

DRAFT

Summary – Meeting #2

Project Development Team – I-5 Willamette River Bridge Project

Jan. 19, 2007, 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.

LCOG Conference Room (644 A Street, Springfield)

ACTION ITEMS

PDT members will:

1. Get a project briefing on the City of Springfield council agenda in March [Greg].
2. Notify the team of any opportunities they identify for the team to make presentations to community groups and organizations.
3. Provide any further comments on the “need” for the project, as documented in the draft purpose and need by email to Lou Krug by close of business Monday, Jan. 22.

The project team will:

1. Investigate permits for the detour bridge to see if there are conditions for how long it would be in place [James]
2. Update website and send out email to interested parties list regarding project status [Randa].
3. Talk to Chris Ramey at the University of Oregon regarding possibilities for involving students at the University in the project design.
4. Prepare draft goals and objectives and evaluation criteria [James]

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 – Area/District Program Coordinator, 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
- Charlotte Behm – Community Advisory Group (CAG) Representative, Springfield Neighborhood and CPC for Whilamut Natural Area

Resource Members/Voting Member Alternates

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

HANDOUTS

- Agenda
- PDT Meeting #1 Summary
- Revised Contact List
- Revised PDT Protocols
- Revised Project Schedule and Process Steps (chart)
- Copies of slides from the bridge options presentation

WELCOME AND AGENDA REVIEW

Lou Krug welcomed the group and quickly reviewed the agenda.

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Meeting Summary Review

Lou asked if there were any comments/suggestions regarding the meeting notes from PDT Meeting #1. For future meeting summaries, resource members and alternates in attendance will be grouped together, so it will be clear which of the designated voting members were in attendance. Regarding the width of the proposed project (page 4 of the summary) it was clarified that the proposed width is approximately 68 feet in each direction. There was also discussion about clarifying information about the number of years the detour bridge was proposed to be in place – it was recommended that the meeting summary reflect that the bridge was planned to be in place 10 years from opening or until 2014. There may be conditions of environmental permits for the detour bridge that establish how long it is supposed to be in place. The team will confirm this.

Meeting Summary Distribution

Distribution of the meeting summaries was discussed (e.g., whether to post summaries on the project web page). There were concerns expressed about the PDT information potentially being misrepresented, and this needs to be balanced with the need for a transparent process. CAG members also do not want their contact information made available on the web page. It was agreed that meeting summaries be approved by the PDT,

and then provided to Joe Harwood (Area 5 Public Information Officer). Joe can then recommend whether and how to publish the information. It was also noted that meeting summaries should be considered and marked "draft" until approved.

Revised Protocols

Randa reviewed the revisions to the protocols based on discussion at PDT Meeting #1. Of note were the preamble that was added and the changes regarding the decision making process, specifically the last three bullets under the "Decision Making":

- That, if consensus is not reached, decision will be by a 2/3 vote based on votes cast;
- If all voting members are not present, then the members present will vote on whether to vote at that meeting; and
- Time will be provided on the agenda to allow the PDT to re-affirm decisions made at the previous meeting at the request of a member and due to new information or the need for additional steps.

Scheduling Work Sessions

Chris discussed that he had received guidance from the Eugene City Engineer regarding the topic discussed at PDT Meeting #1 about briefing the local elected bodies about the project. The direction was to inform the Eugene City Council through memos or the Council newsletter. He noted that if the CAG supports the project proposals then the Council is likely to support as well. Greg reported that he had not discussed this matter with the Springfield City Manager. He noted that there was essentially no availability on the Springfield city council agenda until mid March. It was suggested that the project be placed on the council agenda when a slot is available in March; that would allow them to be briefed in advance of the planned public open house. Dave Carvo added that he let the Urban Renewal District know that the project is starting. Ann asked about whether there was a project mailing list; there is. Randa can send out an email to the list announcing the project is starting. The website should be updated before sending out the email.

Schedule Update

Lou and Randa reviewed the addition of the future PDT meetings and primary subjects that are anticipated.

