

Rivanna River Bike/Ped Crossing Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting

March 12th, 2022

Agency	Name	Attendance
VDOT	Chuck Proctor	Present
Charlottesville PW	Brennen Duncan	
Albemarle Planning	Jessica Hersh-Ballering	Present
Charlottesville PR	Chris Gensic	Present
Albemarle PR	Tim Padalino	Present
Pantops CAC	Dick Ruffin	Present
Woolen Mills Citizen	Annie Stafford	
Rivanna Conservation Alliance	Lisa Wittenborn	Present
Regional transit Partnership	Bea LaPisto-Kirtley	
Charlottesville Planning Commission	Harim Habbab	Present
Albemarle Planning Commission	Daniel Bailey	
Rivanna Trails Foundation	Fran Lawrence	Present
CTAC	Stuart Gardner	Present
	Brian Roy	
	Kevin McDermott	Present
	Ann Mallek	Present
	Allison Ewing	Present
	Peter Krebs	Present
	Bill Emory	Present
	Shane Sawyer	Present
	Liz Russell	
	John Bolecek	
	Elise Burroughs	
	Christopher Hayes	Present
	Michael Barnes	Present
TJPDC	Sandy Shackelford	Present
TJPDC	Ryan Mickles	Present

Ms. Sandy Shackelford: Welcome. This meeting was being held to discuss concepts prior to final applications submittal. Ms. Shackelford noted this was the followup meeting as planned; more information from VDOT was available since the last meeting. She reviewed the Smart Scale Round 5 timeline. Ms. Shackelford referenced factors considered by the MPO Policy Board (Historic resources evaluated, Environmental mitigation, Bridge design/maintenance, structures). Ms. Shackelford asked if there were questions.

Mr. Tim Padalino: Question regarding number of piers in the river at the East Market Street site. Mr. Chuck Proctor: stated the entire park was in the floodplain, including the entire structure. Mr. Proctor stated the piers were not in the waterway per se, but in the island in the middle of the waterway (the piers were not in the river itself- they were in the island).

Ms. Sandy Shackelford: noted Ms. Jessica Hersh-Ballering submitted a question (via chat) regarding possible environmental concerns and factors that led to some mitigation to be considered as a

contingency for either of these connections. Mr. Chuck Proctor: VDOT would have to analyze impacts at the location. The initial concept that the consultant developed looked at costs and tried to get that estimate as low as possible. Mr. Proctor noted that the more piers to the bridge, then the cheaper the cost. Each pier would need to be analyzed and how each pier would be impacting the floodway, not necessarily the river; it could be a structure that caught debris during flood stage. This would be looked at during a hydraulics analysis in a significant flood event. The option/concept shown today had five piers which was different than the initial concept which had one pier. This concept would be cheaper and more competitive in Smart Scale. The number of piers can be reduced but the cost would increase.

Mr. Dick Ruffin: noted that the option/concept shown had no bend in bridge. Mr. Proctor confirmed and noted it was easier to construct and be less expensive.

Mr. Tim Padalino: referenced/highlighted the change in bridge concept/design (ie. number of piers, etc).

Ms. Sandy Shackelford: noted Peter (Last Name) submitted a question (via chat) regarding the distance between piers. Mr. Chuck Proctor: stated just under 100 feet, possibly ~92ft.

Supervisor Ms. Ann Mallek: noted she expected these changes and was interested in learning more about the changes.

Mr. Stuart Gardner: Question regarding if termini changed with bend out of bridge conceptual design. Mr. Chuck Proctor: the termini of the bridge did not change, but the bend in the bridge (shown in the previous concept) was removed.

Ms. Sandy Shackelford: noted question in chat "Who is responsible for cleaning up debris" and "will the impacts to wildlife be evaluated prior to construction?" Mr. Chuck Proctor: VDOT would perform an analyses of the historic resources, hydraulics of river, and complete a detailed study regarding the elevation of the bridge.

Ms. Sandy Shackelford: asked the group if the number of piers was a priority. Mr. Chris Gensic: noted Free Bridge had two piers in the water and suggested looking into its flooding history. He noted the maintenance aspect was important. Mr. Peter Krebs: asked where was the "sweet spot" when the number of piers and vertical element met. Mr. Proctor responded.

Ms. Lisa Wittenbon: Question regarding the cost difference. Mr. Chuck Proctor: noted he did not have fixed costs yet at this point. Ms. Lisa Wittenborn: Question regarding number of piers to bridge height/out of floodplain ratio. Ms. Sandy Shackelford and Mr. Chuck Proctor respond. Ms. Lisa Wittenborn noted there were many matters to consider when making a decision like this.

Supervisor Ms. Ann Mallek: noted this was a good time to get a bridge; there would be engineers and environmental experts to make sure the bridge would be structurally and environmentally proper. Ms. Sandy Shackelford responded.

Ms. Sandy Shackelford: Question to VDOT regarding maintenance. Mr. Chuck Proctor: noted VDOT had performed some of the maintenance duties in the past (ie. Profitt Road a few years ago). He said maintenance work was not done for every storm.

Ms. Sandy Shackelford showed the latest rendering of the bridge. Mr. Chuck Proctor described the bridge rendering. Ms. Sandy Shackelford noted comments from the survey favored trussed style bridge (and for being compatible with the historical identity of the Woolen Mills area).

Mr. Dick Ruffin: stated the feeling of one being on (the experience of) the bridge was important. Aesthetics were important but the experience was most important. Mr. Stuart Gardner agreed with Mr. Ruffin; the experience was about the view and the access more than an architectural beautiful bridge.

Mr. Chuck Proctor: continued discussing some bridge details and noted the bridge deck was 14 feet.

Mr. Fran Lawrence: noted it would be a wonderful/good cluster of bridge types in the Woolen Mills area (railroad bridge, Woolen Mills pedestrian bridge). Mr. Peter Krebs added/included the I-64 bridge. He asked VDOT about railing. Mr. Chuck Proctor responded.

Mr. Chuck Proctor: stated VDOT was looking at concrete deck, precast or other option possibilities, and some items such as color of beams and railing could be decided at a later date.

Mr. Chris Gensic: asked if piers could be made stamped/have decorative look other than concrete. Mr. Chuck Proctor stated it was a possibility; additional work would need to be done.

Supervisor Ms. Anne Mallek: Questioned regarding piers oriented 90 degrees with the river banks (or piers angled in such a way as to prevent object blockage during flood event). Mr. Chuck Proctor answered.

Ms. Sandy Shackelford: noted the need for lighting. Mr. Chris Gensic stated he liked lighting in the rail. Mr. Chuck Proctor explained.

Supervisor Ms. Ann Mallek: Question for city staff and Council's thoughts on dark/night time lighting. Mr. Chris Gensic explained.

Mr. Dick Ruffin, Mr. Stuart Gardner, Ms. Jessica Hersh-Ballering all referenced comments.

Mr. Dick Ruffin: Question regarding if solar power was feasible. Mr. Chuck Proctor answered that solar power could be for the bridge but not likely for the trail. Mr. Peter Krebs referenced comments on motion sensing lighting at Tonsler Park. He would be interested seeing the cost estimate(s) at final design. Mr. Chuck Proctor stated VDOT staff was working on that.

Ms. Sandy Shackelford restated and summarized the meeting and that the goal was to have the most competitive application as possible. Ms. Sandy Shackelford thank everyone and closed the group meeting.