

East Stadium Bridges Replacement Project - 2009

Community Meeting #2 (December 1, 2009)

OVERVIEW

Retaining wall design was the focus of the second community meeting. Design approaches to three wall segments were presented. (These include the walls facing the UM parking lot north of Stadium and west of the Ann Arbor railroad; facing the UM Golf Course south of Stadium and west of the Ann Arbor Railroad and facing Rose Avenue north of Stadium and east of State Street). Design options for three other retaining wall segments were presented. These have been named “plain;” “earth and sky”; and, “smooth and rusticated.” Meeting participants used digital voting devices to record their preference on the design options presented. The voting results were instantly displayed.

RETAINING WALL OPTIONS VOTING RESULTS¹

The “smooth and rusticated” wall design option was selected by the majority of meeting participants.

RETAINING WALL OPTIONS DISCUSSION

The digital voting on retaining wall options also included a discussion of why people voted as they did and whether, and to what extent, the proposed “earth and sky” and “rusticated” wall patterns would increase costs.

The following comments were made concerning the preferred “rusticated/smooth” retaining wall pattern:

- The rough surfaces will reduce the visibility of any imperfections in the wall initially and over time.
- It might make more sense to have the “rusticated” treatment on the bottom portion of the wall.
- Why not consider using the rusticated treatment on both the upper and lower wall “tiers”?

Meeting participants also agreed that the same retaining wall treatment should be used at all three locations under consideration.

The following response was given to the question concerning the cost of “patterned” vs. “plain” walls:

Michael Nearing of the City of Ann Arbor Project Management Services Unit explained that given the size and estimated surface area of the proposed walls, and considering the types of textures and/or colors that have been proposed, it is expected that there will be a very small increase in the estimated costs of the walls themselves. Mike indicated that he believed that the overall cost increase may be on

¹ Please see the design options presented and voting results also posted on the project web page.

the order of \$0.10 to \$0.40 per square foot increase in cost. Mike also indicated that there are approximately 18,300 square feet of retaining walls [this number was determined after the meeting from reviewing the proposed plans] of this type to be constructed on this project. As a result, the cost increase due to coloring/texturing of the retaining walls is expected to be on the order of \$10,000. The overall estimated project cost is \$23M.

QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES²

Why can't the existing bridge beams be replaced, rather than replacing the entire bridge over S. State Street?

In brief, the replacement of only the beams would not address the sub-standard vertical and horizontal clearances for the bridge over S. State Street or the Ann Arbor railroad. Also, the existing bridge over S. State Street was constructed in 1917 and is almost 100 years old. The bridge over the Ann Arbor Railroad tracks was built about 1929. The current structures are at the end of their design life and cannot be cost-effectively repaired. Consequently, the Project Management Services Unit recommends that they be replaced.

Why is a sidewalk needed on the south side of E. Stadium Boulevard? Wouldn't eliminating the sidewalk reduce the overall project cost?

Planning for the replacement of the bridges must look ahead 75 years – the expected life of the bridges. As a result, needs for pedestrian and bicycles, as well as motor vehicles, must be considered in design. It is City policy to design all roadway improvement projects to accommodate pedestrians and cyclists – safely and conveniently. The sidewalk on the south side of E. Stadium has been included in the project consistent with that policy.

The overall project cost could be reduced by eliminating the proposed sidewalk on the south side of E. Stadium or by examining other cost cutting measures. If it becomes necessary to reduce project costs, these possibilities will be considered.

² Please also refer to FAQs and Meeting #1 Q&A Summary Responses posted on the project web page.