

New Paltz Community Advisory Committee  
Carmine Liberta Bridge Replacement  
Meeting Summary  
1:00 PM May 13, 2015  
New Paltz Community Center

In Attendance: Gail Gallerie, William Weinstein, Richard Gottlieb, Allan Stout, Kathleen Coumbs, Joe Snyder, Ed Pine, Brian Cunningham, Robert Sudlow, Kenneth Wishnick, Andrew Emrich, Dennis Doyle

Also: Harry Ellis, Sue Stegen, Butch Dener, Tim Rogers, Fran Wishnick, Paul Brown, Mike Townsend, Matt Maley, Marianne Ananew

Introductions

Mr. Doyle called the meeting to order at 1:05 pm and asked those in attendance to introduce themselves.

Consensus on the Meeting Summary

Mr. Doyle asked the Committee for a consensus on the April 8<sup>th</sup> meeting summary with errors fixed. The committee members were all in favor.

Review Bicycle Pedestrian Committee Action

Mr. Weinstein stated that the Bike Ped Committee reviewed the need for a second bridge.

Recommendation of the Committee:

A bike/ped bridge adjacent to the proposed new bridge would not bring much advantage – It would be a noisy environment, have difficult access on the east side, and interfere with farming on the west. Accordingly, the Committee recommended the following :

- Do not construct a pedestrian bridge adjacent to proposed new bridge – A new pedestrian bridge should be considered at an alternate location in the future.
- The new bridge should have a minimum of four foot shoulders on both sides to accommodate bicycles
- Shoulders should be marked as bike lanes
- Do not use sharrows - not necessary with bike lanes marked as requested
- A sidewalk for pedestrians is needed - cantilevered off of the North side of the bridge.

Mr. Weinstein stated at the next meeting of the Bicycle Pedestrian Committee they will discuss an alternate bicycle/pedestrian bridge location – to cross the river from the Gardens of Nutrition at the wildlife sanctuary to the boat launch connecting to the new path proposed by the Mohonk Preserve.

Ms. Coumbs asked where the pedestrian bridge would have gone and how would it connect to the other side.

May 13, 2015

Mr. Doyle answered that County Executive Hein's initial discussion was that the County would support possibly installing a separate bike/ped bridge adjacent to the existing bridge on abutments. He added that the report of the Bike/Ped Committee has stated by Mr Weinstein now recommends putting bike/ped facilities on the new bridge rather than a separate bridge. The County would not be responsible for a new pedestrian bridge at the alternative location that Mr. Weinstein discussed.

Mr. Gottlieb asked about paving the shoulder towards Springtown Road. Ms. Coumbs asked how this would fit into the OSI plans. Mr. Doyle stated that we are aware of the need to connect to the Ridge and added the UCTC's 2018 capital plan (TIP) contains proposals for 4-foot shoulders on 299.

**Mr. Doyle asked the Committee for a consensus that the adjacent bike/ped bridge no longer be considered. The Committee was in agreement.**

#### Discussion of Bridge Types

Mr. Doyle reviewed from the previous meeting:

- Two types of bridges, Girder vs. Truss
- The Committee was in favor of the Truss style bridge.
- Reuse of existing abutments.  
New bridge above the 100-year flood plain.
- Very few changes to the intersection.
- The new bridge will have two 11-foot wide lanes, two 4-foot wide shoulders and a 6-foot wide sidewalk cantilevered off the north side of the bridge.

Mr. Doyle provided slides of different styles of what the Cambridge bridges look like in the field.

- A painted Cambridge with galvanized gusset plates.
- A galvanized Cambridge in Hurley crossing the Esopus Creek by the Hurley Mountain Inn.
- A weathered steel Cambridge on Bruyn Turnpike in Shawangunk - Mr. Doyle stated this also gives a picture of what the approach looks like coming toward the bridge and what a truss bridge looks like in a rural setting.

Mr. Stout asked if height of truss arch was determined by length. Mr. Pine answered that height is determined by ability to transport the bridge section over the road.

Mr. Brown asked about the weathered steel finish, as he believed this option was off the table. Mr. Doyle answered that we could do weathered arches with galvanized steel underneath remains viable. This is a solution the County has come up with to deter rust under the bridge. Mr. Stout asked if this was a lower maintenance cost than painting. Mr. Doyle answered it was.

