

May 10, 2022 – Design Review Committee Meeting #3



Meeting Summary

Project: Arlington Avenue Bridges	Date: May 10, 2022, 1 PM
Topic: Traffic Model Results Roadway Design Updates Onsite Drainage	Location: Virtual - Microsoft Teams Meeting

Participants:

Judy Tortelli – RTC, AAB Project Manager	David Hutchinson – City of Reno, Traffic Engineer
Joe Coudriet – City of Reno, Floodplain Manager	Dave Cochran – City of Reno, Fire Department
Brian Stewart - RTC, Director of Engineering	Dan Doenges – RTC, Director of Planning
Doug Maloy – RTC, Engineering Manager	Kayla Dowty - CTWCD
Matt Brezina - City of Reno, Parks & Rec	Sara Going – RTC, Multi-Modal
Jamie Schroeder - City of Reno, Parks & Rec	Barb Santner – Stantec, PM and Landscape & Aesthetics
Theresa Jones - City of Reno, Stormwater	Kaci Stansbury – Jacobs Project Manager
Eric Scheetz – TRFMA	Mike Cooper – Jacobs, Bridge Lead
Kurt Dietrich - City of Reno, Traffic Engineer	Jim Clarke – Jacobs, Environmental
Alex Wolfson, City of Reno	Shawn Force - Jacobs
Raymond Enerio - NDOT Hydraulics	Wynn Hessler – Jacobs, Roadway Design
Philip Kanegsberg – NDOT, LPA Coordinator	Kayann Jongsma – Jacobs, Hydraulic Modeling
Robbie Coomes – Jacobs, Bridge Design	Emilee Edginton - Jacobs
Jim Litchfield - Reno Fly Shop	Michael Dulude – RTC Transit
Laura Meyer – Jacobs, Environmental	Manville Strand – Jacobs, Roadway Design

DRC members not in attendance:

Kerrie Koski - City of Reno, City Engineer	Khalil Wilson - City of Reno, Engineering Manager
Roger Trott – NDOT, Environmental	Ryan Bird – City of Reno, M&O Mang. SD/SS
Eric Yount – NDOT, Hydraulics	John L'Etoile – NDOT, Landscape & Aesthetics
Trina Magoon - City of Reno, Environmental	Travis Truhill - City of Reno, Maintenance
Andrea Gutierrez – FHWA, Dist. 2 & 3	Chad Matty – FHWA, Bridge Engineer
Chris Young – NDOT, Environmental	Andrew Stanford - City of Reno, Operation & Maintenance
Kelly Preston - City of Reno, Operation & Maintenance	Calvin Black – Jacobs, Hydraulic Modeling
Jessen Mortensen – NDOT, Bridges	Candy Vermeulen – Jacobs, Admin

Attachments:

Arlington Avenue Bridges DRC Mtg #03 PowerPoint

Introduction

- Judy Tortelli started the meeting and stated this the third Design Review Committee Meeting. She encouraged the group to participate with comments during the meeting.
- Kaci Stansbury summarized the meeting agenda.

Group Discussion Summary (based on work-in-progress 30% design as of May 10, 2022) and Action Items:

Traffic Model Results – Queue Lengths

- Kaci presented the slides for the existing 2020 and future 2050 traffic counts.
- Arlington Ave & W. First Street:
 - Southbound - the analysis shows that the lanes could be shorter than existing; however, the existing dedicated lanes (left turn, thru, bike lane, right turn) will be

