INTRO SLIDE

Hello everyone and welcome to the second Public Meeting for the AAB Project! I am Judy Tortelli, Project Manager for the RTC and excited to be here today to get your feedback on the Project. Due to COVID restrictions, we are unable to hold our typical open-house format public meeting so I am providing you with a virtual project presentation and a link to a survey that will help us gather input from you to help inform our decisions moving forward. I would like to highlight the project website: go to rtcwashoe.com and search "Arlington". All project information is posted on the website and I encourage you to review the material for additional details.

PURPOSE OF THIS PRESENTATION

The purpose of today's meeting is to revisit the goal of this study, provide an overview of what the team has completed, and get input from you. Specifically, I am looking for feedback on recommended concepts being carried forward into NEPA Clearance and final design.

PROJECT SCOPE

When we started this project over a year ago, the goal was to figure out what needs to be done to replace the two bridges over the Truckee River on Arlington Avenue. The scope is to complete a feasibility study to define bridge options, identify constraints, and determine costs. At the end we will have a bridge type and aesthetic package identified to carry forward into environmental clearance and design. Decisions have been documented using a process called Planning and Environmental Linkages (PEL). Following this process helps inform decision-making, engages the public and stakeholders, and streamlines the future NEPA process.

PURPOSE AND NEED

The Arlington Avenue bridges were built in the 1930's, are categorized as structurally deficient by NDOT, and we have begun the process of replacing them. These bridges provide access over the Truckee River and split the Wingfield Park area. The project needs to maintain a functional bridge over the river, improve safety and multi-modal access to the park area, and meet flood-capacity requirements.

PROJEC TIMELINE

This graphic shows project timeline and the steps we have been taking to get through the feasibility study. Back in 2019, our defined process and SWG was confirmed by both the

CoR Council and RTC Board. The SWG is comprised of major permitting agencies, group and organizations that represent a larger component of downtown, and immediate adjacent property owners. Their role has been to assist in developing the purpose and need, evaluation criteria, review conceptual bridge type and aesthetic alternatives, and provide feedback to the project team and City Council.

At our first Public Meeting in December, the process and five original alternatives were presented to gain community feedback. Moving on to 2020, our outreach efforts continued. We held 3 SWG meetings and 2 Technical Advisory Committee meetings, which I will be referring to as TACs during this presentation. Most of the time during this presentation will spent inside this box. I want to update you with these group's recommendations and some details of the analysis that has been performed.

Now we are here in 2021, so glad 2020 is over…. I presented to the RTC Board and CoR Council in February and now we are here at our second public meeting. You will be able to preview this presentation the entire month of March. Please take our survey and send me your questions and comments. This is how we will obtain feedback from you on the recommended concepts. We want to hear from you!

When the survey closes at the end of March, the team will compile community feedback, make final recommendations, obtain agency review/comments/and input, and finalize the feasibility study. As soon as the feasibility study is complete, we will start the NEPA/Design phase of the project so we can hopefully build the bridges in 2025.

PUBLIC MEETING #1

At our first Public Meeting, the process and five original alternatives were presented to gain community feedback. This meeting happened prior to COVID and was held in an open-house format. I would like to note that valuable input received helped shape the engineering design and environmental constraints and criteria presented at the first SWG meeting. At SWG-1, constraints and criteria defined by the design team were further vetted and added to. These constraints and criteria were utilized by the team to develop screening materials for the alternatives analysis and start honing in on permitting requirements.

We heard from you and I would like to take some time summarizing the comments that were received. 45 people attended the meeting and 24 gave us comments. Most

people provide multiple comments and the team split those into two categories. The first being alternative specific and the second being tied to attributes that would be further developed for alternatives analysis.

PUBLIC MEETING #1 COMMENTS

This graphic shows comments categorized into our five original alternatives, additional alternatives mentioned, and keeping the existing bridges. The red color indicates opposition and the green indicates support for the alternative.

There was some misunderstanding around the Elevated Bridge alternative and that is where this orange color comes into play. The proposed Elevated Bridge alternative is actually two bridges with a dirt mound in the middle. Each bridge would be open underneath providing access from one side of Wingfield Park to the other under the bridge. Some people interpreted the Elevated Bridge alternative would span the entire park and be completely open underneath.

As you can see, there were a high number comments on the Elevated Bridge concept, it's about a 50/50 split between opposition and misunderstanding. The Clear Span, Single Pier, and Underdeck Arch alternatives were supported and the Tied Arch was a 50/50 split for and against. There were several additional alternatives mentioned and 2 comments associated with keeping the existing bridges.

