

April 12, 2022 – Design Review Committee Meeting #2



Meeting Summary

Project: Arlington Avenue Bridges	Date: April 12, 2022, 1 PM
Topic: Feasibility of Path Under South Bridge; Maintenance Access Design Updates	Location: Virtual - Microsoft Teams Meeting

Participants:

Judy Tortelli – RTC, AAB Project Manager
Joe Coudriet – City of Reno, Floodplain Manager
Brian Stewart - RTC, Director of Engineering
Matt Brezina - City of Reno, Parks & Rec
Doug Maloy – RTC, Engineering Manager
Manville Strand – Jacobs, Roadway Design
Kayann Jongsma – Jacobs, Hydraulic Modeling
Laura Meyer – Jacobs, Environmental
Jim Clarke – Jacobs, Environmental
Eric Yount – NDOT, Hydraulics
Kelly Houston - SJ Marketing
Robbie Coomes – Jacobs, Bridge Design
John L'Etoile – NDOT, Landscape & Aesthetics
Eric Scheetz – TRFMA
Chris Young – NDOT, Environmental

Theresa Jones - City of Reno, Stormwater
David Hutchinson – City of Reno, Traffic Engineer
Khalil Wilson - City of Reno, Engineering Manager
Dave Cochran – City of Reno, Fire Department
Raymond Enerio – NDOT, Hydraulics
Philip Kanegsberg – NDOT, LPA Coordinator
Calvin Black – Jacobs, Hydraulic Modeling
Wynn Hessler – Jacobs, Roadway Design
Michael Dulude – RTC Transit
Raymond Enerio - NDOT Hydraulics
Kaci Stansbury – Jacobs Project Manager
Mike Cooper – Jacobs, Bridge Lead
Barb Santner – Stantec, PM and Landscape & Aesthetics
Jessen Mortensen – NDOT, Bridges
Candy Vermeulen – Jacobs, Admin

DRC members not in attendance:

Dan Doenges – RTC, Director of Planning
Ryan Bird – City of Reno, M&O Mang. SD/SS
Roger Trott – NDOT, Environmental
Kerrie Koski - City of Reno, City Engineer
Trina Magoon - City of Reno, Environmental
Andrea Gutierrez – FHWA, Dist. 2 & 3
Jaimie Schroeder - City of Reno, Parks & Rec

Kayla Dowty - CTWCD
Kurt Dietrich - City of Reno, Traffic Engineer
Chad Matty – FHWA, Bridge Engineer
Travis Truhill - City of Reno, Maintenance
Sara Going – RTC, Multi-Modal
Hailey Grable – City of Reno, UNR Intern

Attachments:

Arlington Avenue Bridges DRC Mtg #02 PowerPoint

Group Discussion Summary and Action Items:

1. **Feasibility of Path Under the South Bridge**

Kaci presented the slides summarizing the existing path under the north bridge and what it would require to provide the same flood protection for a path under the south bridge. The elevation of the south bridge prevents the ability to provide a path under the south bridge with the same flood protection as the north bridge.

- Joe Coudriet asked if the assumption for protection of flows up to 5,500 cfs was changed, would it make a difference on the recommendation that a path under the South Bridge not being feasible. Kaci responded that reducing the protection level would increase maintenance and decrease safety.
- Matt Brezina said he didn't think there was much maintenance needed for a path. Kaci reminded the group that the more often water got onto the path, the more often mud, sediment, and debris would accumulate along the path, requiring cleaning, and maintenance of the concrete.
- Matt Brezina was asked if the City actively blocks off the path under the north bridge if high flows are anticipated. Matt confirmed signage is placed to notify of possible unsafe situation(s), but it is not physically, completely, blocked off.
- Matt confirmed a six foot tall wall would not be acceptable for a path under the south bridge.
- Brian Stewart said that the RTC believes that the wall needed for the path would change the river flow dynamics and flood conditions. He believes the path's environmental impact would be too costly.
- Matt Brezina added that from the Parks' perspective, a tunnel or even the additional maintenance of a path under the south bridge didn't make sense.
- Joe Coudriet agreed it was likely unfeasible. He would be concerned about debris getting caught where they would need to block the path off.
- Judy added that people don't want to walk in a tunnel path. She believes it also would have a negative impact to the City and to the trees in Wingfield Park. She wanted to know if the group agreed? No objections were made.

2. **Alternatives to a Path Under the South Bridge**

Kaci presented the idea of adding a Rectangular, Rapid-Flashing Beacon (RRFB) or High Intensity Activated Cross Walk (HAWK) at mid-block along Arlington Avenue, coinciding with the existing transit stop locations and path connectivity to the sidewalks along both sides of Arlington Avenue, since a path under the south bridge is not feasible. Judy Tortelli said the idea for a mid-block crossing coincided with the existing amenities and likely where several people would cross the roadway.

