk and pedestrian railings along the water, similar to that seen on the Big and Little Bridges.

4. Steel – Color

- The color can be whatever color the community wants. It will have to be repainted roughly every 20 years.
- It was suggested that the color of the steel be the same as the drawbridge in Woods Hole, namely grey with a slightly green/blue tinge.

5. Concrete (abutments, sidewalks, etc.) – treatment, pattern, color

- The abutments will be granite below the tide line as granite is a requirement in salt water.
- The other “stone” will be concrete to simulate stone using form liners. There is a big choice of colors and patterns. Each stone is individually tinted. Color will typically last 20 years, but may begin to fade after that. It was recommended to go and view the pattern and color of the abutments at the Big and Little bridges.
- For sidewalks, Tisbury has been using Auburn Beige tint that for their concrete. The pedestrian walkway may be chipseal. These treatments are still being evaluated for this project.
- The architect has proposed that the cantilevered concrete element under the observation platform be covered with metal, namely terne (zinc and tin coated steel), which is a soft grey color. He is still working on the detailing of this element.
6. Lighting

- The current proposal is to use 12-foot standards similar to what was used for the Lowell drawbridge, which is also similar to the other lighting along the Beach Road Causeway.
- The lighting should be designed so there is not direct visibility of the bulbs by boat operators passing under the bridge.
- The lights are purely pedestrian, and not to light up the roadway.
- Bollard lights will be used in the park, facing away from the water.
- There was a discussion about using bollard lights instead of high light standards on the bridge itself. This would mean increasing the total number of lights. Most people were favorable to exploring this possibility.

7. Landscaping

- It would be useful to seek the comments of a local expert in native plants on the proposed plant materials (e.g. Carlos Montoya).
- The committee should make comments about the trees. The use of hydrangeas was questioned.
- The fencing around the swale needs to meet town zoning requirements. The Town should write a letter regarding fencing.
- Stormwater first goes into the small part of the swale, then flows into the larger part. The swale is designed to hold a two-year storm. If it overflows, it would normally go through a pipe into the pond. In a 10-years storm, the water would go over the top.
- The 10-foot wide sidewalk on the bridge is not officially a Shared Use Path, which would have imposed other technical requirements.

8. Interpretive Plaques or Elements

- There is a sign which refers to the bridge as a veterans’ bridge. The status of this designation should be clarified with the American Legion, and the designation should presumably be maintained.
- The town line should be clearly indicated on the top and sides of the bridge.
- There was a discussion about the possibility of integrating an interpretative element, such as a plaque, decorative feature, or work of art. Possible locations include the park and or the observation platform opposite the tender’s house. A local committee would have to identify appropriate themes and develop the content. Some possibilities include features of the pond, such as eelgrass and/or scallops.
9. Other Issues

- The committee has been the primary mechanism for getting the word out to Islanders regarding this project.
- MassDOT and Parsons are not planning on going in front of any other boards at this juncture. They are counting on the Drawbridge Committee to make any other contacts it deems necessary.
- Comments regarding the plans will be accepted over the next couple of weeks.
- MassDOT and Parsons were commended for their hard work and efforts on the project.
- The committee discussed making a presentation at the next All-Island Selectmen meeting.

The next meeting of the Drawbridge Committee will be held on February 1, 2012 at 9:30 a.m. at the Martha’s Vineyard Commission. We would like to discuss: if this project should be referred to the MVC as a DRI, and preparations that need to be made for the All-Island Selectmen meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 12:10 p.m.