

Lagoon Pond Drawbridge Committee
Minutes of the Meeting Held on April 20, 2005
At the Offices of the Martha's Vineyard Commission

Present: Melinda Loberg, Chair; Steve Berlucchi, Mark London, Tristan Israel, Angela Grant, Derek Cimeno, Dave Grunden, Harriet Barrow, Jay Wilbur

Observers: Bob Ford, Srinivas Sattoor, Bill Veno, Chris Fried, Kerry Scott

Minutes and Communications

- The minutes of the April 4, 2005 meeting were approved as drafted.
- The procedure for adoption of minutes will be as follows.
 - MVC staff will prepare a first draft and send it to the Chair.
 - A revised draft will be sent to Committee members who will be asked to give corrections in advance of the next meeting if possible.
 - The minutes will be adopted at the subsequent meeting and distributed.
- The adopted minutes will be distributed as follows:
 - Committee members;
 - Oak Bluffs and Tisbury Boards of Selectmen;
 - County Commissioners,
 - MV Joint Transportation Committee;
 - Anyone who requests to be put on the mailing list;
 - Posted on the MVC website.

Existing Bridge

- MassHighway made at least three inspections of the existing bridge in 2004. Steve McLaughlin sent a summary of the last inspection report from October 20, 2004 (see appendix). It shows that the condition of the deck is 3, the superstructure is 4 and the substructure is 4. This is the same as in the 2002 inspection. The 2000 inspection had the same ratings for the deck and superstructure, but the substructure had been a 5. According to the Federal Highway Administration's Recording and Coding Guide's system for evaluating the condition of bridges, the ratings are on a scale of 10 with 5 meaning Fair Condition, 4 meaning Poor Condition, and 3 meaning Serious Condition. Inspections are done by MassHighway staff trained by the Federal Highway Administration and using methodology standardized across the nation. Inspections normally take place every two years, but for more critical bridges, the time period is reduced; it would appear that the Lagoon Pond Drawbridge is on a six-month schedule. Steve McLaughlin is clarifying how the full inspection reports could be made available.
- Over the past two weeks, several Committee members have talked to engineers from firms replying to the RFQ for design engineers for the permanent bridge. One said that it was clear that the bridge had shifted in recent years. Another said that settling was common, that there

are other bridges in the State in worse shape, it was clear that there were several problems that they thought could be repaired, they found more problems the longer they looked. The following note from Fred Lapiana summarizes his discussion of the matter with a third firm:

- They affirmed MassHighway's position that the critical loading condition that may cause failure is the sustained load from the weight of the bridge itself, and not the traffic traversing it.
 - The rate of consolidation in the soils typically diminishes over time. However, with organic materials such as the peat under the drawbridge, classical consolidation may be accompanied by secondary consolidation as the result of material decomposition. This makes the rate of bridge settlement irregular and extremely difficult to predict.
 - To assess the risk of a failure, periodic measurements can be taken to measure settlement/deflections over time. Calculations can be made by a qualified firm to determine an amount of settlement that might safely be sustained while maintaining the bridge in service. Based on the rate of settlement determined from the baseline settlement measurements, a more accurate safe timeline can be established. Due to the irregular and unpredictable nature of the secondary consolidation, continued regular monitoring and adjustments to the safe timeline are recommended throughout the project. It might cost about \$5000 to have engineers set up the monitoring and interpret the results, and another \$5000 to have a local firm of surveyors to collect the data on a weekly basis for the first 3-4 months, if there is a qualified firm with the necessary equipment. This could possibly be funded by the Towns.
 - It is possible to underpin the existing piers. A contingency repair effort should be designed now to minimize potential settlement problems. Underpinning could be accomplished by installing drilled steel casings at either end of the existing bascule pier that would extend through the peat layer to refusal. Using drilled casings would minimize the impact on the existing structure. A heavy steel beam tied to the existing pier would span between the casings. It is felt that the order of magnitude of such an underpinning project might be \$500,000 to \$1,000,000. Furthermore, the casings might be reused in the final design, thereby recouping part of the expense.
 - It is highly doubtful that MassHighway would fund the development of such a contingency plan.
- There was a discussion of whether there would be useful results from the ongoing monitoring of settlement/deflections after only 3-4 months. More useful would be analyzing survey data from the past 10 years, if this information is available and is accurate enough. This data is probably not in the inspection reports, but should be in old surveyors' books.
 - It was suggested that the underpinning could be done only if it is determined that the bridge is in danger of imminent collapse. This would allow deciding to continue using the existing bridge until a permanent bridge was built since it provides a contingency solution should the bridge start to fail. The possible underpinning of the existing piers as suggested above would probably involve closing the bridge to boat traffic, and would not deal with the deck, presently in the worst condition.
 - The construction of the temporary bridge might dislodge the underlying peat and provoke a shifting in the soil that leads to a closure of the existing bridge.