- o Joe Coudriet said he liked the idea of a mid-block crossing along Arlington Avenue.
- o David Hutchinson stated that HAWK signals are not allowed per NRS, and was concerned that a RRFB would be constantly activated, severely impacting traffic flow if placed mid-block along Arlington.
- o Brian Stewart asked David Hutchinson if he had any thoughts on where an RRFB would be most appropriate. David responded that the City of Reno relocated the crosswalk to the south side of Island Avenue to install an RRFB in 2019. The existing south bridge prevented the installation of the RRFB on the north side of the intersection where the crosswalk was previously. David suggested the RRFB and crosswalk be relocated to the north side of Island Avenue with this project, coordinating with the new bridge design to accommodate the RRFB poles and necessary auxiliary equipment.
- o Another idea David Hutchinson had was to install a half signal at Island Avenue, connecting the timing to the traffic signal at the intersection of First Street.
- o Doug Maloy agreed a mid-block RRFB was not appropriate, and said that surface crossings will occur no matter what we do to try to prevent them. A path under the south bridge is too costly and there is no insurance that it would be used.
- o Moving the RRFB to the north side of Island Avenue will align better with the existing Riverwalk and park circulation, and eliminate the two additional crossings of Island Avenue, just to cross Arlington Avenue at the south side of the intersection.

3. **North Bridge Discussion**

- o Joe Coudriet wanted to know if an additional path connection could be included near the southeast corner of the north bridge to connect the sidewalk along the roadway down to the path going under the north bridge.
- o Judy commented the design team would have to look at Joe's request in more detail to see if it could be accommodated with this project.
- o Kaci informed the group the City of Reno was working on a Park Masterplan and this connection could be something the City does with their overarching park updates.
- o Barb Santner of Stantec suggested that perhaps we could do steps instead of making the path ADA accessible. That she was seeing that done in other parks in the country as long as there was one ADA path available.
- o Robbie Coomes referred to a recent project he worked on in San Jose where they were able to do steps because there was a secondary ADA compliant path.
- o The design team will look to see if this can be accommodated, knowing it will not be ADA compliant, which is acceptable since there is an existing ADA compliant route from Alington Avenue to the path under the north bridge.
- o Khalil asked if the path under the north bridge had a railing, and if so, what was the height. Kaci responded, there is no handrail, just a concrete pony wall with a constant top of wall elevation of 4492.25. The pony wall varies in height as the path elevation changes.

4. **Maintenance Access to the River**

- o During the Feasibility Study, it was requested to see if additional maintenance access to the river could be accommodated with this project.
- o Kaci identified the two existing maintenance access locations from Arlington Avenue into Wingfield Park, and showed aerial images where vehicles are seen within Wingfield Park. Kaci emphasized that these existing maintenance access locations would be perpetuated and the new bus stop pullouts and amenities would avoid conflicts.
- o Kaci also pointed out the existing pedestrian access to the river from Island Avenue across from the tennis courts in Barbara Bennett Park. There was discussion about widening this ramp to accommodate maintenance vehicle access.
- o Jim Litchfield said in 2006 the wall to the east of the pedestrian access from Island Avenue was sawcut and removed to allow temporary vehicle access into the river, and suggested implementing a 'permanent' maintenance access in this location.
- o Judy responded that particular location might be beyond the APE of this project.
- o Joe Coudriet wanted to know if the City of Reno added funds to the project, whether the accessibility Jim mentioned could be added to the design of this project. Wondered if Khalil was still on the line. Khalil responded that he was but he wondered what the purpose would be for accessibility at that location. Joe responded that it would be a good location to remove sediment and to provide access to the river for the contractor during construction.
- o Eric Scheetz added the location could be morphed later into doing other things for the City of Reno.
- o Jim Litchfield responded that access at this location had only been used once since 2003 that he was aware of.
- o Khalil wanted to know if there was a need for sediment removal and wanted City of Reno Park's personnel to comment.
- o Matt Brezina of Parks responded saying that he thought accessibility was needed more for emergency access than sediment removal.
- o Joe Coudriet said that he felt sediment removal was very important.
- o Khalil stated that he could be wrong on how often access was needed.
- o Judy brought up that Kayla Dowty, who was not on the call today, had brought this issue up before. Judy stated that she was concerned that this could impact the environmental schedule.
- o Brian Stewart said he felt it was important to work with the community to get access to the river.
- o Joe Coudriet said he'd take it back to the City to see what they thought. Judy offered to help get the discussion with the city going.
- o Khalil wanted to know if Emergency Services needed access in the event of a fire or incident.
- o Dave Cochran, Fire Chief said that additional river access was not necessary. That the existing location from the bridge deck the Fire Department used was good because of its visibility.