ISSUES DISCUSSION

Randa began the discussion/exercise to identify and prioritize issues by reviewing what was done at the previous meeting and requesting input on issues.

Greg asked to add the following issue to the list: "If physically possible, design the bridge to add future ramps." This reflects the City of Springfield's position that there is an opportunity to make a better entrance via Franklin Boulevard to both Eugene and Springfield. The PDT discussed this issue. ODOT concept design studies indicated that potential ramps for Franklin would tie in north of the bridge. That would raise environmental issues, since additional bridges would likely be required for ramps. Other options for ramps would likely impact adjacent neighborhoods. Chris noted that there is a Glenwood/Franklin interchange planning study that is currently going on. Following discussion, "Bridge design would not preclude future additional ramp connections to I-5" was added to the issue list.

Length of construction was discussed. A bullet was added to state: "Minimize the duration of construction." Due to the long anticipated construction period (approximately three years) it was suggested that efforts to mitigate construction impacts should consider changes that could be more permanent (e.g., moving bike trails). It was suggested to modify the item regarding bike paths to state "Keep bike paths open during construction. Make them safe and more compatible with long-term usage."

The PDT then participated in a "dot exercise" where each voting member was given seven dots to place next to the issues that were their highest priorities. Members were allowed to place up to two dots on any one item. Following the exercise, Randa reviewed the results in combination with the voting by the CAG. Many of the votes were similar between the two groups. Items that the PDT placed the most dots on avoiding creating camping locations for the homeless, opportunity for a signature or landmark bridge, and consider aesthetic treatments on the underside of the bridge.

PURPOSE AND NEED

Randa described how the issues identification and prioritization would be used by the team: the information would be used to develop draft goals and objectives. It was noted that many of the actions implicit in the issues identified, such as restore vegetation, would be incorporated in the project regardless and, as such, aren't really something we'll use to evaluate or compare options. James asked if there were further comments on the purpose and need statement that was distributed after PDT Meeting #1. James noted that the CAG had provided some comments at their meeting, mostly to address some of the technical information in the "need" portion. The group discussed the proposed edits submitted by one of the CAG members (to modify language in the purpose statement to read "maintain safety and improve connectivity" rather than "improve safety and maintain connectivity.") The PDT agreed that the purpose statement was more appropriate as written, and to leave the original wording. It was suggested the last sentence of the "need" portion regarding the replacement bridge having "less contact with the Willamette River" be removed as it doesn't deal with the project need. The PDT was requested to provide any other comments on the need to Lou by the end of the day, Monday 1/22. The team will distribute the revised purpose and need with draft goals and objectives and evaluation criteria for discussion at the next PDT meeting (at least one week before the meeting).

BRIDGE ALTERNATIVES

Lou gave a presentation on the bridge alternatives that were considered as part of the initial evaluation of bridge types. A range of bridge types were initially considered, including: girder; box girder; arch; cable stayed; and suspension. Cost, vertical and horizontal geometry, aesthetics, and other factors were used in the team's preliminary evaluation, which has been documented in a technical memo that is currently undergoing review. The presentation provided examples of the various bridge types.

The cost of the bridge relative to the overall project cost was discussed. It was noted that a federal earmark for the project provided some funding specifically for aesthetic consideration. There are a lot of factors that affect the bridge costs and it's possible that the

total bridge length could incorporate more than one bridge type (e.g., one type over land and another over the river), which in turn affects cost. It was also noted that a schematic of the existing bridge would be useful in comparing bridge types. Lou noted that the team will be using specialists in bridge design and visual simulation to help the evaluation. Chris suggested that the University of Oregon may be a resource related to aesthetic treatments.

NEXT STEPS

Randa reviewed the schedule for the upcoming meetings. The next CAG meeting is scheduled for 1/31. The PDT agreed on the following dates for the next three PDT meetings:

- Meeting #3 – 2/2, 10 am – 1 pm
- Meeting #4 – 2/23, 10 am – 1 pm
- Meeting #5 – 3/9, 10 am – 1 pm

The meeting adjourned at approximately 1 pm.