

FINAL

Summary – Meeting #12

Project Development Team – I-5 Willamette River Bridge Project

*August 8, 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 #11 summary to Lou Krug via e-mail (no comments were offered by the PDT at the meeting).

The project team will:

1. Notify PDT of next scheduled meeting

ATTENDANCE

Voting Members

- Tim Dodson – ODOT Project Liaison/CPM, ODOT Bridge Delivery Unit
- Jim Cox – ODOT Environmental Lead, Major Projects Branch
- Chris Henry – Transportation Planning Engineer, City of Eugene Public Works
- Tom Boyatt – Planner, City of Springfield
- Shashi Bajracharya – Planner, Lane County
- Don Angermayer – ODOT Area Maintenance
- Al Heyn – Bridge Engineer, ODOT Region 2
- Charlotte Behm – Community Advisory Group (CAG) representative
- Sonny Chickering – ODOT Region 2, Springfield Area Office

Resource Members/Voting Member Alternates/Observers

- Steve Turner – ODOT BDU
- 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
- Kevin Parrish – Hamilton Construction
- Larry Fox -- OBEC
- John Ferguson – TY Lin International
- Larry Geshner – Slayden Construction

- David Sonnichsen – CAG member
- Dave Carvo – CAG member

HANDOUTS

- Agenda
- Meeting #11 Summary (draft)
- Summary of CAG Meeting #10 (final)
- Project newsletter

WELCOME AND AGENDA REVIEW

Lou Krug welcomed the group and reviewed the agenda. The participants introduced themselves and their role on the project (i.e., voting vs. resource members).

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Lou noted corrections to the PDT meeting #11 summary (Steve Turner is not a voting member, Al Heyn is a voting member). Lou asked that any other corrections be e-mailed to him.

CAG MEETING REVIEW

Charlotte provided a very brief overview of the CAG meeting on August 5, but asked to discuss the outcome of the meeting later in the PDT meeting.

PROJECT UPDATES

James provided an update on the status of the EA and plan amendments/goal exception. . The project team is revising the REA based on the study committee input. Jim noted that the team has asked for FHWA input on the Section 6(f) approach. Goal exception and plan amendment were approved by Springfield, Eugene and Lane County in the last weeks of July. Coordination with Eugene Parks and Open Space and Willamalane Park and Recreation district is ongoing.

Jamie provided a summary of the “bridge view” event held in the project area on July 26th. The event had four stations adjacent to the bridge, and was staffed by ODOT, OBDP, A&E, CM/GC team members as well as members of the CAG. An estimated 200 people participated and 150 booklets prepared for the event were distributed. The event was successful in providing information on the project and survey results and getting general input on bridge types. The public provided general and specific input on the bridge types, as well as on design elements like lighting, colors, surface treatments, etc.

EVALUATION MATRIX DISCUSSION

Jamie reviewed the scoring process and inputs. The A&E, CM/GC, and Agency (including OBDP) scored the bridge type alternatives independently. Tim provided a reminder to the PDT that the matrix considered the *whole* project (not only the bridge type) and employed the goals and objectives and weighting that were agreed upon by the CAG and PDT. Conducting the scoring was a substantial task and required a lot of time. Each of the scoring

groups (A&E, CM/GC, and Agency) explained the process of how they performed the scoring. Tim then said that the today's action by the PDT should be a recommendation to Tom Lauer (Bridge Delivery Unit manager) and Jane Lee (Region 2 manager). The ODOT Bridge Operations Committee (BOC) is ultimately the decision-making body for this project, and they will want to know the pros and cons of what was discussed and considered by the PDT in making its recommendation. Tim noted that ODOT and the BOC will engage the local officials in the selection process. Chris Henry asked what the timeline is for the process; Tim said the goal is to have the decision by August 14th. ODOT and the PDT will prepare a "public statement" that describes the process and recommendation.