5. **Roadway Typical Section and Traffic Counts**

Kaci summarized the roadway typical sections for the north bridge, between the bridges, and the south bridge. She stated that their analysis showed that having the bike path separate from the roadway would add 16 ft to the typical sections, including the width of both bridges, exponentially increasing construction costs. A separate bike path would also create pedestrian/bicycle conflicts at the bus stops.

- At the north bridge, the right turn lane and bike lane would need to be a shared lane 13-ft wide, striped with a sharrow. This is necessary to avoid the existing storm drain system near the north abutment.
- Eric Scheetz likes the idea of minimizing the bridge width. He thinks that that minimizing bridge width might push people to use the existing pedestrian bridges more.
- The radius from southbound Arlington Avenue to the one-way westbound Island Avenue will be smaller than the City of Reno's design standards to ensure the south bridge width is kept as minimal as possible. The traffic counts for this movement are very small, and large trucks do not need to be accommodated.

6. **Utilities**

There are several utilities along the east face of the bridge that will be relocated inside the bridge.

The group had no comments or questions about utilities at this time.

7. **Right Away**

Kaci showed the three City of Reno owned parcels that will require access for construction.

- Khali said that Lori Miles of the City of Reno could work with the selected contractor on getting the right of entry needed for construction.
- David H. asked if a staging area had been identified. Kaci replied no.
- Eric Scheetz that they would need to work on abutments at each end of the bridges. He wanted to know who owned Island Avenue? He thought State Lands owned up to the vegetation on the river.
- Khalil thought Eric was correct on that and said the City of Reno owned Island Avenue. Judy said they could get temporary access from State Lands for the construction.
- Joe Coudriet will look up and send group info on what they did in 2017.

8. **Hydraulics**

The project is required to analyze 2 events to ensure no rise in the water surface elevation.

- The 14,000 cfs flow, for CTWCD, 408 Permit requirement (approx. 50 year event)
- 100-year storm per FEMA requirements (City of Reno, TRFMA)
- Eric, TRFMA, provided the most recent 100-year model to Jacobs
- A separate call will be set up with the City of Reno to discuss the model and assumptions. Joe Coudriet would coordinate who should be on the call from the City of Reno.

9. **Environmental Updates**

- Kaci stated that a 408 Permit would be required for the geotechnical boring at the north bridge.
- Jim Clarke asked if the whitewater course would be considered a park by FHWA and wanted to know if a call could be scheduled to find out.
- Jim C. said that construction staging would be considered a part of NEPA and 4F. He said the best we could do would be to make a judgement on what would be the reasonable place to assume for staging the construction. He wondered if Matt Brezina was still on the call. Matt was still on the call and responded that it was not realistic to think that staging could be in the park.
- Jim C. wanted to know if it would be possible to shut down the parks during construction. Matt B. responded that that might be more feasible on the north side.
- Jim Litchfield wanted to know if the pedestrian bridges would remain open during construction. Judy thought we could keep the pedestrian bridges open, and simply make Arlington Avenue not accessible to the public during construction.
- Jim Litchfield wondered with construction starting in 2024 and going for 2-4 years, would Arlington be closed that entire time? And he wanted to know if the channel would be de-watered? Judy responded and said the intent was to de-water the channel under each bridge when it was being constructed.
- Kaci reminded the DRC group that construction withing the 14,000 cfs level could only occur July 1 – Oct 31 and that they were leaning towards a precast to keep the construction timeline to one year for each bridge. How de-watering would be done was still an unknown and that answer would likely be determined by the contractor.
- Jim Litchfield suggested that they should limit access from the pedestrian bridges to keep people away from the island.
- Eric Scheetz said that means and methods would help the contractor provide solutions. He thought one bridge at a time would be best. He likes the idea of the surrounding parks for possible staging areas. He mentioned that the courts at the Barbra Bennett Park would also be another potential location for staging.

10. **Project Schedule and Misc. Items**

Judy reminded the group that the 30% plans would be submitted at the end of June and that there would be a public meeting held at the end of July. She reiterated that people should reach out to her or Kaci with any suggestions, concerns or questions they had.

Judy also stated that she was aware that a mid-block RRFB could cause problems for the City. She asked Khalil if he could provide feedback on the need for continuous street lighting along Arlington. Khalil said he would do that.

Judy said they would get the agenda and a draft PowerPoint presentation for the next DRC meeting out to the group a couple of days prior to the next meeting. Kaci asked the group to bring up any questions they might have ahead of the meeting so they could get the information for discussion.

11. **Teams Chat Function Comments Not Included in the Notes Above:**

[1:25 PM] Brian Stewart RTC

What is the normal water surface elevation during most times of the season at the south bridge

12. **Action Items:**

- a. Design team to see if possible to add stairs from east side of Arlington to path under north bridge
- b. Judy/Joe/Kaci coordinate to schedule hydraulic modeling focused meeting with the City of Reno
- c. Coordination with City of Reno for maintenance access from Island Avenue
- d. Khalil to determine if continuous street lighting is required along Arington Avenue