- The decision whether to take the risk of continuing to use the existing bridge until a permanent bridge is in place affects not only Oak Bluffs and Tisbury but the whole Island.

Temporary Bridge

- Senator O’Leary’s office has drafted a letter to the new Secretary of Transportation asking him or her to take a fresh look at the overall situation before moving ahead with the temporary bridge.

Permanent Bridge

- Deferred until the next meeting.

Actions

- The Committee will request the following information from MassHighway:
 - Criteria for prioritizing bridge repairs and whether they include the functional category of the road (Beach Road is a rural minor arterial) and the presence of a temporary bridge;
 - Raw survey settlement/deflection data for the past 10 years;
 - When it is anticipated that permits will be received and the RFP issued for the temporary bridge (i.e. the deadline for taking a second look at this approach);
 - Clarification as to the risk that the construction of the temporary bridge might lead to an immediate closure of the existing bridge.
- The Committee will recommend to the Oak Bluffs and Tisbury Boards of Selectmen that they get one or more independent engineers to review the inspection reports, to look at the bridge, and to look at the historical settlement/deflection data, if available, in order to comment on the expected life of the bridge and the likelihood of imminent failure. It is important that these engineers be objective and not come in with pre-conceptions. If historical settlement/deflection survey data are not available, the Committee might also suggest setting up a monitoring system. We will finalize the recommendation at the next meeting.

Next Meeting:

Wednesday, May 4, 8:30 a.m., MVC

Topics:

- 1) Design of permanent bridge
- 2) Contingency plans in case of closure of existing bridge
- 3) Availability of information on existing bridge and recommendation to Boards of Selectmen

Minutes prepared Mark London, MVC.

Adopted by the Committee on May 4, 2005.

