

Final
Summary – Meeting #1
Project Development Team – I-5 Willamette River Bridge Project
Jan. 12, 2007, 1:00 to 4:00 p.m.
LCOG Conference Room (644 A Street, Springfield)

ACTION ITEMS

PDT members will:

1. Let Randa know of any changes to the contact list, names and contact information of alternates, and any other individuals who should be added to the list to receive PDT communications.
2. Notify the team of any opportunities they identify for the team to make presentations to community groups and organizations.
3. Review and provide comments on the Draft Purpose and Need Statement – to be discussed at the next meeting.
4. Review and develop feedback on issues to be considered in the Goals and Objectives – to be discussed at the next meeting.
5. Assist the team in scheduling introductory work sessions with City Councils and the County Commission sometime in the next month or two (coordinate with Randa).

The project team will:

1. Email PDT members the meeting packet items (including Draft Purpose and Need Statement), the list of CAG members, and the issues display boards. [Randa]
2. Make the Conceptual Bridge Alternatives Report available to the PDT and provide a summary at the next meeting.
3. Incorporate changes to the Protocols and distribute a revised version. [Randa]
4. Update the Project Schedule and Process Steps flow chart and distribute a revised version at the next meeting.
5. Develop a draft briefing packet of potential bridge alternatives for review at the next PDT meeting. A final briefing packet will be prepared the following week.
6. Work with local jurisdiction representatives to schedule introductory work sessions with City Councils and the County Commission. [Randa]

ATTENDANCE

Voting Members

- Tim Dodson – ODOT Project Liaison/CPM, ODOT Bridge Delivery Unit
- Ann Sanders – Project Leader/ Area Representative for Lane County, ODOT Region 2
- Don Angermayer – Transportation Maintenance Manager, ODOT District 5

- Molly Cary – Environmental Manager, ODOT Region 2
- Al Heyn – Senior Bridge Engineer, ODOT Region 2
- Chris Henry – Transportation Planning Engineer, City of Eugene Public Works
- Greg Mott – Community Planning Manager, City of Springfield
- Kent Howe – Planning Director (Land Use Planning), Lane County
- Charlotte Behm – Community Advisory Group (CAG) Representative, Springfield Neighborhood and CPC for Whilamut Natural Area

Resource Members

- Jim Cox – ODOT NEPA Coordinator, ODOT Office of Project Delivery
- Lou Krug – Project Manager, Oregon Bridge Delivery Partners
- James Gregory – Environmental Task Leader, Oregon Bridge Delivery Partners
- Jamie Damon – Facilitator, Jeanne Lawson Associates
- Randa Gahin – Public Involvement Coordinator, Jeanne Lawson Associates
- Ed Moore – Senior Region Planner, ODOT Region 2
- Tom Boyatt – Transportation Division Manager, City of Springfield Public Works
- Dave Carvo (Alternate) – CAG Representative, Vice Chair, Glenwood Neighborhood Group

HANDOUTS

- Agenda
- Protocols (discussion draft)
- Contact List
- Decision-Making Structure
- Project Schedule and Process Steps (chart)
- Purpose and Need Statement – Guidance
- Purpose and Need Statement – Draft 1/8/07
- Design and Environmental Issues
- Aerial Photo

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Lou Krug welcomed the group and gave an introduction to the project. This project is unique in the OTIA program in that we are doing an Environmental Assessment (EA). Most of the projects are classified as Categorical Exclusions, but this project will be undergoing a full environmental analysis. The Oregon Bridge Delivery Partners (OBDP) was hired by ODOT to complete the work. OBDP is assisting ODOT, but are not the decision-makers. Lou introduced the project team.

PROJECT OVERVIEW

Lou gave an overview of the project. We are essentially picking up where we left off under the previous contract. OTIA projects need to be completed by the end of 2012. It seems like a lot of time, but to get through the environmental process, design, and construction, it is

not much time. We do not want to let schedule drive us to make poor decisions, but we do need to keep things moving along.

