

# FINAL

## Summary – Meeting #8

### Project Development Team – I-5 Willamette River Bridge Project

*November 30, 2007, 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon  
St. Vincent DePaul Royal Building, Springfield, OR*

---

#### ACTION ITEMS

##### PDT members will:

1. Provide comments on Meeting #7 summary to Lou Krug via email (no comments were offered by the PDT at the meeting).

##### The project team will:

1. Prepare meeting summary.
2. Prepare for upcoming EA release and public hearing.

#### ATTENDANCE

##### Voting Members

- Tim Dodson – ODOT Project Liaison/CPM, ODOT Bridge Delivery Unit
- Don Angermayer – Transportation Maintenance Manager, ODOT District 5
- Jim Cox – ODOT Major Projects Branch
- Philip Taylor – FHWA Operations Engineer
- Al Heyn – Senior Bridge Engineer, ODOT Region 2
- Rob Inerfeld – Transportation Planning, City of Eugene Public Works
- Charlotte Behm – Community Advisory Group (CAG) Representative, Springfield Neighborhood and CPC for Whilamut Natural Area
- Shashi Bajracharya – Planning Department, Lane County
- Greg Mott – Planning Department, City of Springfield
- Ann Sanders – Project Leader, ODOT Region 2

##### Resource Members/Voting Member Alternates/Observers

- Carl Deaton – Designer, ODOT Region 2 Roadway
- Dave Carvo – Community Advisory Group member
- Frances Sakaguchi – FHWA Environmental Protection Specialist
- 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

## **HANDOUTS**

- Agenda
- Meeting #6 Summary (final)
- Meeting #7 Summary (draft)
- Slides from presentations on EA status and A&E and CM/GC procurements.

## **WELCOME AND AGENDA REVIEW**

Lou Krug welcomed the group and reviewed the agenda.

## **COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

### **Meeting #7 Summary Review**

The PDT members had no comments on the draft notes for PDT meeting #7. Lou asked members present to email comments, if any, and he would finalize prior to next PDT meeting. The handouts also included final meeting notes for PDT meeting #6.

### Review of November 19 CAG meeting

Lou informed the PDT that the CAG had met the previous week. Charlotte provided a summary of the meeting. She mentioned that there was a lot of discussion on design issues. The planned EA open house/hearing and the procurement process were also discussed at the CAG meeting.

## **PROJECT UPDATE**

### **EA Progress & Distribution Process**

James reviewed the process and status of the preparation of the Environmental Assessment for the project. The document has been revised based on the Study Committee Review, which included members of the PDT, comments and ODOT has reviewed the revisions. The document will be forwarded to FHWA for final review and, if appropriate, approval. The team still anticipates the EA being ready for public release on or around December 18, 2007. The Technical Reports are also being finalized.

James reviewed the distribution process: a CD with the document and a letter explaining how to comment will be mailed to everyone on the interested parties list; hard copies of the document will be made available at ODOT area office, libraries, and municipal buildings, and on the project website. Jim explained that ODOT has found that distribution of CDs is a time- and cost-effective way to provide the document for public review and comment. The comment period will extend through the end of January.

The EA is not a public document until it is released for public review and must be treated as confidential for now.

The application to the cities of Eugene and Springfield and Lane County for the required plan amendments and goal exception has been finalized and is likely to be submitted the following week.

### **Update on A&E Selection**

Tim presented an update on the procurement process<sup>1</sup>. The A&E solicitation is moving into the proposal phase. Four teams have been short-listed through the qualifications phase of the procurement and will receive a request for proposal (RFP) in early December with proposals due in early January. Selection of the A&E and notice to proceed are expected to be completed by April 2008. That will allow the A&E to be on board and be involved in bridge type selection, which will occur following completion of the NEPA process.

Current plans are for the RFP for the CM/GC to be released in December, which would allow the CM/GC to be on board shortly after the completion of the NEPA process.

Jim added that the A&E and CM/GC proposers have been directed to not contact CAG or PDT members about the project.

