

I-5 Willamette River Bridge EA

SUMMARY OF OPEN HOUSE— APRIL 5, 2006

OVERVIEW

A public open house for the I-5 Willamette River Bridge EA Project was held on Wednesday, April 5, 2006 from 11:30 AM to 2 PM at the Springfield City Hall and from 3 PM to 7 PM at the Eugene Public Library. The purpose of the open house was to introduce the project to the public and gather feedback on the public's initial concerns, ideas, and expectations about the project.

ATTENDANCE

Members of the project team attending the meeting included:

- Ann Sanders, Project Leader (ODOT)
- Susan Vickers, Environmental Project Manager (ODOT)
- Carl Deaton, Designer (ODOT)
- Mark Wigg, Project Manager (David Evans and Associates)
- Gigi Cooper, Planner (David Evans and Associates)
- Randa Gahin, Public Involvement Coordinator (Jeanne Lawson Associates)

The sign-in sheets recorded 86 meeting attendees, including 46 at the Springfield session and 40 at the Eugene session (the total number of individuals attending was actually 84 because two people attended both sessions).

NOTIFICATION AND PUBLICITY

The meeting was advertised by the following methods:

- A four-page color newsletter was mailed to approximately 295 agencies, organizations, and individuals on the interested parties list.
- An announcement was printed in the electronic newsletter of the Eugene Chamber of Commerce, and email messages were distributed to the listserves of the Laurel Hill Valley Citizens Association, the Eugene Neighborhood Leadership Council, the Harlow Neighborhood Executive Committee, and the Glenwood Neighborhood.
- Newspaper display ads were published in the *Eugene Register-Guard* on 3/29, 3/31 and 4/2, in the *Springfield News* on 3/31, and in the *Eugene Weekly* on 3/30.
- Notices were published in the Community Briefs section of the *Eugene Register-Guard* and the *Springfield News*.
- A press release was issued on 3/28.
- Letters and copies of the newsletter, fact sheet, and flyer were mailed to about a dozen organizations representing low-income and minority communities.
- Flyers and posters were posted in key community locations, and were distributed to neighborhood contacts for posting in local areas.

MEETING FORMAT

The format of the open house was drop-in style, with no formal presentation. Several stations were set up around the room (listed below). Project team members were available throughout the meeting to explain the display boards, listen to comments, and answer questions.

Displays

1. **Sign-in Table** – including a welcome sign display board, sign-in sheet, comment box, and hand-outs.
2. **Slideshow** – a looping slideshow presented a project overview and background. Printed copies of the slides were also available for viewing in a notebook.
3. **Aerial Photo** – a large (approximately 3-foot x 10-foot) photo of the project area.
4. **Photos** – a series of display boards with enlarged photos of the bridge and project area. A photo notebook containing a more extensive collection of photos was also available for viewing.
5. **What We Have Heard So Far** – a series of four display boards listing the key issues heard through the stakeholder interviews. Participants were invited to write on the boards and add their comments or issues (Attachment 1).

Handouts

- Comment Form (Attachment 2)
- Newsletter
- Fact Sheet

COMMENTS

A total of 48 comment forms were submitted, of which 18 were submitted at the Eugene session, 18 at the Springfield session, and 12 were sent by mail (Attachment 3). In addition, another 25 comments have been received by email. The key issues raised in these comments include:

- **Park impacts**
 - restoration of vegetation on embankments and under bridge
 - construction staging and access
 - protect the natural areas and wildlife
 - night lighting impacts on wildlife
 - maintaining and/or improving paths (bike, running, canoe)
- **River impacts**
 - Protect the river
 - Minimize the number of piers in the river
 - Minimize disturbance to riparian areas
 - Remove the old pilings in the river
- **Noise**
 - in neighborhoods
 - in the park

- **Bridge width**
 - build enough capacity for the future
 - do not widen – either keep to 4 lanes or 6 lanes
- **Interchange and ramps**
 - do not add ramps – would have a negative impact on the park
 - would like to have ramps to Franklin – improve access
 - the interchange needs improving
- **Bridge design and aesthetics**
 - opportunity for a signature or landmark bridge
 - create something aesthetically beautiful and compatible with the surroundings
 - incorporate innovative and environmentally sensitive design elements
 - include architects in the design, not just engineers
 - maintain the view of the river, park, etc.
 - involve the community in design and naming of the bridge
 - don't waste money on design; just build something practical
- **Construction impacts**
 - neighborhoods – equipment access, work hours, noise, etc.
 - access and staging in park
 - safety for recreational users on the river and bike path users
 - keep the bike path open during construction
 - coordinate with local entities as you did for the temporary bridge

LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – *What We Have Heard So Far* display board comments

Attachment 2 – Comment Form

Attachment 3 – Comment Forms Received through 4/19/06

ATTACHMENT 1

What We Have Heard So Far - display board comments

From whom? List of actual names.

