

Meeting Notes Memorandum

Meeting Date: July 13, 2009

Subject: B-4929 – Topsail Island Bridge Replacement Project

Location: NCDOT Highway Building, Room 470

Attendees: Charles Cox, PDEA
Michele James, PDEA
Rob Hanson, PDEA
Tony Houser, NCDOT Roadway Design
Lee Moore, NCDOT Roadway Design
Radha Krishna Swayampakala, RS&H
Steve Gurganus, HEU
Eileen Fuchs, HEU
Herman Huang, HEU
Tyler Bray, TPB
Chad Critcher, RS&H

Via Conference Call:

Allen Pope, Division 3

Jackson Provost, Division 3

The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the results of the June 24th & 25th, 2009 Public Officials Meetings and CIW1 meeting. In addition, the Draft Concurrence Point 1 (CP1) Packet and potential design alternatives were discussed. Handouts were provided to the attendees that included notes from the Public Official Meetings, a summary of the CIW1 Comment Cards, and a CP1 Packet. The CIW1 maps were available and included the alternatives drawn by the citizens. Also, maps showing alternatives developed by RS&H were presented.

Chad Critcher started the meeting by presenting results of the CIW 1 Comment Cards to the attendees. General observations from the Citizens Comment Cards summary include the following:

- 60% prefer a movable bridge type
- 84% do not use the North Topsail Bridge to avoid delays
- 70% do not want the bridge closed for a significant time period
- 92% desire accommodations for pedestrian/ bicycle traffic on the new bridge
- 95% expressed a favorable opinion of the CIW1 presentation material and explanations

The following summarizes the comments and questions from the attendees:

Public Officials Meetings & CIW Summary:

- The three towns in the study area did not suggest a preferred bridge type or alternative; however, Surf City has previously provided NCDOT with a letter indicating their preference for a movable type replacement in-place.
- For the CP1 packet, summarize the citizens' comments on Purpose and Need under a separate heading.
- Charles Cox mentioned that it would be nice to know the community break-out of the CIW attendees – island resident or visitor? Renter or Owner of a property? Topsail Beach/ Surf City/ N. Topsail Beach? This information may need to be collected at CIW2.
- Common statements expressed at the CIW1 meeting included:
 - Adjacent business owners strongly request a movable in-place replacement (Sears Landing, Crab Shack, mobile home park)
 - Six requests for a Saturday meeting were documented
 - Several citizens were impatient with the process and requested alternative designs
 - Several citizens requested a swing bridge instead of a bascule

- Consider a citizen steering committee
- Character of the bridge is important

Concurrence Point 1 Report:

- HEU will be providing their comments on the Community Characteristics Report in the next week or so. Some of these comments will also need to be incorporated into the CP 1 report.
- Rob Hanson would like to review the packet and provide comments to RS&H.

Design Alternatives:

- Include pedestrian and bicycle facilities on both sides of the proposed bridge.
- Attendees discussed the need for evaluating a movable bridge alternative that impacts the park. Final decision was to include as a functional design alternative.
- No alternatives were rejected in the meeting; however, Tony & Lee suggested combining Alternatives 11 and 12 into one Alternative.
- A new sweeping radius alternative to the north that ties parallel to the island at NC 210 was added.
- A new high-span bridge alternative at the existing location was added.
- Constructability is a vital issue for some of the alternatives under study. The Project Team will need to evaluate this as part of the functional design before identifying the alternatives carried forward (Concurrence Point 2 meeting).
- Movable bridge alternatives will have two options – low-level (15' +/-) and mid-level (30' +/-). In order to determine an optimal height for a mid-level movable bridge, a vessel height survey will need to be conducted. RS&H will include this work effort in Task Order #3 and submit for PDEA's review and approval.
- The in-place movable bridge alternative will have three options. Symmetrical widening, asymmetrical widening to the north, and asymmetrical widening to the south.
- Tony & Lee will inform RS&H as to the typical section to include in the study. Four lane versus two lane bridge option.
- RS&H will include time to inventory boat manufacturers and boat maintenance shops near the project site. This has been a concern on other similar projects.

Action items:

- RS&H will investigate if any "FEMA Buyout Properties" are located in the study area.
- RS&H will investigate if Section 6F applies to the Soundside Park?
- RS&H will send CIW summary to Lonnie Brooks and Don Idol.
- RS&H will revise the Study Area Boundary to include the new alternatives suggested by the project team.
- PDEA will review the CP 1 report and provide comments to RS&H.
- PDEA will review public officials meeting summaries and provide comments/approval to RS&H. RS&H will then forward a copy of the notes to the respective towns.
- NCDOT will provide a decision on the two lane versus four lane bridge typical section.