Lou reviewed the overall project schedule (yellow handout). This outlines the process to develop the alternative that will be addressed in the EA and then will be designed and constructed. The dates of some meetings are set. Other meetings will fall in the approximate time frames shown. The chart hits the highlights of what we need to do. If we follow this schedule, an EA will be published in 12 months – around next fall (November or December), with a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) issued approximately 6 months after that. It is possible that the project could go into an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), so we need to be prepared for that, although it is not anticipated to happen.

In the next few weeks, we need to decide on the feasible bridge types that will be evaluated in detail. Ultimately, we will be selecting one that will become the Build Alternative in the EA. Conceptual engineering work is going on right now to develop the feasible bridge types. Engineering and environmental information will be brought to the PDT and the CAG to help in the decision process.

This is an aggressive schedule. We think it is reasonable and not so aggressive that we cannot make good decisions. We have confidence that the process will be productive and yield good decisions.

A question was asked whether PDT members can attend CAG meetings. The team responded that PDT members are welcome to attend CAG meetings.

The first bridge report is in internal review right now. The team will be getting copies to the PDT for review following the internal review. The report contains the team's recommendations on which bridge types to consider and look at in more detail. The team will be developing renderings on what those types look like in the setting and various details. The team will be utilizing a variety of experts, for example, landscape architects to address compatibility with the surroundings.

The project team is available to make presentations to community groups and organizations to talk about the project. PDT members should notify the team if they receive requests or identify groups that it would be helpful to address.

James Gregory mentioned that the project team will also be going through the Goal Exception process with the local jurisdictions.

PURPOSE AND NEED

James explained where we are with the project Purpose and Need Statement. A review draft Purpose and Need Statement is in the packet. The team presented it to the CAG to allow them to comment. We would like comments from the PDT. The team will email it to you so you can review and comment. We will discuss it at the meeting next week.

James presented the Design and Environmental Issues (handout). This list was developed based on some of the things we are aware of so far. James reviewed the environmental

considerations on the handout. The PDT is invited to think about other issues that need to be considered.

Lou mentioned that with regard to cost, ODOT recognizes that this is a unique bridge and has allocated extra funds for aesthetic factors. The intent is not just to build the lowest cost bridge possible. We want to make sure the bridge fits in the setting and meets the needs of the community. Lou reviewed the design parameters listed on the handout.

Tim Dodson mentioned that the width of the bridge has been decided by ODOT and FHWA. The bridge will be 3 lanes each direction plus 14 ft shoulders and 2 ft barriers for a total width of 68 ft. each direction. The width for both directions would be 136 ft. Initially it will be striped for 2 lanes each way to match the number of lanes on I-5. It could be restriped in the future to three lanes each way with full width shoulders. If needed at some future time, it could be striped to four lanes each way but it would not have full width shoulders. Jim noted that the alignment has been more or less decided since it must match into I-5 on each end.

Chris Henry commented that it might be helpful to state in the Purpose and Need that the temporary bridge was initially planned to be in place for only 10 years, and then is slated to be removed. He also asked whether there is a need for the cities to go back to their councils to get buy off on the Purpose and Need before they can vote on it. The team responded that this item does not require local jurisdiction approval. At the same time, the project team is relying on the local jurisdiction members on the PDT to convey local positions.

Lou noted that the next step is to define some more specific goals and objectives to help evaluate the bridge options. This needs to include some of the issues that have been brought up in the community. Jim clarified that the Purpose and Need is very narrowly focused on the state highway purpose. When we get to how we are going to evaluate the options, it will include a broader base of criteria. Chris commented that it is important to communicate that to the public. Chris stated that the local jurisdictions are in agreement that the bridge needs to be replaced. It is the details of how that gets done where local support will be determined.

The team reminded the PDT that this project is following the NEPA process and requirements. It was noted that CETAS will not be tracking this project.

TEAM PROTOCOLS

Jamie Damon explained the protocols and led the group in a discussion of the draft protocols (handout). The group engaged in a lengthy discussion on a number of items. The key points and decisions are summarized below.