What We Have Heard So Far...

In February, we interviewed representatives of local agencies, neighborhoods, and organizations to learn more about the community's ideas and concerns regarding the bridge replacement. This is a summary of some of the key points we heard.

➔ PLEASE ADD YOUR IDEAS TO THE LIST

Importance of the Bridge for the Community

- The bridge is a critical link on Interstate 5
- Important for local traffic, too
- The bridge could be a symbol or focal point for the community
- The Willamette River makes it special
- The bridge offers a vantage point to view the communities
- Name the bridge so it is more meaningful

Signage to current interchange is important.

Parkland Quiet areas are the focal point.

Most important consideration is how the "natural" community-parkland is affected by bridge.

Guardrail that you can see thru or post suspension bridge?

? Not supposed to be!

Ho ho ho!

Natural

i.e. parks

The EA needs to factor in PEAK OIL and CLIMATE CHANGE for the design year 2030. 4 Lane replacement, not more – FIRE the officials who built the so-called temporary bridge w/o seismic standards. -Study alternative of seismic retrofit of temp bridge.

Why laugh? This is a golden opportunity to build-in beauty!

Consider a safe canoe crossing of river to tie potential canoeways on both sides of river – i.e. Alton Baker Park canoeing, Springfield Mill Race and Eugene Millrace, Amazon Creek, etc.

Hire Lane County Consultants – not out of town.

Aesthetics/Design

- Design should be something special and unique for the community
- Don't let cost be the only determinant
- An opportunity to make an architectural statement – create a landmark bridge
- Height/scale should be compatible with the parks and riverfront
- Maintain visibility from the bridge (what you can see from the bridge)
- Design should be compatible with new development (Glenwood, Franklin Blvd., riverfront, transit nodes, etc.)

architect

Put an artist on the design team as a means of pointing out possible overlooked options and creating an aesthetic that is pleasing to the community and creates a sense of place.

What does this mean? Subjective!

Design should be compatible with natural areas: quiet design!

A beautiful bridge is an economic investment in tourism – think of the Golden Gate, London's Tower Bridge, the Oregon Coast Bridges.

No

Yes! Symbolic covered bridge without supports in the River! No lights.

Be very frugal don't spend a lot on "looks". Don't spend a lot on admin/management/design; put \$ into material.

Lights create safety – Great opportunity to create regional symbol.

Yes, highlight park views.

Mass transit should not be included!

Can we find an attractive use for the temp. bridge – bikes, runners, etc?

Bike and pedestrian bridge over railroad tracks for better access to area.

I agree. Now is the time to connect the bikes and peds safely.

Do a Glenwood Entrance to the city – both cities.

Use design elements so the bridge is a unifying element for the Eugene-Springfield community.

What We Have Heard So Far...

Parks, Recreation, and Habitat

- Impacts to natural habitat and wildlife
- Impacts to recreation users – pedestrians, bicyclists, hikers
- Boater safety on the river
- Keeping the bike path open during construction
- Noise impacts on heron rookery
- Invasive species
- Night lighting impacts on wildlife
- Restoration - vegetation on embankments and under bridge – including use of native species, and long-term monitoring to ensure success
- Visual impact on park users

No impact,
Yes, quiet.

-Don't use the
Whilamut Natural
Area for access
during construction
this time.
-Good point!

-No night lighting!
-Lights for safety
-I agree
-Light the road
surface, not the
general area- use
many small
directional lights
near the pavement
surface instead of a
handful on high
poles – Think
different!

Incorporate habitat features into the design! le bat perches or heron nesting structures.

No impact at all. Do a freestanding Bridge/NO ramps nothing in our river.

Reduce noise impacts! No supports in the river.

Yes Yes Definitely

-Please muffle the noise.
-Yes, please design for quiet.
-Strongly agree re: avoiding impacts to heronry.

