

Lagoon Pond Drawbridge Committee
Minutes of the Meeting held on March 8, 2006, 2006
At the Offices of the Martha's Vineyard Commission

Members Present: Melinda Loberg (Chair), Fred LaPiana, Steve Berlucchi, Mark London, Derek Cimeno, Jay Wilbur

Observers: Jo-Ann Taylor, Srinivas Sattoor, Dan Greenbaum and Bob Ford

1. Minutes

- The minutes of the February 22 meeting were approved as presented.

2. Temporary Bridge

- The Committee will ask MassHighway for a copy of the USCG permit, most recent plans, and visual simulation for color options.
- The Committee will ask Steve McLaughlin for an update regarding the schedule.

3. Permanent Bridge

- The Committee continued review of a February 21 draft identification of design issues, to be presented to MassHighway for forwarding to the design team for the permanent bridge. Several suggestions were made of clarification and strengthening preference indications, and the Committee voted to send the document, after amendment with the morning's comments and one more round of review.
- Comments included:
 - include the approaches to the bridge;
 - the multi-user path should include dealing with links to the nearest existing network;
 - clearly indicate that the boat channel should be moved toward the Tisbury side;
 - indicate preference for raising height of bridge by about 4'
 - include a discussion of repairing the seawall;
 - clearly identify lay-down areas, or at least define off-limits areas;
 - include a generator hookup/and or mechanical means to operate lift in the event of power failure;
 - indicate a preference for moving the power and lift mechanism to the Oak Bluffs side and burying the wires on the Tisbury side

4. Integrated open space/access network for the vicinity

- The Committee voted unanimously to recommend that the Tisbury Board of Selectmen research acquisition of the property with the house adjacent to the bridge, as an important public access piece as well as to facilitate bridge replacement. The Shellfish Department will support the recommendation, as in important access point for

shellfishing. The recommendation will also include researching the feasibility of linking up public access/pedestrian/bike network as far as the town landing.

- The Committee voted unanimously to advise the Oak Bluffs Board of Selectmen of the recommendation made to the Tisbury Board of Selectmen, and to request that the Oak Bluffs Board look into the feasibility of linking up public access and pedestrian/bike network as far as the hospital.
- The Commission will prepare a pictometry image with potential open space/access network illustrated, for the March 21 meeting.

5. Next meeting

- Tuesday, March 21, 2006, 10:30 A.M., with Steve McLaughlin, MassHighway and representatives from the design team for the permanent bridge (Parsons Engineering)

Minutes prepared by Jo-Ann Taylor

LAGOON POND DRAWBRIDGE COMMITTEE

C/O MARTHA'S VINEYARD COMMISSION
BOX 1447, OAK BLUFFS, MASSACHUSETTS, 02557, 508-693-3453,
FAX 508-693-7894 INFO@MVCOMMISSION.ORG WWW.MVCOMMISSION.ORG

Memorandum

To: Steve McLaughlin, MassHighway
From: Lagoon Pond Drawbridge Committee
Subject: **Lagoon Pond Permanent Drawbridge
Identification of Design Issues**
Date: March 15, 2006

We understand that MassHighway has selected Parsons as the engineering firm that will design the permanent Lagoon Pond Drawbridge and has agreed to consult with the Lagoon Pond Drawbridge Committee about the preparation of Parson's scope of services. It is anticipated that Parson's contract will be negotiated over the next four months and that the Notice to Proceed (NTP) will be given this summer.

The following is a preliminary outline of some of the issues involved in the design and construction of the Lagoon Pond Drawbridge. It was prepared in order to help:

- Identify items to be included in Parson's final Scope of Services;
- Identify planning or analysis efforts to be carried out before Parson's NTP;
- Initiate discussion of issues.

The first series of issues relate to the integration of the bridge in its context; the second series deals with the bridge itself. Note that in the identification of who would be responsible for each activity, and where applicable, "Parsons" includes MassHighway, and "Drawbridge Committee" includes the towns of Oak Bluffs and Tisbury as well as the general public. Note that this memo is being presented as an exploration of issues to discuss, not as a firm position of the Committee or the towns.

CONTEXT

1. Waterfront Access and Open Spaces at Both Ends of the Bridge and Along the Approaches

Issue: Can we use the drawbridge as a catalyst to link or create adjacent public recreational areas – including public access along the water's edge at both ends of the bridge – so that the drawbridge serves as a node for a comprehensive recreational area providing waterfront access along the shores of Lagoon Pond and the Sound?