Membership and Roles

- PDT members should notify Randa Gahin of any individuals who should be added to the list to receive PDT communications. Also, let her know of any changes to the contact list.
- It is important that all groups are represented at each meeting. No limit will be placed on the number of alternates allowed, but members are encouraged to limit the

number of alternates, and to identify them ahead of time to include on the distribution list for communication purposes.

- Alternates can vote.
- Members are responsible for briefing and preparing their alternates for the meetings.
- Lane County was added as a voting member.
- The votes of Molly Cary and Jim Cox will be consolidated into one.
- A comment was made that ODOT has the majority of votes (5 out of 9). While this might be a concern, it was noted that a similar process for the temporary bridge worked well. However, the group should be clear about how the process will be worked through. Others responded that ODOT does not always vote as a block, and some ODOT members often advocate for local interests. Jim noted that the purpose of the process is to include the local interests in the decisions.

Internal Communication

- Questions were asked about what happens if the local jurisdictions do not agree with the decisions. Jim noted that the EA process cannot be completed unless the local jurisdictions approve the land use permits. He also noted that local issues need to be identified ahead of time as much as possible. Ann Sanders noted that involving the CAG was intended to ameliorate some of the problem of getting the local jurisdictions on board. A CAG representative commented that the CAG feels confident that they have good representation of interests in the group.
- The group discussed the need to engage the City Councils and County Commission and the best way to do that. It can be difficult to get on their schedules. It was decided that the team will develop a briefing packet to distribute and possibly make available on CD and/or on the website for other community groups to use (Ray Mabey's presentation at the MPC last week was suggested as a good base for this). The team will bring draft memo packet to the Jan. 19 meeting for PDT review. In addition, work sessions will be scheduled with the Councils/ Commission in the following time periods:
 1. Introductory Briefing – Jan/Feb
 2. Briefing on bridge types and public feedback – early May
 3. Local representatives will notify the team of other good times
- Greg Mott noted that for the Plan Amendment Hearings, it can be difficult to schedule joint hearings at certain times of year (i.e. December). He recommended scheduling them in January or February. This should work well with the project timing of having a Draft EA published in November/December.

Meeting Attendance and Structure

- Materials will be distributed two weeks in advance, if possible, and one week at a minimum (the first two meetings are exceptions because of the short timeframes). The team will alert the PDT when a short turnaround time is needed.
- Decision points need to be identified ahead of time for PDT members so they can do any background research that is needed in preparation for discussion and voting. The decision points will be highlighted on the Project Schedule and Process Steps flow chart.

- On the flow chart, the milestone *Select Build Alternative* was modified to read *Identify Build Alternative(s) for EA*. The team will update the chart and send a revised version to the PDT.
- It helps to have good meeting facilitation. The group is encouraged to help keep the facilitator on track.
- For three-hour meetings, include a break after an hour or hour and a half.
- Add a standing item to the agenda to review the previous CAG meeting.
- Schedule meetings as far ahead of time as possible.

Decision-Making

- If the authorized decisions of the local jurisdictions do not coincide with the group's decision, members might need more time before voting.
- Decisions will be made by consensus or "consent." If consensus is not possible, the group's decisions will be by a 2/3 vote of the votes cast.
- It is expected that all voting bodies will be present for decisions. The group discussed the idea of a quorum but did not make a final decision on how to handle it. The group agreed to address it if and when the situation arises.
- The group will be allowed to revisit project decisions at the next meeting before being finalized.
- A "preamble" will be added to the beginning of the protocols describing a spirit of working together.

ISSUES DISCUSSION

Randa gave an overview of the public input received so far and the issues listed on the display boards. She reviewed the input from the CAG and the items that received the most dot votes from CAG members. The PDT is invited to review this issues list for further discussion at the next meeting. Randa will send the list to the PDT electronically.

NEXT STEPS

After the PDT discusses the issues, the team will be drafting the Goals and Objectives for PDT and CAG review. The two groups will then be asked to develop evaluation criteria, which might involve a joint meeting. PDT members would like to do this as efficiently as possible. A joint meeting might not be necessary.