PDT DISCUSSION OF BRIDGE TYPE SELECTION

Jamie reminded the PDT of the public input on bridge type provided throughout the NEPA process, but particularly from the public survey and the bridge view event. From the public survey, the public favors the through arch, with the deck arch a "close second." There was a high degree of support for the arch form and that the bridge needs to be "more than just another highway bridge". Also, maintenance and sustainability over a long life were also given high value based on public input, as well as a high degree of interest in integrating art and design for people viewing the bridge from up close, like park users. Jamie also noted that there appear to be two "schools of thought" with regard to bridge type: having a bridge that makes a statement vs. one that blends in with the setting.

Each of the scoring groups reviewed their process and recommendations (handouts were provided with the scoring results). The Agency team did not score all attributes on the matrix, just those that had the most impact in differentiating between the bridge types. Primary influencers were: the higher vertical profile for the girder bridges; how much falsework would be required; and community preferences. The A&E team had nine of their team's engineers score the alternatives independently and then averaged the scores. The scores varied among the scorers. Larry Fox pointed out that "Goal E" and issues of maintenance and long-term durability were why steel bridges scored lower than concrete. Kevin reviewed the CM/GC's scoring, noting that three factors were key influences: construction impacts; material type; and control the constructor has over the entire construction process.

Jim observed that the reason for doing the scoring separately was so that diverse viewpoints could be represented and considered.

Lynn noted that cost was a "piece of the puzzle" in the scoring and that cost factors had changed over time, even in the short period of time since the EA was prepared. OBDP economists, known as the Economic Stimulus Group or ESG, evaluated cost information, and Lynn presented their findings. The ESG conducted a "Monte Carlo" analysis that considers economic and construction industry trends to develop a probability of meeting a certain budget. Lynn distributed the findings of the analysis. The ESG analysis produced cost figures that were lower than the A&E's estimate and showed more variability in roadway costs and less in bridge costs. Cost estimates included a two-span through arch in addition to the three-span thorough arch. (The two-span through arch would have two through arches over the river, but a girder type bridge over Franklin Blvd.) This alternative was added since cost analysis indicated that the three-span through arch would exceed the

project budget. Based on this analysis, the two-span through arch with concrete approaches is within the identified project budget. Of note was the fact that this option and the updated cost analysis were not shared with the CAG at their meeting earlier in the week because the analysis had not been completed at that time.

Chris asked which cost figure gives ODOT more confidence. Lynn explained the difference between the two figures: The A&E cost is based on average bid prices for estimated quantities and is inflated based on general rates; the Monte Carlo estimate projects inflation item-by-item. Larry noted that the A&E's estimate used the same approach as a contractor bidding the project. Tim said that the Agency's view is that the Monte Carlo is based on analysis of several years of trends. ODOT has a similar process and has compared its analysis with the ESG's, which gives ODOT a high level of confidence in the Monte Carlo analysis. Chris followed-up, noting that the new numbers are different from what was presented at the CAG meeting, and asking what should be the basis for considering costs? Tim said that ODOT would consider the ESG's analysis as the more reliable estimate.

Charlotte noted that the PDT could possibly move forward based on different information than the CAG had. Jamie reviewed the CAG's discussion on this matter, and that they consented to taking options other than the through arch and deck arch off the table. The CAG voted on how to move forward. Two major points came from the CAG's deliberations:

- If deck arch is chosen, can ODOT commit to something above the deck that would make it more distinctive?
- Several CAG members felt that, because of cost, the decision was being pushed toward the deck arch option.

As a result, the CAG vote yielded more of a set of opinions than a consensus on bridge types. Also, the CAG instructed Charlotte to vote on their behalf in the PDT.

Dave Carvo added that there were some CAG members who advocated for a through arch bridge and expressed concerns that the deck arch wouldn't allow for above deck treatments. As a result it was difficult to reach consensus. David Sonnichsen noted that one member expressed concern about feeling like the CAG was "being led" into making choices. He added that the new information would have likely made a difference in the CAG's votes if they had had it when they met. Chris noted that Tim had expressed a good faith commitment on the part of ODOT to above-deck features.