Report Date: April 20, 2005

KOREAN & VIETNAM VET MEMORIAL

State Information		Classification		Code
BDEPT# 001001=T04001	Agency Br.No.	(112) NBIS Bridge Length		Y
Town= Oak Bluffs=Tisbury		(104) Highway System		N
BLN= 4A3	AASHTO= 024.3	(26) Functional Class - Rural Minor Arterial		08
	FHWA Select List= Y	(100) Defense Highway		0
Identification		(101) Parallel Structure		N
(8) Structure Number	0010014A3MHDNB1	(102) Direction of Traffic - 2-way traffic		2
(5) Inventory Route	181000000	(103) Temporary Structure		N
(2) State Highway Department District	05	(105) Federal Lance Highways		0
(3) County Code 007 (4) Place code	50380	(110) Designated National Network		N
(6) Features Intersected	WATER LAGOON POND	(20) Toll - On free road		3
(7) Facility Carried	HWY BEACH RD	(21) Maintain - State Highway Agency		01
(9) Location	AT TISBURY OAK BLUFF TL	(22) Owner - State Highway Agency		01
(11) Kilometerpoint	0001.416	(37) Historical Significance not eligible		N
(12) Base Highway Network	Y	Condition		Code
(13) LRS Inventory Route & Subroute	000000000000	(38) Deck		3
(16) Latitude	41 DEG 27 MIN 29.99 SEC	(39) Superstructure		4
(17) Longitude	70 DEG 35 MIN 11.72 SEC	(80) Substructure		4
(98) Border Bridge State Code	Share %	(81) Channel & Channel Protection		6
(88) Border Bridge Structure No. #	T04001	(92) Culverts		N
Structure Type and Material		Load Rating and Posting		Code
(43) Structure Type Main: Steel	Code 316	(31) Design Load - OtherUnknown		0
Movable - Bascule	Jointless bridge type Not applicable	(83) Operating Rating Method - Load Factor (LF)		1
(44) Structure Type Appr: Slab	Code 201	(84) Operating Rating		19.3
(45) Number of spans in main unit	002	(85) Inventory Rating Method - Load Factor (LF)		1
(48) Number of approach spans	0019	(86) Inventory Rating		18.6
(107) Deck Structure Type - Concrete Cast-in-Place	Code 1	(70) Bridge Posting		0
(108) Wearing Surface / Protective System:		(41) Structure - Posted for load		P
A) Type of wearing surface - Bituminous	Code 6	Appraisal		Code
B) Type of membrane - Built-up	Code 1	(87) Structural Evaluation		4
C) Type of deck protection - None	Code 0	(88) Deck Geometry		4
Age and Service		(89) Underclearances, vert. and horiz.		N
(27) Year Built	1935	(71) Waterway adequacy		2
(106) Year Reconstructed	2000	(72) Approach Roadway Alignment		7
(42) Type of Service: On - Highway-Ped		(36) Traffic Safety Features		0 0 1 1
Under - Waterway	Code 55	(113) Scour Critical Bridges		D
(28) Lanes: On Structure 02 Under structure	00	Inspections		
(29) Average Daily Traffic	014900	(90) Inspection Date 10/20/04	(91) Frequency	06 MO
(30) Year of ADT 2004 (108) Truck ADT	03 %	(92) Critical Feature Inspection:	(93) CFI DATE	
(19) Bypass, detour length	010 KM	(A) Fracture Critical Detail	N 00 MO A)	00/00/00
Geometric Data		(B) Underwater Inspection	Y 12 MO B)	08/17/04
(48) Length of maximum span	0009.1 M	(C) Other Special Inspection	Y 08 MO C)	10/20/04
(49) Structure Length	00107.3 M	(*) Other Inspection 0	N 00 MO *)	00/00/00
(50) Curb or sidewalk: Left 01.8 M Right 00.0 M		(*) Closed Bridge	N 00 MO *)	00/00/00
(51) Bridge Roadway Width Curb to Curb	006.4 M	(*) UW Special Inspection	N 00 MO *)	00/00/00
(52) Deck Width Out to Out	012.0 M	(*) Damage Inspection		06/02/99
(32) Approach Roadway Width (w/shoulders)	009.1 M	Rating Loads		
(33) Bridge Median - No median	Code 0	Report Date 11/01/00	H20 Type 3 Type 3S2 Type HS	
(34) Skew 00 DEG (35) Structure Flared	N	Operating	12.0 22.0 35.0 22.0	
(10) Inventory Route MIN Vert Clear	99.99 M	Inventory	11.0 15.0 23.0 18.0	
(47) Inventory Route Total Horiz Clear	09.1 M	Field Posting		
(53) Min Vert Clear Over Bridge Rdwy	99.99 M	Status POSTED	Posting Date 01/24/01	
(54) Min Vert Underclear ref	N 00.00 M	Actual	2 Axle 3 Axle 5 Axle	
(55) Min Lat Underclear RT ref	N 00.0 M	Recommended	12 15 24	
(56) Min Lat Underclear LT	00.0 M	Misc		
Navigation Data		Bridge Name KOREAN & VIETNAM VET MEMORIAL		
(38) Navigation Control - Navigation control on waterway	Code 1	N Anti-missile fence	N Acrow Panel	N Jointless Bridge
(111) Pier Protection	Code 2	Accessibility (Needed/Used)		
(39) Navigation Vertical Clearance	004.6 M	N/N Liftbucket	N/N Rigging	Inspection
(116) Vert-lift Bridge Nav Min Vert Clear	M	N/N Ladder	Y/Y Staging	Hours: 093
(40) Navigation Horizontal Clearance	0005.1 M	Y/Y Boat	N/N Traffic Control	
		N/N Wader	N/N RR Flaggerperson	
		N/N Inspector 50	N/N Police	