

# FINAL

## Summary – Meeting #10

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

*June 24, 2008 10 am – 1 pm*

*McLane Conference Room (644 A Street, Springfield)*

---

#### ACTION ITEMS

##### PDT members will:

1. Provide comments on Meeting #9 summary to Lou Krug via email (no comments were offered by the PDT at the meeting).

##### The project team will:

1. Revisit issue of space between bridges with ODOT Maintenance.
2. Prepare matrix survey.
3. Prepare for upcoming events (including prepare newsletter and publicize July 26 public event).

#### ATTENDANCE

##### Voting Members of PDT

- Tim Dodson – ODOT Project Liaison/Interim PM for WRB Project
- Don Angermayer – Transportation Maintenance Manager, ODOT District 5
- Anthony Boesen – ODOT Liaison Engineer, FHWA
- Molly Cary – ODOT Region 2, Environmental Unit Manager
- Al Heyn – Senior Bridge Engineer, ODOT Region 2
- Ann Sanders – Project Leader, ODOT Region 2
- 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
- Celia Barry –Lane County Planning

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

- Steve Turner – ODOT, Assistant PM
- Lou Krug – Project Manager, Oregon Bridge Delivery Partners (OBDP)
- James Gregory – Environmental Task Leader, Oregon Bridge Delivery Partners
- Jamie Damon – Public Involvement Coordinator, Jeanne Lawson Associates/OBDP
- Larry Fox – A&E Team Project Manager, OBEC

- John Ferguson – A&E Team Assistant PM, TY Lin International
- Larry Parrish – CMGC Project Manager, Hamilton Construction
- Larry Gesher – CMGC Assistant PM, Slaydon Construction
- Megan Banks – A&E Public Involvement Coordinator, Lane Council of Governments
- Andy Fagen – Intern, FHWA

## **HANDOUTS**

- Agenda
- Meeting #9 Summary (draft)
- Summary of Survey Results
- Bridge Type Selection Matrix (draft)

## **WELCOME AND AGENDA REVIEW**

Lou Krug welcomed the group and reviewed the agenda.

## **REVIEW OF CAG MEETING**

Jamie reviewed what was discussed at the CAG meeting on June 17<sup>th</sup>: Items discussed included:

- Introduction of the Architect/Engineer (A&E) team;
- Review of web survey results
- Arts community involvement in design
- Reconsideration of the space between the proposed bridges over the Willamette River
- The bridge type selection matrix
- Upcoming events

## **COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

Lou noted that the summary of the previous meeting had been provided. There were no comments on the summary. Lou asked PDT members to email him any comments that they may have.

## **PROJECT UPDATES**

### **Status of EA and Land Use Process**

James provided an update on the land use actions and environmental assessment:

- Planning commissions of all three jurisdictions recommended approval of application.
- There will be a joint meeting of the city councils of Eugene and Springfield and the Lane County Commission on June 24<sup>th</sup> to hear evidence on the application, which will be followed by individual hearings to deliberate and make any decisions.
- The project team anticipates decisions in July or August.
- The Revised Environmental Assessment (REA) draft has just been formatted and ready for ODOT/FHWA study committee review, which will include PDT

members. The project team anticipates revisions and reviews will occur through July and finalization and submission of the REA concurrently with the decisions on the land use actions.

### **Meetings with Community Groups**

Lou provided updates on recent meetings with community groups:

- *Laurel Hill Valley Citizens Association.* Several members of the project team met with the Laurel Hill Valley Citizens Association on May 28. Most discussion was related to bike/pedestrian access issues. There was a lot of productive discussion of what the community's issues were and how they could be addressed. While many of the concerns were outside the scope of the Willamette River Bridge project, there were some that could potentially be addressed by the City of Eugene and/or ODOT, and these were referred for further consideration.
- *Harlow Neighbors.* The project team members met with the Harlow Neighbors on May 21. Most of their concerns were regarding noise. Craig Milliken, OBDP's noise specialist, explained how noise analysis and mitigation recommendations were developed. The meeting appeared to satisfy the neighborhood's concerns.

