

Summary – Meeting #3

Project Development Team – I-5 Willamette River Bridge Project

*February 2, 2007, 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.
LCOG Conference Room (644 A Street, Springfield)*

ACTION ITEMS

PDT members will:

1. Provide comments on the draft PDT Meeting #2 notes to Lou Krug by February 16, 2007.
2. Suggest organizations who may want to meet with the project team.

The project team will:

1. Revise goals and objectives per discussion at CAG and PDT meetings.
2. Prepare draft evaluation criteria
3. Develop concept level simulations of bridge types.

ATTENDANCE

Voting Members

- Tim Dodson – ODOT Project Liaison/CPM, ODOT Bridge Delivery Unit
- Ann Sanders – Project Leader/ Area Representative for Lane County, ODOT Region 2
- Don Angermayer – Area District Programs Coordinator , ODOT District 5
- Molly Cary – Environmental Manager, ODOT Region 2
- Anthony Boeson – Environmental and Transportation Engineer, FHWA
- Al Heyn – Senior Bridge Engineer, ODOT Region 2
- Chris Henry – Transportation Planning Engineer, City of Eugene Public Works
- Greg Mott – Community Planning Manager, City of Springfield
- Charlotte Behm – Community Advisory Group (CAG) Representative, Springfield Neighborhood and CPC for Whilamut Natural Area
- Kent Howe – Planning Director, Lane County

Resource Members/Voting Member Alternates

- Dave Carvo (Alternate) – CAG Representative, Vice Chair, Glenwood Neighborhood Group

- Lou Krug – Project Manager, Oregon Bridge Delivery Partners
- James Gregory – Environmental Task Leader, Oregon Bridge Delivery Partners
- Jamie Damon – Public Involvement Coordinator, Jeanne Lawson Associates
- Ed Moore – Senior Region Planner, ODOT Region 2
- Carl Deaton – Designer, ODOT Region 2 Roadway

HANDOUTS

- Agenda
- PDT Meeting #1 Summary (final)
- Draft Meeting #2 Summary
- Revised Public Involvement Plan
- "Issues to Consider" list with dot votes cast by CAG and PDT
- Purpose and Need with draft Goals and Objectives
- Updated project schedule
- Draft Initial Conceptual Bridge Alternatives Report

WELCOME AND AGENDA REVIEW

Lou Krug welcomed the group and reviewed the agenda. Anthony Boesen of the Federal Highway Administration introduced himself and announced that he will be the FHWA representative that will regularly attend the PDT meetings.

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Meeting Summary Review

Lou noted that the PDT Meeting #1 summary has been finalized. Lou asked if there were any comments/suggestions regarding the draft meeting notes from PDT Meeting #2. Chris and Don provided comments that will be incorporated into the meeting notes. The PDT discussed whether meeting summaries should be published on the project website. The CAG had decided at the meeting on January 30th to have CAG meeting summaries posted on the project website. The CAG had also requested PDT meeting summaries as they are finalized. The PDT discussed options regarding posting PDT summaries on the website. Previous discussion and direction of the PDT was that Joe Harwood (ODOT Public Information Officer) would receive PDT meeting notes and produce summaries for the website. Following discussion on this matter, the PDT decided the website should note that "for more information contact Joe Harwood". This should appear near or with the link to the CAG notes. Jamie also noted that the CAG indicated that they wished specific quotes to be attributed to individuals in the CAG.

Schedule

Lou reviewed the updated schedule, noting dates of upcoming meetings. The CAG requested changing their meeting #3 to February 26th since several members could not make it for the previously scheduled February 23rd date. This change would shift PDT #4 to March 2nd and PDT #5 to March 16th. PDT members indicated that these changes were

acceptable. Charlotte Behm noted that she can't make meetings on Monday, Wednesday or Friday in May. As such PDT #6 was scheduled for May 17th from 11-2.

Review of CAG Meeting

The CAG met on Wednesday, January 30th and discussed the goals and objectives and bridge types/aesthetics.

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

James summarized the process of drafting goals and objectives as a follow on the purpose and need. The goals and objectives seek to incorporate the issues (which were discussed at the previous PDT and CAG meetings) that are to be addressed by the project. Frequently these issues go beyond the specific transportation requirements that are addressed in the purpose and need. Goals are high-level statements that provide context for what the project is trying to accomplish; objectives are concrete statements that describe things the project is trying to achieve. Also, the goals and objectives form the foundation for the development of criteria used to evaluate the solutions that will be developed as part of the project. The draft goals and objectives were grouped into the following categories:

- Transportation and Mobility
- Natural Resources
- Recreation
- Aesthetics
- Project Design, Construction, and Operation

James explained that the project team had focused on the issues that were given the most dots during the dot voting exercise at the previous CAG and PDT meetings. James reviewed the draft goals and objectives (displayed on posters for the PDT) and noted that they had been grouped by subject. He also reviewed the input and changes provided by the PDT.

The PDT provided input and suggestions on the goals and objectives. Revisions that incorporate the comments of both the PDT and the CAG will be provided to both groups.

The project team will use the goals and objectives to prepare evaluation criteria, which the CAG and PDT will review at their next meetings.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PLAN

Lou pointed out that the project team is available to meet with various community groups to discuss the project and listen to what they have to say about it. He encouraged the PDT to identify groups who may want to learn about and discuss the project. Local Rotary Clubs and the City Club of Eugene were suggested. The CAG had suggested three neighborhood groups and coordinating with Beth Bridges, the City neighborhood association coordinator.

BRIDGE ALTERNATIVES

Lou provided a demonstration of the visualization tools that will be used to evaluate the bridge types. These tools allow various structure types, span lengths, pier types, etc. to be visualized in the actual setting of the bridge. Computer simulations of several bridge types will be presented at the next CAG and PDT meetings. The PDT discussed options for bridge aesthetics, including previous comments about what constitutes a “landmark” or “signature” bridge, and what types of aesthetic treatments that could be used for context (e.g., using form liners). Viewpoints for visualizations of the bridge types were also discussed.

NEXT MEETING

The next PDT meeting will be on March 2nd from 10-1 at the LCOG Room.

The project team will try to arrange a field trip prior to the next CAG or PDT meeting. The team will be in touch regarding the field trip.