

# FINAL

## Summary – Meeting #9

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

*March 13, 2008, 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.  
McLane Room (644 A Street, Springfield)*

---

#### ACTION ITEMS

- Web survey to “go live” on April 7<sup>th</sup> (later updated to April 15<sup>th</sup>)
- Tim to lead preparation of “white paper” on bike/ped access to and on bridge

#### ATTENDANCE

##### Voting Members

- Tim Dodson – ODOT Project Liaison/CPM, ODOT Bridge Delivery Unit
- Chris Henry – Transportation Planning Engineer, City of Eugene Public Works
- Greg Mott – Planning Director, City of Springfield
- Charlotte Behm – Community Advisory Group (CAG) Representative, Springfield Neighborhood and CPC for Whilamut Natural Area
- Kent Howe – Planning Director, Lane County
- Jim Cox – ODOT Major Projects Branch
- Al Heyn – Bridge Engineer, ODOT Region 2

##### Voting Members not in Attendance

- Ann Sanders – Area 5

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

- Lou Krug – Project Manager, Oregon Bridge Delivery Partners
- James Gregory – Environmental Task Leader, Oregon Bridge Delivery Partners
- Jamie Damon – Public Involvement Coordinator, JLA
- Carl Deaton – Designer, ODOT Region 2 Roadway
- Lissa Willis – Public Affairs, ODOT Region 2

#### HANDOUTS

- Agenda
- Meeting #8 Summary (draft)
- Summary of CAG Meeting #7 (final)
- Land Use Action Schedule

- Draft Issue Tracking list
- Meeting #4 Summary (final)

## **WELCOME AND AGENDA REVIEW**

Lou Krug welcomed the group and reviewed the agenda. Lou suggested that the order of the agenda be revised because Greg had to leave by 11:15. As such, the web survey was moved to the beginning of the agenda.

## **REVIEW/COMMENT ON DRAFT WEB SURVEY**

Lou briefly reviewed the intent of the survey, which is to gather information on the interests and values of the community, bridge users, and other interested parties as we move forward with the process of bridge type selection. Jamie walked through the components of the draft survey and relayed to the PDT what had been said by the CAG in their review of the survey on March 11<sup>th</sup>.

Jamie discussed the concern that individuals or groups could take the survey multiple times to “stack the deck” for one option or another. JLA’s experience in doing on-line surveys for multiple projects is that that typically doesn’t happen. They can recognize and track patterns to tell when the same individuals are repeatedly taking the survey and address it at that point.

Greg asked how the information gathered through the survey and other public input are “weighted” in making the bridge type decision. Jamie responded that we need to check the demographics on who’s taking the survey and providing input to make sure that the information gathered is representative of the community. Jim added that it also depends on what the PDT decides to do with the information and to potentially weight the information provided through these outreach efforts. Charlotte noted that how the survey is promoted and publicized affects whether it reaches the broader community. Jim encouraged her to provide input and spread the word in the community. The survey will be advertised in the Register-Guard and the Eugene Weekly. Greg suggested notices be placed in the libraries and internet cafes.

Charlotte offered that the survey could ask about the primary mode of travel. She also asked if there was a way to find out if specific types of communities that people are affiliated with (such as disabled, university, transit-dependent, etc.) could be drawn out in a survey in order to understand if a broad cross section of the community was really participating. She has concerns about the diversity of people and views that are being represented in the project development process. Chris recommended advertising in the Hispanic Times. Charlotte suggested using list-serves to reach different communities and interest groups. Jamie said we can consider adding a question at the end of the survey about how the respondent learned about the survey.

Lissa pointed out that, as we develop and go live with the survey, we need to be mindful of managing public expectations. People need to understand that they are not voting on a bridge type, but rather providing information to help in bridge type selection.

Jamie said that the team plans to go live with the survey on April 7<sup>th</sup>. (Note; this date was later changed to April 15) Chris asked how long it will be kept open and how will it be used in light of the upcoming decision points (e.g., Metro Plan Amendment and REA/FONSI). Jim noted that it will help with the local land use decision, demonstrating we are getting broad public input on the bridge type selection. Chris then asked who ends up selecting the bridge type. Tim said the PDT will recommend a bridge type, but ODOT ultimately makes the decision on which bridge type to build. Chris raised concerns that he will need to have the Eugene City Council inform him on what to recommend, and suggested revisiting this process with the Council. Jim noted that the environmental process isn't completed until the land use actions are approved and that it's critical to get through the land use approvals and environmental process in order to be able to begin construction during the 2009 "in water work window". Tim added that the survey brings important information to the city councils and county commission and allows us to show how we're considering community values and preferences. Jamie commented that it also allows us to illustrate the trade-offs and consequences of one type vs. another. Other factors will be used in bridge type selection – input from the survey allows us to frame the information and recommendations that will be provided to the local elected bodies.