PUBLIC MEETING #1 COMMENTS

Now onto the attributes. You can see that the aesthetics were the most important followed by pedestrian access and additional elements within the project area. From there constructability/cost and lighting/signage received a lot of comments followed by bridge functionality and coordinating with other downtown bridges.

FIVE ORIGINAL ALTERNATIVES (SLIDES 9-11)

Let's talk about the five original alternatives presented at the first public meeting. The team reviewed previous studies to determine these alternatives. The intent was to start with all feasible options, gather feedback following the PEL process, and reduce the range of alternatives carried forward for additional analysis. The alternatives considered included:

- Single Pier Concept – one pier in the river as opposed to 2, overall thinner bridge deck, provides flexibility to widens sidewalk space, and will maximize headroom for the existing path under the bridge
- Clear Span Concept – thinner deck in the middle, thicker at the edges
- Underdeck Arch Concept – uniform deck thickness, thickness of the arch underneath the structure at the edges
- Tied Arch Concept – above deck features
- Elevated Bridge Concept – carried forward from the TRAction Visioning Project completed by CoR in 2009. One feature to note is that this concept is not fully open under the bridge. There is a mound of dirt in the middle of the two bridges.

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Two separate TAC groups were created at the beginning of this feasibility study. The primary role of the TAC is to dig into the details and analyze information on the technical aspects of the project. Permitting and regulatory requirements were the focus of the TAC-1 group. The team developed a summary of anticipated permitting and regulatory requirements associated with five original alternatives. This summary was presented at the first TAC meeting, where members confirmed permits, permit timeframes and referenced additional requirements that would need to be considered. TAC-1 members concluded that the Tied Arch and Elevated Bridge concepts would be more challenging from a permitting/regulatory perspective based on view shed impacts due to above deck features of the tied arch and the increased roadway profile of the Elevated Bridge concept.

Bridge and roadway elements were the focus of the TAC-2 group. The five alternatives were further developed into nine concepts. Qualitative attributes (construction cost, schedule, maintenance/inspection access, river recreation impacts, environmental impacts, and aesthetics) were defined by the team so Level 1 Screening of alternatives could be performed by TAC members. TAC members individually scored the range of alternatives. Scores were reviewed and discussed as a group at the TAC-2 meeting where consensus on moving forward with two concepts, single-pier and clear span, as the preferred alternatives was achieved.

PERMITTING/REGULATORY TAC-1 MEMBERS

Here is the list of TAC-1 members. There are 13 agencies on this list that were invited to the TAC-1 meeting. 10 attended the meeting and provided input.

BRIDGE/ROADWAY TAC-2 MEMBERS

Here is the list of TAC-1 members. There are 11 members on this list that were invited to the TAC-2 meeting. 9 attended the meeting, scored the alternatives, and provided input.

TAC-2 SCORING SHEET

This is the scoring sheet sent to TAC-2 members. You can see the qualitative attributes, like construction cost, impacts, and aesthetics, listed here along the top row with 9 concepts listed in the first column. The concepts listed are categorized based on the original alternatives, Single Pier/Clear Span/and Elevated Bridge. In addition to this scoring sheet, TAC-2 members were provided with Qualitative Attribute Guidelines (providing a description of each attribute, telling members why it's an attribute) and Concept Evaluation Factors (providing some things to consider during evaluation). The intent was to provide enough data about the alternatives to the members that so that they could provide scores based on informed decisions.

CONCEPT EVALUATION – SCORING RESULTS

Here are the results of the TAC-2 members Level 1 screening analysis. Individual scores were compiled by the team and averaged. The average score is listed here along with overall ranking here. You can see that Clear Span Rigid Frame Concept scored the highest, and the elevated bridge concept scored the lowest.

TAC-2 RECOMMENDATION

Scores were discussed at the TAC-2 meeting where consensus on recommendations was achieved. The elevated bridge concept received the lowest scores and was not recommended to carry forward. The Clear Span Rigid frame concept scored the highest and the group felt it made sense to eliminate the Underdeck Arch and Tied Arch concepts from this group. Looking at the single pier alternative, based on scores and group discussion, the Steel I-Girders concept was also recommended to be eliminated.