### **INTRODUCTION OF A&E AND CMGC**

Lou provided a brief background on the transition from concept development and EA preparation, which the OBDP team is presently completing, into design and construction. The transition should be seamless (particularly to the community), but there will be new faces at the meetings and doing the work, and several team members will be phasing out.

Tim introduced the A&E and CMGC. Both are led by local firms – OBEC (a Eugene-based firm) leads the A&E team and Hamilton (Springfield) leads the CMGC team.

Larry Fox introduced the A&E team members and summarized their approach. Their lead bridge engineers – David Goodyear and Jiri Strasky – are both nationally- and internationally-known experts. OBEC and Hamilton have lots of experience working together on design-build projects, which sets the stage well for collaboration on the Willamette River Bridge project. Larry introduced John Ferguson of TY Lin International, who is the assistant project manager. John noted the local nature of the team and that team members will want to succeed because they live in the community where the project is located.

Kevin Parrish of Hamilton discussed the history of Hamilton in the Springfield/Eugene community, and reiterated the local nature of the team and their commitment to the community. He mentioned that Slaydon (Hamilton's subcontractor) has CMGC and ODOT experience. Larry Geshler or Slaydon reviewed the advantages of the CMGC approach – the owner (ODOT) retains control, but gets the input of the constructor in designing and building the project. Tim added that CMGC is likely to become a more common project delivery method.

Megan Banks (Lane Council of Governments [LCOG], as subcontractor to OBEC) was introduced as the lead for the public involvement team. She explained LCOG's role in

the region and how it straddles the public and private realms, and how LCOG's breadth of responsibilities (land use, transportation, policy) make it a good fit for leading public involvement.

The A&E and CMGC answered questions from the PDT.

- Charlotte Behm asked about what would be different with this project compared to the detour bridge. Kevin said the main difference is the delivery method.
- Chris Henry asked who would be doing the roadway work. Kevin indicated that it would be done by subs. Larry added that the A&E team included roadway designers.
- Charlotte raised issues about the Whilamut Natural Area, bike paths, and involvement of the Citizen Planning Committee (CPC) for the Whilamut Natural Area. Several A&E team members said they understood the community's concern for the natural area and they had an understanding of issues. The coordination efforts would continue throughout design and construction
- Anthony Boeson asked about retaining the same team throughout the project. Larry noted the commitment on the part of high management of all firms involved, and the desire of key staff to work on this project. While certain staff changes are inevitable over the life of the project, ODOT would have to approve changes proposed by the A&E and CMGC. Anthony noted that keeping a core team together is important. Larry added that the aggressive schedule for the project doesn't allow for much shifting, adding, or removing staff.

## **DESIGN QUESTIONS FROM A&E AND CM/GC**

Lou noted that the team wanted the opportunity to discuss a few specific design questions with the PDT (they were also raised with the CAG at the meeting on June 17).

Larry noted that the RFP specified a gap of 16 feet between the two bridges over the Willamette River. The CMGC identified an opportunity to reduce construction time if the bridge alignments could be shifted and the gap closed to six feet that would allow the main spans to be constructed at the same time, potentially representing a benefit to the schedule. This issue was discussed with the CAG. The CAG had concerns about the amount of light allowed under the bridges, as well as whether it may be an "attractive nuisance" by encouraging people to jump between bridges. Jamie noted that the CAG indicated that the long-term implications should be weighed against short-term benefits to schedule. Chris added that not much light would get through the gap between bridges under any circumstances. Kevin noted that, while it's likely that the shift/narrowing of the gap would be a benefit, it would not be possible to precisely quantify it in terms of dollars or time. Ann asked if six feet was a "magic number" for the gap between the bridges. Kevin answered that it seemed to be an absolute minimum based on conversations with ODOT Maintenance.

Don Angermayer said he'd spoken to ODOT maintenance staff about the issues associated with the gap between bridges and read an email from Jeff Swanson stating that the 16-foot opening would be the preference for the space between bridges. Don added that maintenance is a long-term issue.

Lou posed the question to the PDT: are the construction savings enough of an advantage to consider the gap issue further? Ann noted that it sounds like Maintenance would not support it. Charlotte asked about round-the-clock construction work. James noted that the EA has measures limiting pile driving to between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m., unless authorized by ODOT. Molly asked what could be done to make maintenance easier, and suggested the PDT, A&E and CMGC think creatively about it.