### **BRIDGE RENDERINGS**

Lou noted that the through arch option is now one of the design options that is under consideration in the EA. Lou presented new visual simulations illustrating the through arch from several view points and with different design treatments (such as color and textures). The through arch form could be carried over Franklin Boulevard. The team has checked into some of the concerns that have been raised about the through arch, such as the larger "footprint" and the potential issues with the adjacent electric power lines.

Renderings of the other bridge types were reviewed as well. These renderings attempt to illustrate the basic bridge forms in the actual setting and the opportunities for various treatments during design.

Greg asked if the different bridge types would affect pier placement. Lou reviewed the proposed pier location options (there are two presented in the EA) and noted that, due to the fact that there are fewer piers and longer spans than either existing bridge, the foundations for the piers would be substantially larger than the existing bridges. All bridge types would work with the proposed pier locations. Greg asked if the existing piers would affect construction of the proposed bridges. Tim answered that they would not.

The use of the bridge renderings in the NEPA process was discussed. James noted that the purpose of the EA analysis of visual impacts is to compare the existing conditions to the build alternative. All bridge type options are considered qualitatively.

Lou reviewed the differences between the through arch and the other bridge type options. The footprint for the through arch would be larger since the structural elements are outside (vs. underneath) the traveled portion of the bridge. This means the footings for each bridge would be approximately 12 feet wider for the through arch than for the other bridge types. Roadway approaches on the north (between the Canoe Canal and the Willamette River) would be wider as well, which would require additional use of retaining walls. Greg asked where walls would be located. Tim explained that ODOT is required (by the agreement granting the temporary easement for the detour bridge) to remove the fill east of ODOT's

---

<sup>1</sup> PDT Meeting #7 Notes contain details on the procurement process.

right of way. A wall would be needed to make sure that the roadway fits within existing right of way; the wall would be tapered from south to north. Rob noted that there are clearly trade-offs that will be of interest to the community and that this is one of the issues that will play out through the public involvement process. Lou also pointed out that to keep the project within existing permanent right of way would require the mature trees on the west side of the roadway between the Canoe Canal and the Willamette River to be removed.

Don noted that there are maintenance issues associated with the through arch that are different from the other bridge types. Al said that galvanized cables can help reduce maintenance needs.

Jamie said the team is working on how to effectively demonstrate the trade-offs between the bridge types. Charlotte added that the CAG consensus was clearly not to rush to one particular bridge type, but to keep options open and focus on the potential artistic and architectural treatments. Jamie noted that for the hearing we want to give people a sense of the possibilities that are available with the range of types on the table. Rob observed that the EA is not about selection of a particular bridge type, so we need to help facilitate public expectation.

## **PREPARATION FOR PUBLIC HEARING**

Jamie distributed the draft newsletter and reviewed its content. The team's intent is to send this out in advance of the EA approval. The hearing is tentatively scheduled for January 16<sup>th</sup>, 2007 (depending on approval and public release of the EA). The PDT discussed how to characterize the hearing, noting that, for some people, "hearing" implies something much more formal than what is being planned. Citizens will have the opportunity to give oral testimony for the record, but there won't be a panel or formal presentation at the meeting. The hearing will be described as an "open house format public hearing" to minimize public confusion.

Ann and Charlotte both asked questions about the noise analysis, which were discussed by the group. Charlotte asked that the EA include more information on noise in the subdivision on the east side of I-5 north of the river. She asked for more explanation in the EA on noise walls and when they would be warranted and included in the project. Rob suggested a noise fact sheet would be useful for the hearing.

Jamie mentioned that the CAG plans to meet on January 8, 2007 at the Eugene Library (10:00 AM to 1:00 PM) to discuss the EA in advance of the hearing. The PDT did not indicate that they should meet before the hearing.

Jamie also mentioned that the team is holding off on any type of web survey on bridge types until the A&E is on board.

## **SET NEXT MEETING AND ADJOURN**

The next PDT was set for Thursday, February 28<sup>th</sup> from 10 – 1.

The meeting adjourned at around 12 noon.