maintained in their existing condition

- b. Westbound – existing shared left turn/thru lane will be maintained as is.
 - c. Northbound left- model results show 250 feet needed for the left turn queue length (excluding deceleration); existing is about 175 feet; will be maximized with the new design
 - d. Northbound right – model results show the existing queue length is adequate, maintain as minimum
 - e. Eastbound right – model results show need 150 feet; however, the existing 50-foot configuration for the right turn was built in 2003 when the roadway was narrowed from two lanes to one; lengthening the right turn would have substantial impacts to the Riverwalk; maintain existing
3. Judy asked about scope of the analysis. Kaci said it was from California Ave to 2nd street.
 4. Eric Scheetz asked about the Sharrow lane that was shown in the current proposed design. Kaci explained there was not enough room to provide a dedicated left, thru, right, bike lane, and an 8' sidewalk because must avoid the existing large box culvert in the flood wall to the east of the existing bridge. Therefore the bike lane ended in the northbound direction and bicycle traffic would share the right turn lane (which matches existing conditions)
 5. Khalil Wilson said this bridge corridor is only 15 MPH, why do we have the long deceleration lanes?
 6. Khalil asked if we have considered eliminating a lane by combining the left/thru or the thru/right movements, and adding a protected bike lane.
 7. Eric agreed, dedicated bike access is biggest benefit.
 8. Khalil asked if there are going to be any recommendation to increase the speed limit because if not then this corridor is not conducive to moving traffic left or right. He suggested to shorten the lanes to add a multi-modal and peds lane.
 9. Kurt Dietrich said combining the left lane with the thru lane, wouldn't you have a split phasing at traffic signal at north and south. Khalil said Yes. Kurt suggested possibly adding a dedicated left and a shared right? Khalil Wilson agreed.
 10. Khalil suggested looking at the protective bike lanes at Arlington Ave and 5th street.
 11. Sara cautioned there could be significant backup/blockage of a combined right/thru lane due to high pedestrian volumes
 12. Khalil said that since we won't have additional path under south bridge, all the pedestrians will be on the surface. This is another reason to keep the lanes shorter and speed down.
 13. Alex Wolfson agreed with Khalil, and asked the intent of the long Queue Lengths are for left and right turns? Kaci will confirm with the traffic team. Kurt said it may be to mitigate a starvation issue.
 14. Khalil stated that the long taper where the bikes merge back into the road (shown in work-in-progress preliminary design as of 5/10/22) is a conflict point with the bus stop pullout and right turn lane traffic and suggested researching an alternative. Kaci agreed.
 15. Alex suggested more analysis on the thru/left and thru/right options to see how they would work. He said split-phasing is not ideal but could be beneficial for pedestrian-traffic conflicts.
 16. Khalil summarized the City Traffic Engineers question, what do we want this corridor to be, since is it 15 MPH – is not a vehicular capacity corridor.
 17. Judy asked what is the minimum lane width of the lane? It is currently 11', can it be reduced to 10'?
 18. Khalil said he cannot speak to the lane width, but asked if we could combine walking and biking into shared use path?
 19. Kaci reminded the group that with the bike lane in the roadway, no additional shoulder is necessary.
 20. Khalil suggested an options to have the bike lane elevated 4" above the roadway.
 21. Sara said that there are good striping configuration options for combined bike/turn lanes. It was agreed to research these options.
 22. David said the shared bike configuration is not in the FHWA and technically the bike lane would need to end before the shared scenario.
 23. Khalil asked if FHWA would consider experimentation?
 24. David said it would be possible, but they would need to involve NDOT since they are already doing a similar configuration.
 25. Kurt said that 10' lanes are risky with a two-lane road and recommends 11'.
 26. David Hutchinson said that it is important to remember that this the only truck route going north to south, another reason to keep 11' lanes
 27. Judy summarized that they would do more analysis to determine the best lane configuration options.

Maintenance access

1. Kaci described the maintenance access concept. She presented the existing access from Arlington into the Park and reported these would be maintained., ensuring any new bus stop amenities would not preclude access.
2. The westside has 50' length and the 16' sidewalk area is for loading/unloading/transit use. She presented an idea to provide an additional load zone on the west.
3. The eastside is 75' length. The is a loading/unloading/transit and existing access from Arlington into the Park with the bollards which will be maintained
4. Kaci presented the roadway striping prior to and after the 'road diet'
5. Alex asked if the north pull out could be flared back into the lane? He the concern is that the pullout would be used as an auxiliary lane.
6. Joe Coudriet asked if it was intended to be a used as a loading zone or could it be use for event parking or vendors? Kaci said the intent is a yellow loading zone.
7. Kaci asked if there is an issue with illegal parking in the area. Matt Brezina said there haven't been any issues.
8. Judy asked Matt if he thought it would be a good idea to increase size of the western side pull out? Matt said he no issues unless it encroaches into the big tree.
9. Khalil asked that on roadway slide 11, can they replace the of the skewed crosswalk with a straight crosswalk? Kaci and Judy said it is a possibly. Khalil said it was a concern with the ADA community.

Bridge Design Updates

1. Kaci said that the bridge design has not changed much since last meeting and they are constraint by the culverts.

Hydraulic Modeling Updates

1. Kaci reminded the group that there are two hydraulic events that need to be analyzed for the project. The 14,000 cfs per CTWCD for 408 Permit and 100-year storm per FEMA requirements (City of Reno, TRFMA). Kaci said there is a 6.2 model that should have been sent to Reno. Kurt did not see an email and requested it again.
2. Kaci stated at mid-block of Arlington Ave, it is not clear where the inlets drain to. Khalil asked if City of Reno should get a crew to do camera work? Joe Coudriet confirmed that would be good for the design. Kaci agreed. Andrew Stanford agreed to send a crew to do camera work.
3. Joe said that the 5-year storm path elevation criteria may be changing and should not be in the public work manual. If it becomes a limiting factor, he said to each out to him.
4. Kaci suggested providing the City of Reno a Hydraulic Design Memorandum. Joe said that was reasonable if they are only replacing the two existing inlets and not upsizing the storm drain. Kaci said that would change if it became necessary to upside the storm drain.