There was additional discussion of the issue and Tim polled the PDT on whether the shift/gap reduction was an acceptable option to pursue further. Most PDT members indicated deference to what ODOT Maintenance could live with. Chris noted that it wasn't totally clear that 16 feet was needed, but thought that, in the end, it's ODOT's decision to make. Several others concurred with Chris' assessment. Tim noted that both the web survey and CAG have indicated maintainability as a key concern. He noted that the project team would revisit the issue with Maintenance and get a definitive answer on this issue. The Project Management Team will meet the Tuesday following the PDT meeting and will discuss Maintenance's recommendations. (See discussion at the end of these notes.)

## WEB SURVEY RESULTS

Jamie reviewed highlights of the recently-completed web survey:

- More than 1,200 responses, with most responders providing input to the open-ended questions.
- Demographically representative of the community.
- "Maintenance" was the top value noted by responders.
- Top words to describe what people wanted – "graceful", "curves", "memorable", "distinctive".
- Ranking bridge types: Through arch got the most top votes, but also got a large number of low votes; deck arch received the second most top votes, but also got the fewest bottom votes. Deck arch received the most first and second votes.
- Regarding the open ended question, people indicated that they appreciated the opportunity for input and some provided examples of bridges that could serve as inspiration for this project.
- Chris asked how sustainability is addressed with respect to the survey results, since it is a value that has been noted by the community. Lynn Iaquina explained how sustainable solutions are considered in the project. Jamie noted that it will be a challenge to communicate sustainability issues to the public as the project moves forward.

## CS3 DECISION MATRIX FOR SELECTING BRIDGE TYPE

Tim explained that the OTIA III Context Sensitive and Sustainable Solutions (CS3) matrix had been modified to include the project goals and objectives, and that the matrix would be used to score the bridge options. Some criteria differentiate among bridge types and others do not – the intent is to remove the non-differentiators.

The matrix was presented to the CAG and it was determined at that meeting that doing the scoring was too complex and time-consuming to complete as part of the meeting, so it will be done by survey of the CAG and PDT. The project team is developing the survey. To complete the bridge type selection process, additional CAG and PDT meetings will be needed in mid-July, with follow ups in mid-August. Jamie reviewed the tentative schedule for upcoming meetings:

| Meeting         | Date     | Objective             |
|-----------------|----------|-----------------------|
| CAG Meeting #12 | July 15  | Matrix scoring        |
| PDT Meeting #11 | July 18  |                       |
| Public event    | July 26  | Public input/update   |
| CAG Meeting #13 | August 5 | Bridge type selection |
| PDT Meeting #13 | August 8 |                       |

Charlotte mentioned the artistic treatments and the importance to show that the bridge can be interesting (regardless of type). Lynn noted that there are opportunities with abutments, retaining walls, and sound walls to incorporate artistic treatments. She also cautioned that examples, particularly for things like rails, meet ODOT and FHWA standards for interstate freeways. Lou pointed out that the four bridge types in the EA are the same as those in the matrix. However the matrix also differentiates material types, concrete or steel, so that there are seven “alternatives” listed. Alternative G in the matrix, listed as a “segmental”, is still a haunched box girder. Charlotte asked about when detours for paths would be discussed. When the bridge type is selected, the CMGC will prepare plans for how path impacts will be avoided and mitigated.

## SET NEXT MEETING AND ADJOURN

Lou reviewed upcoming meetings (see table above). The matrix survey will be sent out to PDT and CAG. Lou asked that comments on the matrix should be sent to Jamie as soon as possible. There will be a newsletter distributed in advance of the July 26 public event. On July 10 there will be a presentation to the Metropolitan Policy Committee.

The PDT will meet again on July 18.

The meeting adjourned at about 1 p.m.

### *Additional Note:*

*Immediately following the PDT meeting, ODOT staff met to discuss the issue of the gap between the bridges. They agreed that maintenance issues were very important and that the 16 ft. minimum separation should be provided.*