False brome prevention measures

-Yes
-Oak savanna restoration!

- Yes. Minimize intrusion.
-Create a 100 yr. bridge, free standing,
no intrusion on river or park.

Lighting for bike/ped safety.

Keep Pre's trail thru Eastgate Woodlands open.

Willamette River and Greenway

- Water quality impacts on river
- Damage to fish habitat
- Minimize the number of piers in the water
- Remove the old pilings
- Willamette Greenway Goal exception
- Greenway impacts, generally
- Riverbank restoration
- Compatibility with Metro Water Study

Wetlands and stormwater management need to be integrated into the project.

303d listed as temp impacted; so deepen if you can by creating fishing holes.

ZERO

-An aesthetically-designed bridge will honor this landscape with no pilings in the Willamette River.
-Agree

Absolutely!

?

Connect Pre's jogging trail to Springfield along Riverside.

Keep our local birds, such as the osprey on the railroad bridge happy – no impact – also protect the herons.

What We Have Heard So Far...

Construction Impacts

Make safe bike-pedestrian-connect to Ridgeline trails, neighborhoods & U of O. If it is easy to bike and walk- they will come.

-Don't use the Whilamut Natural Area for access during construction this time.

- **Maintain bike path connectivity**
- **Safety for boaters and park users**
- **Traffic delays and detours**
- **Location of staging areas and equipment access routes (through park and neighborhoods)**
- **Cumulative impacts with other road projects**
- **Notification regarding impacts to local property**
- **Public information during construction**

Acceptable and preferable to trucking through neighborhoods and parkland during construction.

*-Please no!
 -I agree- this disturbs life for everyone.
 -Staging must be done with sensitivity to parkland and neighborhood NE of worksite.
 -Please keep trucking out of the park!!
 -Agree*

Keep Pre's trail open to Eastgate woodlands.

Noise

Construction noise is not a problem! What is a problem (for Laurel Hill Neighborhood) is TRUCK noise! This impacts everyone in our neighborhood all the time!

- **A sound wall will not be sufficient – need to be open to other solutions**
- **Pile driving will impact the neighborhoods – negotiate time periods**

*-Please design bridge to minimize sound traveling into park.
 -Explore options of road bed placement and height in relation to noise.
 -Sound walls are largely a waste and eyesore.
 -Use quiet pavement technology – it works in other places.
 -Be proactive to reduce freeway noise in adjacent neighbors. Design bridge to minimize noise.*

Widening the Bridge

*-Yes!
 -No! minimize width.*

*-No
 -Yes
 -No
 -Yes
 -Yes. Prepare us for the future and this area is predicted to go. Let's be smart and pro-active to keep our quality of life high-quality.
 -Yes*

- **It makes sense to widen the bridge to prepare for future growth**
- **Is a wider bridge needed?**
- **Safety hazard of extra-wide shoulders on a six- or eight-lane bridge that is only striped for four lanes**
- **Don't widen the bridge unless you are sure the highway on either side can be widened, too**

*-Agree!
 -Build it big.
 -6-8 lanes are on the other parts of I-5. This would match the North side of I-5 at the bridge. Build future NOW.*

Consider peak oil/global warming in NEPA process.

What We Have Heard So Far...

Franklin Interchange

- Do not preclude the future possibility of ramps to/from Franklin Blvd.
- This project should be done in conjunction with the interchange
- It would be a mistake to tie the interchange in with the bridge
- Ramps would interfere with aesthetic design options for the bridge

ODOT has already determined that interchanges are not necessary!

-I agree.
 -No interchange!

-Ramps would impact wildlife and people's enjoyment of this natural area.
 -Don't make offramps develop a truck stop for interstate traffic!
 -Don't let small group of vocal special interests dictate options!
 -We'll see how small the interest groups are on each side. The numbers came out for the environment on I-5/Franklin!
 -Design should allow for possible movement of Franklin Blvd. away from the river but still under the bridge span – regardless of interchange improvement scenarios.

-No off ramps! Any interchange should be strictly Glenwood.
 -No off ramps! Better signage.

-Good idea.
 -Needs to given great consideration.
 -No! These are separate projects as defined by ODOT.

Accommodate bicyclists/pedestrians.