Chief Snyder expressed concern over people climbing on these types of bridges. Mr. Doyle stated we could think about putting barriers on truss end. Mr. Emerich stated we could go with Cambridge Flat style, it gets steeper quicker. Mr. Stout said people could get up just as easy. Mr. Gottlieb stated the Flat style was not as aesthetic.

Mr. Doyle provided a slide of the arch suspension bridge in Eddyville, which had been recently painted and informed the Committee that the manufacturers say paint lasts 20 years at best. He added that if paint were chosen the county would likely galvanize and paint over the galvanized. Mr. Doyle stated as far as costs: assume that weathered starts at zero, galvanized adds about 5% more to the cost of the

May 13, 2015

bridge and 10% more for a painted bridge. We have planning level estimates of bridge costs at a range of about \$1,000,000. Ms. Gallerie asked if galvanized extends the life of paint. Mr. Doyle stated we don't have that answer; we do know that it will help prevent rust.

Mr. Doyle informed the Committee that color choices are from the Federal Color System.

**Mr. Doyle asked the Committee if they saw graffiti as a big problem – Response was YES!  
If painted we would need to address the graffiti problem.**

#### Abutments for Temporary Bridge

Mr. Pine stated abutments will be Precast Concrete Block.

Mr. Stout stated there was a discussion of developing a small viewing area or park on East side. Would abutment work into that – bench at that point? Utility lines will be gone, better view, many people were happy to hear that. Mr. Doyle answered that if there is a decision to create the overlook, the abutments on east side would likely stay. He added that we also discussed doing improvements and cleaning up existing abutments for the older bridge. Ms. Gallerie asked if the community does not plan on an overlook will the abutments on the east side be removed. Mr. Doyle answered yes the abutments would be removed. If the overlook option was chosen we would build up the abutment so it is level and grade out accordingly.

#### Discussion on Handrails (pedestrian bridge railings)

Mr. Doyle showed many different styles of rails and stated we tend to favor a straight forward horizontal railing on the sidewalk. Mr. Gottlieb stated he likes the look of galvanized rails on the weathered steel bridge – makes a nice color contrast without paint. Mr. Stout stated that he would like to keep the design simple since the rails will not be overly visible. Ms. Gallerie asked if all designs all equal in safety value. Mr. Doyle answered that we follow Federal guidelines.

Mr. Wishnick asked if we save \$100,000 on cost of the pedestrian bridge – can it be used for something else? Mr. Doyle answered that we will need a budget first and the something else would have to be eligible for county funding.

#### Discussion on painting

Ms. Gallerie asked if red and blue are the only colors in the Federal pallet. Mr. Doyle answered that there are hundreds of colors but if you are considering painting we would like to limit colors to a smaller choice such as red, green and blue.

Mr. Gottlieb mentioned that Rosendale closed one lane each way when that bridge was repainted. Mr. Pine stated future maintenance it may be possible to do painting by closing the shoulders and shifting lanes. He noted that the lack of overhead truss would make it much simpler than Rosendale.

Mr. Stout stated the Community Improvement team might want to weigh in on color. Mr. Doyle answered that if painting is what you decide to do, but graffiti and cost work against a painted finish. Weathered steel, galvanized or a combination of both, would work best.

#### **Committee Preference – Bridge Type**

**Mr. Doyle asked the Committee for their preference on style – Cambridge or Cambridge Flat.  
The Cambridge Arch was chosen by consensus of the committee**

May 13, 2015

Mr. Doyle stated that he will get some pricing on the bridge as a Cambridge Arch and see how it fits the budget.

Ms. Gallerie stated the cost of design type we reached consensus on may determine budget for lighting and handrails. She added there are no lights on bridge now. Mr. Doyle suggested only lighting the walkway. Keep the lighting just on the sidewalk to prevent driver confusion. He added that the County would install conduit if the community pays for lighting. He proposed mounting lights on the truss so no back splash on road. Chief Snyder stated that lighting is not needed on bridge, but *sidewalk lighting is an improvement and a deterrent*. Mr. Stout stated the Village Board would have to weigh in on the cost of lighting part of project. Mr. Weinstein asked about the types of lights and possibility of using solar. Mr. Doyle stated the lights would be LED – probably not solar, due to mounting issues and aesthetics, but the Village could buy renewable power. Mr. Doyle added that LEDs last much longer than MH or HPS lamps in the order of 70k to 100k hours. A good local example is the New Palt Campus parking lot.