- At the Oak Bluffs end, can a walkway be extended from Eastville Beach under the bridge and along the shore of the Pond towards the back of the Hospital?
- On the Tisbury end, can there be an open space on the site of the house (if it is moved or removed) with a walkway extending under the bridge and along the ocean shore.
- Can the pedestrian access from both of these spaces near the abutments up to the sidewalk on the bridge be made direct and comfortable, so that the bridge serves as the hub for this open space network?

How to Resolve the Issue:

- Define the elements of an overall open space plan for the surrounding area including an analysis of the feasibility of off-site connections. (Drawbridge Committee, Towns of Oak Bluffs and Tisbury, MVC).
- Develop alternative plans (Parsons).
- Select preferred open space option (Parsons, Drawbridge Committee.)
- Incorporate into the bridge plans walkways linking to adjacent recreational areas, walkways along the abutments providing pedestrian links from the Lagoon to the ocean sides, and stairs/ramps providing easy access to the bridge sidewalks. (Parsons).

2. Integration of a Multi-User Path

Issue: Should there be a separate MUP on the drawbridge, the approach roads, and connecting to the existing network, what should the design be, and what is the most effective way to get it built?

- Are we sure that there are no obstacles that would prevent implementation of all parts of an MUP extending the existing section on Beach Road close to Vineyard Haven, i.e. from the town landing to the drawbridge and from the drawbridge to the hospital?
- What should the width of the MUP be, 8' the width of the existing path on Beach Road and as indicated in the preliminary scope of services, or wider?
- What is the best layout to link the MUP on the bridge to the existing network? Would this require a shift in the horizontal alignment of the roadway and MUP on the bridge and its approaches?
- Are there any design features that should be integrated?

How to Resolve the Issue:

- Analyze the overall feasibility of the off-site parts of the MUP route. (Bike/Pedestrian Committee, Towns of Oak Bluffs and Tisbury, MVC, MassHighway District 5).
- Include/coordinate the design, permitting, funding, and construction of the MUP in conjunction with the drawbridge project. (Parsons in cooperation with Towns of Oak Bluffs and Tisbury, District 5).
- Have MassHighway (bridge project or District 5) assume responsibility for the parts of the MUP in the State layout (e.g. New York Avenue) including the links to the nearest part of the adjacent network.

- Clarify what the responsibility would be for any portions of the MUP outside the State layout.

3. Boating Channel

Issue: Given that there is a consensus that the boating channel should be shifted towards Tisbury, what should the exact location of the boating channel be and how can visibility be improved?

- How far can the channel be moved without involving dredging?
- What should the width of the channel be?
- If the channel is wider, is there a concern that it would then be used for a larger number of commercial barges?
- What is the strategy for moving it relative to its location with the temporary drawbridge?
- What other improvements can be made to improve visibility in the channel

How to Resolve the Issue:

- Obtain accurate mapping of the bathymetry of the channel. (Parsons)
- Devise strategy to relocate channel, e.g. move lift mechanism to opposite side, widen lift span. (Parsons)

4. Tea House

Issue: Should the house be moved or removed?

- What are the costs associated with maintaining the house in place (namely: construction of a retaining wall and driveway to provide access to the house, possible cost savings if the land can be used to facilitate construction of the drawbridge)?
- Even at this late date, are there any possible advantages related to the temporary drawbridge should it be moved or removed, such as facilitating construction or eliminating the need for compensation during the presence of the temporary drawbridge?
- What are the potential long-term public advantages related to having public use of the property if the house were not there?

How to Resolve the Issue:

- Analyze the potential advantages of moving or removing the house with respect to the construction of the bridge. (Parsons)
- Analyze the potential public use of the land should the house not be there, such as an open space and an access point for shellfishing. (Drawbridge Committee, Town of Tisbury, MVC)
- Analyze the overall cost and benefit of moving or removing the house and make a decision. (Town of Tisbury and MassHighway)

5. Seawall

Issue: What is the most effective way to get the seawall repaired, as it is in a state of disrepair having had very little maintenance in recent years?

How to Resolve the Issue:

- Analyze the current condition of the seawall.
- Analyze what changes might be needed as a result of the bridge project including possible modifications of the road alignment and incorporation of a pedestrian walkway. (Parsons in consultation with the Drawbridge Committee and the Town of Tisbury.)
- Include/coordinate the design, permitting, funding, and reconstruction of the seawall in conjunction with the drawbridge project. (Parsons in cooperation with Towns of Oak Bluffs and Tisbury, District 5).

BRIDGE STRUCTURE

6. Amenities

Issue: What amenities should be integrated into the bridge and its approaches?