Public Involvement

- Work with the parks and neighborhoods, as on the temporary bridge
- Inform and engage the community
- Be clear about the decision-making process
- Be able to answer questions at public meetings
- Do not dismiss public opinion
- Make sure to engage key stakeholders
- Have a contest to name the bridge

Don't dismiss importance of public park.

-Yes
 -Yes – Keep traffic out of park. (It was awful during temp. bridge construction.)

- But don't give too much weight to small, vocal minority interests.
 - Nor to pro-development special interests.
 - But don't try to squeeze an elephant through a garden hose. Intelligent, planned livable growth.

Least important.

Be transparent with facts!

Other

- Use local workers and pay fair wages for construction

?

At what expense?

ATTACHMENT 2

Comment Form

COMMENT FORM

March/April 2006



We would like to hear from you. Please return this comment form during the open house or postmark no later than **Wednesday, April 12, 2006**. Thank you!

Comments:

Would you like to be kept informed about the project? If so, please fill in your information below and we will add you to our contact list.

Name:	Affiliation:
Address:	City, State, Zip:
Email:	Phone:



For more information, contact **Ann Sanders**, ODOT Project Leader, at (541) 744-8080 or Ann.I.SANDERS@odot.state.or.us, or **Joe Harwood**, ODOT Public Information Officer, at (541) 726-2442 or Joseph.D.HARWOOD@odot.state.or.us.

Visit the project website: www.oregon.gov/ODOT/HWY/REGION2/I-5WRB.shtml

Additional Space for Comments:

.....
Fold along dotted line. Tape closed (no staples).
.....



Apply
39¢
Postage

Randa Gahin
Public Involvement Coordinator
Jeanne Lawson Associates
1110 SE Alder Street, Suite 301
PORTLAND OR 97214

.....
Fold along dotted line. Tape closed (no staples).
.....

ATTACHMENT 3

Comment Forms Received through 4/19/06

I-5 Willamette River Bridge EA Comment Forms Received through 4/19/06

<p>The computer-generated "photo" of the permanent I-5 bridge crossing the Willamette river at Springfield/Eugene shows no supporting concrete pylons. Let's do it that way! / It is time for an attractive permanent structure that honors our river and community by keeping support structures out of the water. Also, I am one of many Springfield residents who DO NOT favor on-and off-ramps attached to this new bridge, and connected to Franklin Blvd. the huge expense of this ill-conceived proposal is not cost-effective, and would put more pillars in the river. NO! Kudos to ODOT for not going forward with this poor use of our tax money. Build a beautiful bridge, and fix the Glenwood Blvd. interchange for I-5 access to and from Franklin Blvd.</p>
<p>Thanks for this opportunity. The bridge is a very significant opportunity to demonstrate Eugene values of environmental and people concerns. Great design and visual esthetics have not been evident in Eugene but here's a chance to add these values to our city. / I'm opposed to off-ramps, they are unnecessary and would destroy the intimacy, safety, esthetic and quality of life in the Fairmount and Univ. neighborhood. We don't want to be a truck stop! I live in Fairmont neighborhood ... it's a special place.</p>
<p>When remaking the new bridge, I feel that it should be 6 or 8 lanes to match the needs of the freeway. So there would not be a bottleneck of reduced lanes. The I-5 corridor IS 6 lanes in some (much) of the state and WA.</p>
<p>1) Avoid adding more structures WITHIN rivers. 2) Remove present pilings where old structure go. 3) Interchange should be at present Glenwood exit/interchange. 4) Consider overlook highway right-of-way in terms of width-scale of new bridge. It clearly must be wider than the present bridge, but go easy-shoulders shouldn't dwarf the actual roadway. 5) Go easy on the park! - no flying ramps there! 6) Make it pretty!</p>
<p>An artist and a landscape architect should be included on the design team. They have the ability to point out potential areas for integrating aesthetic, design, public art, and landscape design that would create a sense of place and living community pride. Consider the use of transportation enhancements written into SAFETEA-LU? for things such as bike and pedestrian paths.</p>
<p>Protect natural areas as much as possible: Salmon habitat, Whilamut, riparian zones, the less disturbance the better. It makes sense to build wider now if we know it will be needed in the future.</p>
<p>The most important problem to address with the bridge design is NOISE. At times, truck traffic across the bridge is incredibly loud, even where we live at the south end of Riverview St., 3/4 mile away. It's NOT impossible to deal with this - my brother in law lives in El Cerrito, Calif., 3 blocks from I-80, which is an 8 lane freeway in a giant metropolitan area, and we hardly hear the freeway from his house.</p>
<p>Would like to see Franklin (east/west) widened enough to accommodate two dedicated EMX? lanes if possible under I-5 Bridge.</p>
<p>I support on-ramps and off-ramps at Franklin Blvd. Do not let a small but organized minority dictate the future of the less-vocal minority. Also remember that what you call the "Whilamut Natural Area" is known to locals and long-time residents as "The old landfill".</p>
<p>Eugene is so backwards! Portland has many bridges over the Willamette and we need this access to reduce future congestion and ease access to the U of O and Springfield. / Alton Baker Park used to be a landfill. / Please don't let short-sightedness and P.C. environmentalism short circuit this needed option.</p>
<p>This whole proposal strikes me as a "...why do it?" "Because it's there" sort of thing. / The notion of "building to the future" appears to be a popular one, but WE MAKE the future. The future we will make with the acceptance of most elements (as stated and illustrated in these public expositions) is one that will bring no-one any good, except-maybe-trucking interests. Eastern Eugene will be lost to residential use (unless faceless multi-story apartments). The link between Franklin Blvd and Springfield will be a passage through horror. Etc. Your "future" is one that disregards the human angle. In short: you haven't shown a response to this perceived problem that I can have anything helpful to say.</p>