Mr. Dener stated the flag has been replaced 43 times due to vandals, so he thought they will vandalize the lights. Ms. Gallerie stated that lighting may deter some of those activities.

Mr. Stout stated the Community Improvement team would like to offer input on lighting design. Mr. Emerich stated that Sun Valley Lighting, used for bridge types has about 500 types.

Mr. Maley (on Community Improvement Team) asked about having decorative lighting, perhaps temporary for holidays. Mr. Doyle answered that he wasn't aware of any County policy on decorative lighting, but the liability could be onerous. We would have to see what is proposed.

Mr. Gottlieb stated box rail is most utilitarian, especially with snow removal, and he asked about the *possibility of having lighting mounted flush in box beam handrail*. Would light the walkway and be difficult to vandalize. Mr. Doyle stated we have seen surface mounted lights. He asked Mr. Pine where the lights could be mounted. Mr. Pine stated we could do it right in the rail from the start of the bridge (not in the truss.) Mr. Gottlieb stated it would likely be an inviting soft light and still be able to see the stars at night.

#### Paint or Not – Weathered or Galvanized

Mr. Weinstein said he liked the weathered finish– maybe we could paint the gusset plates for an aesthetic purpose. A guest stated there were so many different colors of paint would like to see colors that won't clash – go with natural. Mr. Gottlieb asked if there were any electrolysis or corrosion issues with galvanized next to weathered. Mr. Pine said there were not.

Mr. Doyle stated he would come back with pics of both galvanized and weathered finishes on a Cambridge Truss, a budget, and come back to Community Improvement Team about surface lights. Mr. Doyle stated he would begin a dialog with the Team outside of the Committee with their permission.

**Mr. Weinstein asked if we had a consensus about the pedestrian railings. Mr. Gottlieb stated that rubrail were the least expensive option, would work with snow removal and we could locate lighting underneath toward the inside. Mr. Pine said he thought that would work easily with the rubrail – the rails below are smaller for safety and the upper is heftier and we could run the lights underneath. Mr. Weinstein stated that seemed like a good choice.**

May 13, 2015

Mr. Doyle stated that during construction the following was presented: Reduce speed limit to 20 mph, an exit right turn only from Huguenot restriction. All other turning movements in the intersection would be unrestricted. Ms. Gallerie asked if you could continue going straight up Main Street coming off the bridge going east. Mr. Doyle said that through movement was okay because there are no conflicting turning movements and sight distance is okay.

#### Committee Preference

**Mr. Doyle asked the Committee if they wanted to develop the overlook?**

**The Committee responded – Yes**

#### SEQRA – Type II vs Unlisted

Mr. Doyle stated the County thinks this will be an Unlisted action. We will do EAF, etc. County will coordinate with SHPO, DEC and others due to temp bridge.

#### Update on Utility Relocation

Electric Lines: Mr. Pine stated as far as he knew everything was moving along and the utilities will be relocated to south side of bridge.

Mr. Doyle stated we will get together with the Mayor Elect Rogers and the Village about relocating the water line. Looking at the cost of moving the line two times might be worth boring under the creek. He added that it is the community's responsibility to move like any other utility in the County right-of-way.

Mr. Gottlieb asked if New Paltz was about the overall water supply for the village. Mr. Doyle noted the presence of an existing bored line up by the sewage treatment plant and there may be a possibility of locating the lines near each other up at plant. If the decision is for the water line to stay on the bridge, the County would like to create a betterment agreement with Village to ensure that the line is moved when we need it to be so that construction can begin on time. Mr. Gottlieb remarked about the use of a flexible line into the river or on the temporary bridge to reduce costs.

Mr. Emrich stated it depends on the size of the line. The county will be doing a flexible six inch line in river in Wallkill. Mr. Emrich stated we can have this discussion with Village Engineer.

#### Next Steps

Next meeting will be Tuesday, June 16<sup>th</sup> at 1PM.

Mr. Doyle stated he would send a link to the Long Range Transportation Plan mapping tool to the Committee.

The meeting ended at 2:43 PM

\*\*\*The Community Center was not available for the selected date so the Conference Center at BOCES in New Paltz was reserved. (175 Route 32 North, New Paltz)