Operation and Maintenance River Access Request



1. Joe said Sergio contacted Andrew Stanford and Kelly Preston regarding river access for the operation and maintenance crew. He was wondering if there could be improvements to the river access across from the tennis court, specifically for a 10-wheeler haul truck and loader that moves sediment and debris from the river. They wanted to know the potential cost for this improvement. He continued that if it was cost prohibitive for the 10-wheeler haul truck, then they would like to know the cost for only the loader.
2. Kaci asked if they wanted to modify the existing ramp access or something that is off the road?
3. Kelly said they would prefer either option, as long as they can get a loader to the river then it back to street level.
4. Kaci asked if there is a maximum grade of 10%. Andrew said they could go steeper than 10% but it would not be ideal.
5. Joe said for design reference, they are using a Cat 950M Wheel Loader and the truck is a 2007 International 7600.
6. Judy asked if we could stay away from the existing ramp and possibly go over the wall. Joe said that was acceptable.
7. Kaci said there is already a plan to use the area during construction. Joe said dual purpose is ideal.
8. Mike Cooper asked if the wall is providing fall protection for the vehicles and/or is it a flood wall? Kayann Jongsma confirmed that it is being used as a flood wall for the 14,000, but it is over the top for the 100-year. Mike said they would need something that is flood proof for the 14,000. Kayann Jongsma said there are holes already, and they are plugged up with sandbags.
9. Joe suggested something that looks like stairs and have the loaders can go up and over the barrier.

Utilities

1. Kaci gave a detailed overview of existing and abandoned utility conduits on the bridge.
2. Khalil asked if we know the prior right of all the utilities. Kaci was unsure but will verify with the utilities group.

Environmental Update

1. Kaci said that the project will require two 408 permits: 1) the overall permit and 2) a permit for the Geotech Boring for North Bridge Pier. She said the permit have been submitted and dues paid. Jim has been working with the Traditional Cultural Property of the Truckee River (Native American group) regarding the Geotech Boring for North Bridge Pier.
2. Kaci said they meet with the City of Reno regarding the Section 4(f) to discuss the parks, construction staging and possible closing the parks . We need to work with FHWA to determine if the whitewater park is considered a Section 4(f).
3. NEPA will be stated at the 30%
4. There were no questions or comments.

Right of Way

1. Kaci gave a brief overview of the right of way. She reiterated from last meeting that Jacobs can assist with legal description for the documentation that the City of Reno can submit.

Schedule

1. Kaci summarized the schedule.
2. Kaci reminded the group that the presentation and meeting notes are available on the SharePoint and if anyone needs access, please notify Kaci.
3. Judy said she has not received the SharePoint access email, she suggested that Kaci notify the team when emails are being sent and which domain name will send them, so that people can ensure it is not being filters. Kaci agreed.
4. Judy asked if anyone has suggestions for topics for next month's meeting?
5. Barb Santner asked if lighting needed to be discussed at this meeting? Judy said she would prefer to keep the aesthetics meeting separate. Kaci clarified, and Barb confirmed that there needs to be a discussion about street and pedestrian lighting requirements.
6. Khalil said, and Kurt confirmed, the City of Reno has lighting requirements, but it is dependent on usage, conflict points, and speed limit. Khalil was expecting a recommendation on the type of lighting that meets the requirements, then they could decide on the height and lumen.
7. Khalil asked about existing lighting. Kaci said there are only three. There is one where the bike lane ends, and two on the north end . The lighting is not continuous.
8. Judy said that the intent is to have lights on the sidewalk and not the roadway. Kurt said that he is concerned about jaywalking at night since there is a park in the area and suggested lighting on the roadway.
9. It was agreed that once the lighting type is determined and ensure the standard requirements are met, they will be presented to this group.

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

Teams Chat Function Comments Not Included in the Notes Above:

[Tuesday 3:10 PM] Scheetz, Eric (Guest)

surprised no fiber is going through there- could be your unknown 4"???

[Tuesday 3:21 PM] Sara Going, RTC (Guest)

Thanks All!

Email comment from Jim Litchfield, Reno Fly Shop - A ramp for loading and unloading boats from trailers would be very beneficial.