<p>Noise from the freeway is a significant issue for nearby residents. Please be sure to design the bridge to minimize noise in surrounding neighborhoods.</p>
<p>I don't want new off ramps! Consider creating fishing holes when removing the temporary bridge supports. Naturalize the Patterson canoe canal and realign the path approaches. Your photo note book lacks public users ie bikers, walkers, joggers and animals: frogs, birds; fish etc. A video of each approach from the passengers point of view would be helpful; also sound impact would be better understood if taken from a park users' point of view.</p>
<p>I would like to see new materials construction methods and technology incorporated into the design. I would like to see the comparison of (3) three roadside landscaping schemes, i.e. w/ deciduous trees; coniferous trees; low shrubs. I don't want to see informational signage interrupt the view of the park or distract from the auto passengers attention of the existence of the park. Prefontaine trail should be extended along the river to Springfield. Areas prone for graffiti & homeless encampments should be design out of existence. Animal habitats should be a part of the evaluation, i.e. Bat & Bird perches, nesting opportunities.</p>
<p>I would like a bridge that symbolizes the cover bridge while having NO supports placed in the river. I want total (bridge and supports) temporary bridge removed completely from the project area. I would like to see a southbound wayside providing an overlook to the park w/historic and access information. I would like to see Oak Savanna restoration as part of the restoration of the area. If ODOT is considering (2) two bridges that should be made clear to the public at the beginning. I would like to see sound abatement paving and stormwater porous pavement incorporated into the project where feasible.</p>
<p>Incorporate sustainable practices throughout the project that includes future disassembly, potential and cradle to grave assessments. Include limited future supply of energy for automobiles (peak oil). Open up the process for a design competition (see Poole? Harbor Bridge Design Competition at U of O Library AAA TG 64.P65 1997. The incorporation of Natural images and materials would be beneficial. A basalt base w/ native American petroglyphics and language would be a unique feature. Please read "30 Bridges" by Matthew Wells at U of O library. AAA TG 300.W44 2002. Make the bridge uniquely Pacific Northwestern; not generic! Incorporate the rainfall into the design. Design white noise to mask the sound of traffic.</p>
<p>I would like to see a sideview profile that mimics a tree canopy as a possible option. Look at use of new materials (composites) and/or old recycled materials in the design of the bridge. Consider using the cavity of the bridge infrastructure for future incorporation for mass transit or pedestrian passage. I would like to see a habitat friendly bridge-moss; nesting space birds/bats perching for birds of prey. I would like the Whilamut Citizen Planning Committee to get restoration funds for Oak Savannah restoration in areas outside of the project area as compensation for impacts to the park during construction. How much of the growth in traffic is due to trucks? They should be diverted to rail!</p>
<p>I think ODOT did a fabulous job on the "temporary bridge" addressing our needs and concerns from the park and the neighborhood. / For the neighborhood, we were concerned about truck traffic and parking, noise in the evening and other pollution. / For Eastgate, we love the park and are very watchful and appreciative of the plants and animals there, and value them immensely. / As a bike commuter, I want to say a big thanks for how you accommodated our needs - on a light note the Santa flagger was a kick. At first, there was vehicle (like trucks) traffic on bike paths that was hazardous, but as soon as we called you, instant fix - awesome! / A part of the park that is dear to my heart is the frog pond (seasonal) at the entrance to the Knickerbocker bridge. Please continue to protect that area - you did SUCH a great job on that last time with the barrier and the communication with the construction crews. / The most major request is that you consider the noise generated on the north side of the river east side of the freeway as that impacts my neighborhood ALOT, especially after the wall was put in on the other side of the freeway - north of river, west side.</p>
<p>Keep it simple! Minimal disruption to surrounding areas.</p>
<p>Don't add future off-ramps. It's sufficient as it is.</p>

