

Summary – Meeting #4

Project Development Team – I-5 Willamette River Bridge Project

March 2, 2007, 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.

LCOG Conference Room (644 A Street, Springfield)

ACTION ITEMS

PDT members will:

1. Send comments, if any, on the draft meeting notes for PDT Meeting #3 to Lou Krug (via email) by March 9th.
2. Send comments on draft evaluation criteria to James Gregory (via email) by March 9th.

The project team will:

1. Revise Objective 5G of Goals and Objectives based on the input from the CAG.
2. Revise the briefing packet.
3. Develop renderings of bridge options from three viewpoints
4. Contact LCOG regarding oblique aerial photographs of the project area.
5. Consider above deck arch treatments for bridge options.
6. Provide copies of Slide presentation to members

ATTENDANCE

Voting Members

- Tim Dodson – ODOT Project Liaison/CPM, ODOT Bridge Delivery Unit
- Kevin Finch – Transportation Maintenance Manager, ODOT District 5
- Molly Cary – Environmental Manager, ODOT Region 2
- Anthony Boeson – Environmental and Transportation Engineer, FHWA
- 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
- Kent Howe – Planning Director, Lane County

Resource Members/Voting Member Alternates/Observers

- Dave Carvo (Alternate) – CAG Representative, Vice Chair, Glenwood Neighborhood Group
- Lou Krug – Project Manager, Oregon Bridge Delivery Partners
- James Gregory – Environmental Task Leader, Oregon Bridge Delivery Partners
- Jamie Damon – Public Involvement Coordinator, Jeanne Lawson Associates
- Melissa Hennessy – OBDP Bridge Engineer
- Brad Henry -- ODOT
- Carl Deaton – Designer, ODOT Region 2 Roadway
- Sam Seskin – CH2MHill (observer)

HANDOUTS

- Agenda
- PDT Meeting #2 Summary (final)
- Draft Meeting #3 Summary
- Final Purpose and Need and Goals and Objectives
- Fact Sheet

WELCOME AND AGENDA REVIEW

Lou Krug welcomed the group and reviewed the agenda.

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Meeting Summary Review

PDT Meeting #2 summary has been finalized. Lou asked if there were any comments/suggestions regarding the draft meeting notes from PDT Meeting #3; PDT members were requested to send comments to Lou by email.

CAG Meeting Update

Lou reviewed input from the CAG on the goals and objectives regarding the lifespan of the bridge components in the environmentally sensitive areas. Suggested change to Objective 5G was suggested (see Goals and Objectives summary below).

The CAG meeting involved a field trip of the project area; eight CAG members attended the field trip. Local television news crew (KVAL) and members of the public attended the CAG meeting. KVAL ran story on the news that evening. Lou will send a link to the video that is on KVAL's website. The Fact Sheet was distributed at the CAG meeting.

Briefing Packet

The briefing packet is being revised based on some of the recent comments received and media coverage of the project. Most comments have been about cost and aesthetics. The Register-Guard website has a feature that allows readers to vote on their preference of bridge types; this could provide input for this planning process.

PROJECT UPDATE

Final Goals and Objectives

CAG input recommended changing Objective 5G to include intent that the parts of the bridge substructure that “touch the ground” will require little or no maintenance over the life of the bridge to minimize disturbances to the river or sensitive lands. James will revise and provide to CAG.

BRIDGE TYPE OPTIONS AND DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

Viewpoints

Lou discussed CAG field trip and the consideration of viewpoints that was part of the field trip. Project team recommended three viewpoints:

- View of the bridge from Knickerbocker Bridge
- From underneath the bridge on the north side of river (park)
- From Franklin Boulevard looking west toward the bridge that shows the transition from the bridge over the river to the bridge over the road

These viewpoints capture the major elements of the bridge and are representative of visual concerns represented to date by the CAG and PDT.

Charlotte indicated that the bridge over Franklin Boulevard provides a relatively small “window” over Franklin and asked what kind of aesthetic treatments could be incorporated (such as an arch). The PDT acknowledged that there are different constraints for the crossing over Franklin than for the crossing over the river, especially the need for vertical clearance for vehicles.

Bridge Type Discussion

Melissa reviewed renderings of the bridge types under consideration. Bridge types included a 275-foot span concrete segmental that would have two piers in the river and two piers on shore near the bank, and 390-foot spans that would have only one pier in the river. Both renderings illustrated “haunched” spans. Renderings illustrated a crossing with two individual bridges that would have about a seven foot gap between them. Advantages of two bridges were discussed; these included:

- Operational flexibility
- Construction phasing
- Allowing light under the bridge
- Maintenance (access between bridges)

Chris asked when decisions about the bridge type, whether two bridges or one, etc. would be made. Tim explained what is needed to get through the NEPA process – selection of bridge types, span length, location of piers, roadway alignment, etc. The NEPA process is anticipated to be completed in mid 2008. Some elements of the bridge, such as above deck treatments and aesthetic finishes, may not be finalized as part of the NEPA process, but will be addressed in design of the bridge.

Kent noted that the bridge is gateway entering and departing the Willamette Valley along I-5, and the region would like the bridge to make a statement to I-5 drivers and from other

regional viewpoints, like Autzen Stadium. Kent suggested that there should be some features above deck that helps make that statement.

Melissa then showed the bridge renderings with v-shaped piers, which present the opportunity to create the appearance of an arch. This pier type was discussed at the CAG. The PDT discussed if there could be an arch over the roadway. This could potentially be an ornamental feature with a railing and not necessarily a structural element of the bridge. Dave pointed out that a bridge with large structural component above the deck could be a distraction from the natural surroundings and may not compliment the natural areas on the north side of the Willamette River. Molly pointed out that the treatment could be only a small extension above the bridge deck, and wouldn't have to be a large element. Dave observed that the solid v-piers don't appear to allow much light in below the bridge.

Melissa then reviewed renderings of an arch bridge. It's unlikely that the arch could be continued over Franklin due to the clearance requirements. Kent asked if the arch could be extended above the deck for the portion of the bridge crossing Franklin, thus providing a gateway. Lou noted that this is something that could be explored. Greg also asked what could be done to give this bridge the signature of Eugene/Springfield area. Molly suggested some of the treatments on the coastal bridges, such as "pylons" at the bridge ends, that give the bridge a unique appearance.

Regarding viewpoints, Chris noted that a "regional" viewpoint would be useful for illustrating the bridge. He suggested low-level oblique aerials that have been taken by LCOG. Project team will contact LCOG to investigate further.

Several members asked if copies of the slide presentation could be made available. Lou said it would.

DRAFT EVALUATION CRITERIA

James reviewed the draft evaluation criteria that were included in the handouts. The criteria were based on the goals and objectives and are intended to provide ways to differentiate the bridge types under consideration in order to define the build alternative for the EA. Tim suggested review of the draft criteria and that the PDT should provide suggestions on which are useful and how they could be measured. The PDT provided comments on the draft criteria. James will revise evaluation criteria so that the PDT can apply them at the next meeting. Also, PDT members may provide comments to James by Friday, March 9th. Jamie added that the PDT will be asked to apply the criteria at the next meeting with the objective of defining which bridge types that we take forward to the public open house in April.

NEXT STEPS

The next PDT meeting will be on March 16th from 10-1 at the LCOG Room. Jamie noted that the next meeting will involve applying the evaluation criteria and that the PDT needs to be comfortable with what we put forward to the public at the open house. Chris clarified that what the PDT is "recommending" is the bridge types that will be considered further in the NEPA process.

