

FINAL

Summary - Meeting # 11

Project Development Team - I-5 Willamette River Bridge Project

*July 18, 2008, 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.
McLane Room (644 A Street, Springfield)*

ACTION ITEMS

PDT members will:

1. Provide comments on Meeting # 10 summary to Lou Krug via email (no comments were offered by the PDT at the meeting).

The project team will:

1. Score matrix.

ATTENDANCE

Voting Members

- Tim Dodson - ODOT Project Liaison/CPM, ODOT Bridge Delivery Unit
- Al Heyn - Bridge Engineer, ODOT Region 2
- Chris Henry - Transportation Planning Engineer, City of Eugene Public Works
- Greg Mott - Planning Director, City of Springfield
- David Sonnichsen - Community Advisory Group (CAG) Representative, CPC for Whilamut Natural Area
- Kent Howe - Planning Director, Lane County
- Molly Cary - ODOT Region 2 Environmental
- Don Angermayer - ODOT Area Maintenance

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
- Lynn Iaquina - Oregon Bridge Delivery Partners
- Carl Deaton - Designer, ODOT Region 2 Roadway
- Steve Turner - ODOT BDU
- Larry Fox -- OBEC
- John Ferguson - TY Lin International
- Larry Gesher - Slayden Construction

this. Greg mentioned that the stream channel may be a Goal 5 resource and the team will look into this.

Jamie provided an update on coordination with the Lane Arts Council. Douglas Beauchamp is willing to serve as an “arts facilitator” for the project to address incorporation of artistic thinking and aesthetic features. The Council is interested in being involved and will form a team of persons with experience in public art. They would like to meet with OBEC to identify steps in the process at which they could provide input. The first meeting would be after type selection. This includes options for “temporary arts” that could mitigate construction impacts.

GOALS WEIGHTING SURVEY

Jamie reviewed the results of the survey and noted that the CAG had recommended that neither the PDT nor the project team change the weights that had resulted from the survey. The survey was completed by six CAG members and seven PDT members. The results were fairly consistent between the CAG and the PDT. The CAG had considerable discussion on the goals and weights and they generally concurred that the matrix was a good tool for making the bridge type decision. Jamie mentioned that three CAG members who didn't take the survey provided input at the CAG meeting.

John explained how the weighting would be applied in the scoring exercise. Scoring will be done independently by ODOT, the A&E team, and the CM/GC. That scoring will be reviewed in making the final decision on bridge type. The OTIA III Context Sensitive and Sustainable Solutions (CS³) team was consulted on the matrix to ensure consistency with how the CS³ matrix is used in decision-making for the overall statewide bridge program. Jamie added that having the CAG participate gives added value to the process.

Kent asked about the “communities” mentioned in Goal G – did it refer to communities across the state or in the project area. In this case, it would apply to the Eugene-Springfield community. Kent recommended that it be changed to specifically indicate that.

The PDT discussed how the weighting aids in bridge type determination. Lynn noted that some criteria don't necessarily differentiate between the options, but others do, and those would be reviewed at the next CAG meeting. John observed that the scoring for the criteria was relatively close (i.e., not a large “point spread” between the highest and lowest scores), which is a good indicator that one criterion won't dominate the selection process.

Lou noted that the matrix listed seven bridge type alternatives, and pointed out for clarification that the same four bridge type options described the EA are still on the table; the seven alternatives are variants of those options, primarily steel or concrete.

Following the discussion, the PDT voted to proceed with the scoring process based on the goal weighting as presented and recommended by the CAG.

ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at about 1 p.m.