Our community has a grand opportunity to honor the Willamette River by constructing a bridge crossing on Interstate 5 which defines the environmental consciousness of the majority of Oregonians. I favor a bridge which allows the river to flow unimpeded by any pilings in the water, a bridge anchored at either end by supports outside the immediate riparian area. (Illustration attached.) / ODOT was wonderfully cooperative in partnering with the Citizen Planning Committee for the Whilamut Natural Area of Alton Baker Park in providing tours of the construction site and surrounding parkland, and the Department deserves great praise for it. However, we still wound up with a temporary detour bridge which added to the forest of pilings in the river, due to expediency. I want to urge ODOT to strongly consider taking the next step and acknowledge the landscape it is building within. This is a feral and natural landscape that is being managed for natural and habitat values. At this vital junction/border between Eugene and Springfield, what better statement could be made than to pay the river which has brought sustenance and definitional identity to everyone who has lived on this land the ultimate compliment by freeing it from the intrusion of pilings? An expanse of 237 acres of parkland shared by two cities deserves a bridge which also addresses open space, in this case the open space beneath the span, from riverbank to riverbank. Let us not wait another 75 years (the projected life of this "permanent" structure) to consider this.

I have lived in my home for almost twenty years and go from Springfield to Eugene on Franklin Blvd. several times a week. Build a permanent bridge of quality in appearance with no ramp to mar the site. Keep the Whilamut Natural area free of any structures for all of the people of Lane County to enjoy. This is an opportunity to replace the bridge with a design of beauty. Ramps would damage that beauty. I want to see a free standing bridge with no pillars in the river.

From news media I understand that Eugene opposes new additional piers in the water. Piers act as a habitat boulder - in addition to their primary function of supporting the structure. / Including an off-ramp from south bound lanes to connect with Franklin Blvd. would relieve traffic from Coburg Rd. Ferry St. Bridge and parts of Franklin Blvd. Such an off-ramp would also serve as an alternate for emergency or other detour. / A wider bridge than the old would increase shade over the water and help lessen warming the water temperatures in summer.

(Keep the old bridge arrangement) I favor replacing the old bridge as it was (if necessary, also to widen it,) But I approve direct? Access to Franklin Blvd., because of impact*, and because of probable damage to the river (water quality) bank and to Whilamut Natural area. (Maintain visual passibilities? of the river.) *Explanation: there is not adequate room at Judkins Point to permit more traffic which would occur if a major connect was located there: also, a direct route from such an interchange would adversely affect the neighborhood although the exit provided to the Glenwood area is a bit hazardous (when attempting to reenter I 5), it is possible to do it) a major interchange would increase noise, pollution from increased traffic.

I think it is important to let the public know early what the general scale and footprint of the new bridge will need to be. I doubt that very many citizens or elected officials understand how many lanes and how much space a new bridge will require. Most probably think the "replacement bridge" will simply replace what is there now. This is an exciting project!!

As a past member and chairperson of the Whilamut Natural Area I want to my complete(!) disagreement with the Mayor of Springfield's (and a few others') proposal to create a ramp connection to Franklin Blvd. from the new bridge. This would be disastrous for the Natural Area view, great impacts on the Willamette River and the assoc. Greenway and other river users. The current interchange at I-5 and Glenwood Ave. will serve Franklin Blvd. fine. It could be improved for North and South bound traffic off I-5.