- Fishing/viewing platforms?
- Information panels?
- Public art?

How to Resolve the Issue:

- Outline possible ideas. (Drawbridge Committee)
- Look at feasibility of including. (Parsons)
- Finalize selection (Parsons, Drawbridge Committee)

7. Vertical Alignment

Issue: How high should the bridge be?

- Existing height?
- Raised about 4'?
- Middle height?
- High?

How to Resolve the Issue:

- Ensure that we have complete and accurate information about the types of boats and pattern of passage in the channel as well as the boats in the harbor. (Bridge Tender, Harbormaster)
- Analyze the records of the heights of boats going in and out of the Lagoon, and those moored in the harbor, to determine what percentage of boats could be accommodated with the different heights of bridge when closed. (Parsons)

- If the existing records are not adequate, which is likely the case, carry out a study this summer to accurately ascertain the heights of boats using the drawbridge. This could be done by having the bridge tender get information from boat owners, by having an intern or camera observe usage, and/or by checking the heights of boats moored in the pond and at Maciel Marine. (Parsons)
- Analyze the benefits and detriments of the options including impacts on boats, vehicular traffic, and properties adjacent to approaches. A review of the visual impacts of various options, using computer simulations, is a critical element of this analysis. (Parsons in consultation with the Bridge Committee)
- Select preferred option (Parsons, Bridge Committee.)

8. Horizontal Alignment

Issue: What should the width and alignment of the roadway and bridge be?

- What should the overall width be to accommodate the various requirements (see MUP) but to also minimize the impact on the ocean shore (e.g. height of retaining walls, fill)?
- Can the sidewalks be narrowed from the width in the preliminary Scope of Services?
- Can the sidewalk on the pond side be combined with the MUP?
- What is the optimum location of the centerline of the road to best accommodate the MUP and link the MUP and road to adjacent roads, while minimizing the shift towards the sound and the related height of the retaining wall facing the sea?

How to Resolve the Issue:

- Outline options for the width of the sidewalk, MUP, shoulders, roadway. (Parsons, Drawbridge Committee)
- Analyze the possibility of building the sidewalks, and possibly the MUP as cantilevers to be added after the removal of the temporary bridge, in order to minimize the realignment of the permanent bridge. (Parsons)
- Select preferred option. (Parsons, Drawbridge Committee)

9. Piers

Issue: What should the spacing and design of the piers be?

- How many piers should there be in order to find the best balance between cost, maximizing visibility for boaters, and achieving a design harmonious with Vineyard character?
- What should the materials and specific design details of the piers be?

How to Resolve the Issue:

- Outline options. (Parsons)
- Select preferred option. (Parsons, Drawbridge Committee)

10. **Superstructure**

Issue: What should the basic superstructure be?

- Should the structure be built of concrete or steel?
- What should the specific design details be, including profile and color?

How to Resolve the Issue:

- Outline options. (Parsons)
- Select preferred option. (Parsons, Drawbridge Committee)

11. **Lift Mechanism**

Issue: How should the lift mechanism be designed?

- On what side of the channel should the lift mechanism be located, considering the objectives of moving the boating channel, of maximizing visibility of boaters, and of eliminating the electric poles on the bridge and approaches?
- What should the technology and performance be for most rapid operation, best reliability?
- What back-up systems should be included, such as manual operation and/or a generator hookup?

How to Resolve the Issue:

- Outline options. (Parsons)
- Select preferred option. (Parsons in consultation with the Bridge Committee)

12. **Design Details**

Issue: How should various details be designed?

- What should the design be of structural elements such as the abutments, retaining walls, etc.?
- How should other bridge components such as the housing of the lift mechanism be designed?
- What should the surface materials be of the walkway and MUP?
- What should the design be of other details such as the guardrails, lighting, railings, bridge tender's house?
- What should the lighting be on and under the bridge to maximize safety and minimize visual impact? Can alternative energy be used?

How to Resolve the Issue:

- Outline possible ideas. (Drawbridge Committee)
- Outline options. (Parsons)

- Select preferred option. (Parsons, Drawbridge Committee)

13. Construction

Issue: How can the construction impacts be minimized?

- Where will the staging areas be?
- Can there be double shifts, to reduce the overall construction period?

How to Resolve the Issue:

- Outline possible ideas. (Drawbridge Committee)
- Outline options. (Parsons)
- Select preferred option. (Parsons, Drawbridge Committee)

Prepared by Mark London, Executive Director Martha's Vineyard Commission and adopted by the Lagoon Pond Drawbridge Committee on March 8, 2006