Charlotte asked if community input was done if the through arch type were to be selected. Lynn answered that there are still many elements of the project for which public input will be needed and will be requested through ongoing public activities such as the CAG meetings.

The PDT then discussed the change from the three-span to the two-span through arch bridge. The two-span option was developed to try and make the through arch fit within the project budget. Lou provided a summary of how the through arch was considered through the project planning to date. Dave Carvo observed that people in the community are expecting a three-span arch, so that questions about the change will need to be answered. John asked the CAG representatives present how they thought the voting might have

changed if they had the newer information. Charlotte, Dave and David each expressed thoughts and preferences on bridge types. They also noted that they thought each of the CAG members had a preference for a specific bridge type.

Jamie then asked the PDT to discuss the pros and cons of the options on the table (deck arch, two-span through arch, and three-span through arch), before voting on preferences. The table below summarizes the PDT's comments on the bridge types.

| 2 span through arch | 3 span through arch | Deck arch |
|---|---|---|
| Pros | | |
| More affordable | Aesthetics* | Affordable* |
| Less long-term maintenance (than 3 span) | Most public support* | Eugene's 2 nd preference (after through arch) |
| Lane County gateway* | Memorable (landmark)* | Opportunities for art/architectural treatments above deck |
| Eugene preference | Lane County gateway* | More funds available for other things (aesthetic enhancements) |
| Above-deck features | Eugene preference | Lower maintenance (than through arch) |
| More visually open | Above deck features | Meets public goals ("word" associations from survey) |
| Requires less work with the community for aesthetics | Requires less work with community for aesthetics | |
| Aesthetics | More visually open | |
| Cons | | |
| Public issue (no 3 rd arch – different from what has been presented to date) | Had 2 nd most opposition in public survey* | Maintenance (birds in flat areas, hard to wash sections over river) |
| More maintenance than deck arch | Cost | Nothing above deck |
| Overwhelms natural area | More maintenance than deck arch | Could attract people to climb on/jump off. |
| Blocks views | Overwhelms natural area | |
| Hangers require maintenance | Blocks views | |
| Not that unique | Massive structure | |
| Wider footprint | Wider footprint | |
| "Freeway in the sky" | "Freeway in the sky" | |
| | Franklin arch is ugly | |

Following the discussion, Jamie asked the PDT members to vote on their preferences for bridge types and briefly state the reason for their vote. The results were as follows:

| Member | First Preference | Second | Third | Primary Reason |
|-----------|------------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------------|
| Shashi | 3 span through | 2 span through | Deck | Lane Co. gateway |
| Don | 3 span through | 2 span through | Deck | Signature bridge |
| Chris | 3 span through | 2 span through | Deck | Meet community expectations |
| Al | 2 span through | Deck | 3 span through | Within budget |
| Charlotte | 2 span through | Deck | 3 span through | Reflects CAG |
| Sonny | 2 span through | Deck | 3 span through | Aesthetics/cost |

| Member | First Preference | Second | Third | Primary Reason |
|---------------|-------------------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------------|
| Tim | Deck | 2 span through | 3 span through | Cost/maintenance |
| Jim | 2 span through | Deck | 3 span through | Cost |
| Tom | 2 span through | 3 span through | Deck | Springfield preferences |

Following the vote, Tim said that the information from the vote will be used in developing a recommendation, and that it looks like the two-span through arch looks like something that the PDT could support. The recommendation on bridge type by the PDT will be given to Tom Lauer, ODOT's bridge delivery program manager. Tom will, in turn, take the recommendation to the ODOT director as well as discuss it with local elected officials. Chris and Sonny both remarked that coordination and a clear, consistent message for the locals is very important. Charlotte added that it's important to note that the CAG did not make a specific recommendation regarding the bridge type selection.

In summary, the PDT supported a recommendation for the two-span through arch bridge type. Tim and Jim will present the recommendation to Tom Lauer.

NEXT MEETING

The next PDT has not been scheduled. The PDT will be notified of the next meeting by e-mail.

ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at about 1 p.m.