Charlotte stated her concern that the I-girder bridge type is being discounted because it's plain and that people may not realize the potential for above deck decorative features. Lou said that examples of above deck features on Interstate freeway bridges are difficult to find – most examples are from local streets that have different design standards. Jim noted that the cable-stayed bike/ped bridge over I-5 is a gateway feature and may provide a design theme for the Willamette River Bridge. Kent suggested that it could be a question in the survey about whether the new bridge was a gateway.

Chris mentioned the issue that was raised in response to the Metro Plan Amendment application regarding bike and pedestrian access to the I-5 bridge. Carl and Lou said that they have looked at what it would take to provide access from Laurel Hill Valley neighborhood and there are substantial design and cost issues. Charlotte observed that putting bike/ped facilities on the bridge would make it wider and potentially require right of way. Jamie said a response to the issues needs to show the challenges and trade-offs. Chris pointed out that there are issues inherent in the comment that need to be addressed (sustainability, carbon footprint) and referred to a Governor's sustainability report that was recently issued. Tim said ODOT would develop a white paper on this topic.

## **COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

### **CAG Meeting #8 Summary**

Charlotte provided an update on the March 11<sup>th</sup> CAG meeting. Adding members to the CAG was discussed, particular adding members that represent the arts and architecture communities. Charlotte suggested that the arts representative should be someone with experience with public art at the scale of what's envisioned for this project.

### **PDT/CAG Meeting Notes**

Lou pointed out that the draft meeting notes from the last PDT meeting were included in the handout and asked that comments on the notes be sent to him. The final summary for the CAG meeting #7 were also included in the handouts.

### **A&E/CMGC Update**

Tim provided an update on the procurement of the A&E firm and the CMGC. Negotiations with the selected A&E team, which is led by OBEC, is wrapping up and they should have a contract in April. Regarding the CMGC, three firms are likely to propose; proposals are due Friday, March 14<sup>th</sup>. The plan is to have the selected CMGC on under contract by July 1.

### **EA Comments/Responses**

James reviewed the status of the environmental process. Public comment period closed in February. More than 30 individuals and organizations submitted comments. James reviewed the general types of comments and next steps in preparing responses and the EA revisions. Chris asked about the format for the revised EA. James said the format hasn't been determined – it may only be the portions of the EA that were revised, not a reprinting of the entire EA. Chris suggested that the EA somehow be provided for reference. James reviewed the schedule for completing the EA and the inter-relation with the land use approval. The REA should be completed by June, but final approval will be dependent on the land use approvals. Hearings for the land use actions have been scheduled for both the planning commissions and city councils/county commissions, and the team is anticipating receiving the approvals in August.

### **Overall Schedule**

Lou reviewed the overall project schedule. Chris noted that the CAG had had a question about the warranty for the construction of landscaping and wetlands mitigation. Carl said that the warranty for wetland mitigation is five years; landscaping is usually one year, but there is an alternative specification for two years. Jim noted that some of the plantings for this project could be done at the outset of the construction, so ODOT and the contractor would be on site for several years, thus promoting the success of the plantings.

Jamie summarized upcoming outreach. Workshops/charrettes for bridge type selection are planned for June or July. Survey results will help with these events, which will involve the A&E team. Chris warned that the Olympic track and field trials are being held in Eugene in the same timeframe and may interfere with the timing for these events. Jim added that the project team really wants to get the CMGC on board before the bridge type selection so that they can contribute. Given the schedule for the CMGC, bridge type selection (with CMGC input) may not be possible by August.

### **NEXT MEETING**

The next PDT meeting is tentatively scheduled for May 9, 2008. Topics to cover will include survey results, planning commissions hearing, next public event, and procedures for transitioning from planning/environmental process into design and construction. Tim mentioned that a “public concerns” list is being developed to capture the ideas and concerns

expressed by the CAG, PDT and public during the development of the goals and objectives. A copy of the draft list was distributed. It will be used to inform the design team, to help ensure continuity as new players are introduced to the project, and to help manage public expectations. The list is intended to be a list of the concerns and ideas raised and discussed and does not represent commitments. The A&E should be on board for the next PDT meeting.

## **ADJOURN**

The meeting adjourned at approximately 2 pm.