I believe a 6 lane bridge (3 each way) with 10-12' shoulder on each side should be adequate for the foreseeable future. Up to 2 sets of pillars in the river should have minimal impact on water flow and may help reduce construction costs (important). Locate where old bridge is removed. I do not feel it is critical to have off ramps to the Franklin Br. It may be prudent for a design that might accommodate future ramp construction. Priorities: 1) Cost. 2) Safety. 3) Environmental/ neighborhood protection. 4) Amenity enhancement.

Thanks for having the open house! The issues that concern me and my neighbors are: 1) Noise! The noise level has increased w/ the replacement bridge. Explore road design to see how noise can be minimized. 2) Minimize impacts to the park and river. 3) Can we improve access over the RR tracks to bike paths? Some type of safe crossing. 4) Keep the number of lanes down. 5) Let's build something attractive (a signature bridge.) 6) No ramps crossing the river.

One bridge is enough. Improve the Glenwood exchange. Remove the temporary bridge and all construction debris from the river. Leave the river safe for boaters. Try to insulate the river and surrounding natural areas from noise. It's screaming loud in Alton Baker Park. Do NOT provide pretty viewing from the bridge. People hurtling along at 60-70 mph should NOT be checking out the view! Deflect sound up or back to the people generating the noise. Connect up the bicycle lane from Willie Knickerbocker bridge south side through Glenwood ALONG THE RIVER. There should be no supports in the river. Buffer sound on the north side approach also to protect enjoyment of park area. Some signs would be nice – e.g. This is the Willamette River, and some signs directing people to use the Glenwood Exchange. Try to keep the corridor narrow over the river (e.g. 1 bridge, maximum 6 lanes.)

Don't add to road capacity because it increases oil dependence, global warming, urban sprawl - to name a few MAJOR problems. Oil is virtually running out, as the global peak of extraction is imminent - despite recurring wars over oil. How do these points affect your planning now, assuming you did not take them into account in deciding to build this expensive bridge and road?

1) I'm concerned about the noise issue during construction and road noise after the bridge is completed. 2) The staging of the construction project is a concern! Where will it be how will it affect neighborhoods. 3) I live north and east of the bridge. I'm concerned about the statement a "sound wall will not be sufficient" would a tree sound barrier be a possibility? 4) How will the noise issue be evaluated?

I like the idea of making the new bridge a "signature" bridge, something special. Signage on Franklin for those leaving the campus heading N is awful. They end up in my neighborhood totally confused.

Large Concern on Noise - The raised configuration of the new bypass bridge and the removal of the trees has made a very dramatic increase of noise. My house is next to I-5. What additional impacts will be w/ new design - on and off ramps, etc.

I believe all the 7 factors listed in ODOT's I-5 Willamette River Bridge flyer are important considerations. Please pay attention to the last one "Accommodating potential future configuration of Franklin Boulevard" I-5 North to Franklin (West) is a good connection. It's southbound to Franklin that is unclear. Please look at improving the entrance to Eugene and Springfield even if not at the bridge crossing. Just more direction, clean, and attractive access will work south of river. Both cities including U of O deserves a better entrances above what presently exists.

For the next phase of construction don't use East Alton Baker (City of Eugene) Park/Whilamut Natural Area for access to the site. If it takes more state and federal dollars to provide temporary access ramps from I5, then this should be done. After all, if a huge sum can be spent to build 2 bridges (1 "temporary") and then dismantle 2 - rather than 1 cycle of 1 new permanent bridge and 1 old bridge removed - then extra funds should be provided to limit impact on the park. Please STAY OUT OF MY CITY PARK - thousands of daily park users and all the wildlife would appreciate it! / You can anticipate legal action against the City of Eugene and ODOT to block access to the I 5 bridge project thru Alton Baker Park.

When you see or speak to Joe Harwood ask him about Max Onsala? & Blayer Construction and City of Eugene- preserve the Glenwood exit and access to I-5. What happened to Blayer and the Moon Mountain P.U.D. access to I5? The Glenwood exit access is vital to our subdivisions and C2 development as set out in the Laurel Hill Refinement Plan - Changing personnel should not promote change in Policies!!

1) Piers/supports in river are not primary concern construction disturbance to nearby maturing riparian habitat is. 2) Resist widening of bridge. 3) Facilitate riverbank restoration and maintenance in ODOT easement and under bridge. 4) Explore opportunities for expression of local character in bridge construction (e.g. iconic regional detailing, artwork.) 5) Include design touches for river users (under bridge touches such as geographic/ecological messages/symbols.)