STAKEHOLDER WORKING GROUP

Now moving onto our SWG meetings. Our first SWG meeting constraints and criteria for the project were discussed. The team needed to define these so the alternatives analysis could be performed. SWG-1 was held as an open-house format meeting where the group threw everything they could think of out there. 31 were invited and 19 attended.

Next, the SWG-2 meeting conveyed input received from the TAC meetings. This meeting was held virtually with 31 invited and 13 in attendance. Members were reminded of the goal to reduce the range of alternatives that are carried forward into NEPA and design. The group concurred that moving forward with the two TAC-2 recommendations made the most sense.

At the third and final SWG meeting, aesthetics for the Project were presented to the group. High-level aesthetic elements were discussed that focused on overall theme, various lighting potentials, opportunities for railing, widening the sidewalk space, and surface texture options. Again, the group agreed on which elements to carry forward, recognizing the need to start determining the appearance of the bridges while maintaining flexibility as aesthetics are carried forward.

STAKEHOLDER WORKING GROUP MEMBERS

Here is the list of the SWG members. Again, I want to note is comprised of major permitting agencies, group and organizations that represent a larger component of downtown, and immediate adjacent property owners. Folks highlighted in red were added to the list based on City of Reno Council feedback at the November 2019 meeting.

LOCATION MAP – DOWNTOWN BRIDGES

Here is a map showing the various bridges in the downtown Reno area. Currently the bridges at Keystone Avenue, Arlington Avenue, Sierra Street, and Lake Street are included in RTC's 2040 Regional Transportation Plan to be replaced within the 2040 plan horizon. Arlington is designated to be replaced during the 2022-2026 timeframe with the other bridges programmed in the later years.

OPPORTUNITIES AND CONSTRAINTS

Read from Slide

AESTHETIC DESIGN GOALS

Read from Slide

PROPOSED AESTHETIC ELEMENTS

Read from Slide

ALTERNATIVES ELIMINATED (SLIDES 24-26)

Now I want to spend some time digging into which alternatives were recommended by the SWG/TAC to be eliminated and why? The first ones I want to talk about are the underdeck arch and tied arch concepts.

- Underdeck Arch - Framed system not a smooth surface
- Tied Arch - SWG members felt this concept detracted from the Virginia Street, which they felt was the "signature" bridge downtown. The architectural features, and above-deck arches don't fit in with the surroundings and limit upstream and downstream river views.

And finally, let's talk about the elevated bridge concept – you can see from this graphic the footprint impacts this alternative will have on the park.

RECOMMENDED BRIDGE TYPES

Let's move on to what IS recommended and why? Describe photos

SINGLE PIER BRIDGE TYPE

Read from slide

CLEAR SPAN BRIDGE TYPE

Read from Slide

RECOMMENDED AESTHETICS (SLIDES 30-33

Read from slide

PREFERRED BRIDGE TYPE

The goal of this study is to reduce the range of alternatives that are carried forward into NEPA and design. As noted in the timeline, this phase of the Project is anticipated to take up to 4 years. As we move into this phase, having one alternative opposed two will reduce the time and complexity of getting through this phase and allow us to get these bridges replaced sooner. I want to take this opportunity to let you know what our preferred bridge type is based on outreach efforts and analysis performed. The single pier concept allows for a thinner deck section because the pier in the river provides additional support. Having a thinner deck will provide more space and headroom for the pedestrian path that goes under the bridge. It also limits how much the roadway elevation need to be raised to maintain flood-capacity requirements, this will minimize

impacts to the Wingfield Park area. The additional support of the pier provides the opportunity for wider sidewalks along the bridges, creating more space for pedestrians. The single pier bridge type will have a similar look to the existing bridge but with fewer obstructions in the River. During flood events, the City currently pulls debris from the River that collects on the bridge piers at Arlington Avenue. Less debris during floods will be caught on the single pier in the river, and the City will continue to have the capability to remove debris before it increases flooding impacts. This concept will be easier to construct and is slightly less expensive than the Clear Span Concept.

WE NEED YOUR INPUT!

I need to hear from you! Your input is crucial to finalizing this study and moving forward so we can get these bridges replaced. Please take our survey, it will be available until the end of March. The survey questions include references to slide numbers within this presentation and a pdf of the presentation is posted on our website. Also, recaps of our first Public Meeting and the SWG/TAC meetings are posted on the website. I invite you to review that material if you want additional details on what I have covered in this presentation. You can also email or mail me any questions or comments you may have. My contact information is shown on the screen.

Thank you for participating and I look forward to hearing from you!