A bridge design of significant architectural merit is a great benefit to tourism. The Calavera Bridge at Turtle Bay near Redding, CA draws many tourists. This type of design "bridges" the river without pilings. Other bridges in Europe by this same designer get international publicity.

<p>New off ramps could encourage truck traffic to use the Walnut/Franklin Blvd. entrance to Eugene as a truck stop. This is in direct conflict with the development of the new Walnut Nodal Development in that neighborhood.</p>
<p>Once in a lifetime chance to design a bridge that serves essential function - w/ international as well as statewide and local importance - and can be a signature design element that celebrates this community (Eugene and Springfield). Bridge needs to be built to next generation of seismic standards and have a design that can somehow unify the two cities, rather than form a barrier. / While care should be taken during construction, potential park and/or river impacts can be mitigated-don't think there cannot be any supports in the river if that's what allows for optimal design and function. / Allow design to be able to accommodate possibility of moving Franklin Blvd. away from the river and possible local bridge, esp. on Springfield side - regardless of any interchange improvement scenarios.</p>
<p>Minimize lighting, due to impact on wildlife and NO on/off ramps to Franklin! Too much impact on park. Keep it to 4 lanes - with Peak Oil already past, we should not be building bigger roads. / Minimize piers in the river, minimize impacts to the river and the Whilamut Natural area. / During construction: Keep bike lane open; Time noisy construction to have the least impact on wildlife and recreation; Have safe boat passage under work bridge; Plan for minimal impact on the park due to construction access, parking, etc. / After construction: remove temp bridge entirely and replant native vegetation.</p>
<p>1) Minimize fill in park areas. 2) Maintain or expand the clear space along the banks under the bridge to keep paths open. 3) Maintain paths during construction. 4) Like to see a decent looking structure, reflecting style elements of the DeFazio bridge and new Beltline bike/ped bridge. 5) Build at least 6 lanes. 6) Consider improvement to the Southbound merge w/Franklin Blvd. on ramp and the weave at Glenwood Interchange. 7) Do the Bridge fun run again.</p>
<p>Ann, I think that the priorities should be traffic flow, and access to the community. I don't care if the bridge has pilings in the river. Build it STRONG and cheap. Don't waste a lot of money on how it looks. Now is the time to connect bike paths, perhaps include a bike bridge over Franklin, in the project. Perhaps remove the remains of the old dam upstream. we have a limited amount of money, and there are lots of roads that need repair and bridges that need to be built and updated. Please don't waste a lot of money on aesthetics, be practical. Build it to last more than 40 years like the last one.</p>
<p>Build the bridge! The longer we wait, the more it will cost.</p>
<p>Do we get a stakeholder for the Harlow Neighborhood?</p>
<p>1) There should not be construction (trucking) access on the service road through the Whilamut Natural Area! The noise, dust, and safety hazards that previously occurred during the temporary bridge construction (not to mention deterioration of the service road) should not happen again. Please use funds to create/build some other access route. 2) The Whilamut Natural Area is a beautiful irreplaceable gem that is truly loved by the community. Please design a bridge that minimizes noise pollution. The people and wildlife using the park should be given top consideration when designing the bridge - not the vehicle passengers taking in a few seconds view from the bridge. 3) Franklin Blvd. ramps have been deemed unnecessary by ODOT. Franklin Blvd. should be considered separately from this project. Thank you.</p>
<p>I'm glad to have this opportunity and want to be kept informed. / I'm concerned to maintain and enhance the esthetic and environmental aspects of the bridge and the riparian surroundings. / The bike path along the river has been important to me since it was built - I assume it will be maintained, and hope every effort is made to keep it open during bridge construction in that area. / I have been part of the discussion of the off-ramps/entry into Eugene and Springfield recently. I want to see that treated as a central matter here. A new off-ramp pattern that emphasizes commercial considerations seems extremely wasteful of money and likely of the environmental and esthetic dimensions mentioned earlier. Furthermore, regarding the economic upheaval in the near future (though timing is hard to specify) regarding over-indebtedness, the consequences of increasing oil and natural gas costs, and climate change. We need to adjust to these impending changes. Thus I would favor maintaining and adjusting the existing off-ramp patterns, which seem to offer a more economical meeting of the transportation need.</p>