

Final

Summary – Meeting #5

Project Development Team – I-5 Willamette River Bridge Project

March 16, 2007, 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.
LCOG Conference Room (644 A Street, Springfield)

ACTION ITEMS

PDT members will:

1. Provide comments on Meeting #4 summary to Lou Krug via email.

The project team will:

1. Provide a copy of the decision process memo to the PDT.
2. Revise evaluation criteria based on CAG input and distribute to PDT and CAG.
3. Provide information to the PDT regarding scheduling of the open house (planned for week of April 30th).

ATTENDANCE

Voting Members

- Tim Dodson – ODOT Project Liaison/CPM, ODOT Bridge Delivery Unit
- Don Angermayer – Transportation Maintenance Manager, ODOT District 5
- Molly Cary – Environmental Manager, ODOT Region 2
- Anthony Boesen – Environmental and Transportation Engineer, FHWA
- Al Heyn – Senior Bridge Engineer, ODOT Region 2
- Chris Henry – Transportation Planning Engineer, City of Eugene Public Works
- Tom Boyatt – Transportation 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
- Carl Deaton – Designer, ODOT Region 2 Roadway
- Matt Stucker – Bridge Engineer, ODOT Region 2
- Sam Seskin – CH2MHill (observer)

HANDOUTS

- Agenda
- PDT Meeting #3 Summary (final)
- Draft Meeting #4 Summary (draft)
- Final *Initial Conceptual Bridge Alternatives Report*
- Revised Screening and Evaluation Criteria

WELCOME AND AGENDA REVIEW

Lou Krug welcomed the group and reviewed the agenda. Lou pointed out that “public comment” (in the agenda) was not part of the PDT meeting.

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Meeting Summary Review

CAG Meeting Update

Charlotte Behm provided a summary of the CAG meeting, which was held on March 14th. CAG members shared their vision for what the bridge should be like. Common features expressed by the CAG included:

- Environmental protection is more important than aesthetics
- Arches and curved lines are preferred over straight lines
- Something above the deck would convey a “gateway”
- All views (from bridge, from Franklin Boulevard, from park, etc.) are important

Regarding the gateway concept Tim Dodson added that Chris Ramey (U of O representative) pointed out three “classes” of how the bridge is viewed; (1) from a distance; (2) by the “through traveler” moving at a relatively high rate of speed; and (3) person viewing bridge from close-up. Tim added that several CAG members noted the arch form is preferred because it is a natural form that is consistent with the natural setting of the park and river. Jamie Damon added that the CAG expressed the view that continuity of form and pattern is important – essentially that the bridge not be composed of disparate element. However, it was understood by the CAG that different forms can blend together.

Lou Krug noted that seven members of the public attended; one person brought photographs from south (looking north) and a model bridge that her 11 year old son had constructed to illustrate the type of bridge that he felt should be constructed. Public

comment included questions of funding and whether additional funds could be raised for bridge enhancements. The CAG meeting also included discussion of the draft Screening & Evaluation criteria; discussion of opportunities for integrating aesthetic visions and bridge form; (Anne Peterson, the OBDP team's bridge aesthetics expert participated in this discussion); and discussion of criteria and how they related to goals and objectives

Chris Henry mentioned that the view of the bridge as a motorist travels eastbound on Franklin Blvd. lasts about 15 seconds at the speed limit and that is an important view that should be considered when evaluating bridge types.

Committee Business

Upcoming Meetings:

Tom Boyatt asked about the next scheduled meetings. They are:

- CAG – May 8th
- PDT – May 17th – 11-2 (note time change)
- A public information meeting is being planned for late April

Meeting Summaries

Lou pointed out the PDT meeting summaries are included in the handouts. Notes for meeting #3 are final. Lou requested PDT members to email comments on the draft notes for meeting #4.

Community Briefings

A briefing to the Springfield City Council will be presented by Ray Mabey of ODOT on March 26th. Jamie pointed out that the U of O design workshops and input has been discussed with Chris Ramey. Chris Ramey indicated that he would coordinate with the "HOPES" (Holistic Options for Planet Earth Sustainability) conference on sustainable building practices as related to water (in May), and possibly with design class in April.

Decision Process

Lou mentioned that the project team has developed a technical memorandum that describes the decision process for the project; he will send a copy to the PDT by email.

Other Committee Business

Lou pointed out that the Final *Initial Conceptual Bridge Alternatives* report was distributed to the CAG and a copy was distributed to the PDT. The report was also distributed to the CAG on March 14 and there was considerable discussion at the CAG meeting regarding costs. Tim provided additional information regarding cost and indicated that the OTIA Bridge Oversight Committee has provided a clear message that ODOT can bring \$70M to the table for this bridge. A higher cost bridge could be constructed if other funds are made available from another source, but ODOT only can bring \$70M. If additional funds are to be identified, then this needs to be done within the year (while the NEPA process is still going on).

Tom Boyatt asked if the \$70M include the earmark for aesthetics; Tim confirmed it did. Tim reviewed in detail the breakdown of the overall \$180M budget for the project and noted that the \$8.8M earmark specifically for aesthetics is included in that figure. Chris

Henry pointed out that the cost information would be important to share with the public so everyone can see how the pieces fit together. An explanation of the project budget (\$180 million) is very important since it was clear that there is some misunderstanding about the cost of the project and the budget and how much of the \$180 million is for the bridge itself. Tim explained \$70 M is the top limit for the bridge (which includes the crossing of the Willamette River, Franklin Boulevard and the railroad) and the project still requires \$110M more for other project features to “make it work.” This includes road work, bridge over the canoe canal (Patterson Slough), demolition of two bridges, engineering, right of way, traffic control, etc. The \$8.8 M is to “make it special.” Tim passed out summary of project budget.

Matt Stucker added that there are a lot of assumptions that go into an estimate like the one that was distributed. Jamie observed that the PDT needs to help in determining how this information is shared with the public -- including how we are applying screening criteria and issues of raising local funds to pay for a higher cost bridge type. Molly Cary asked about what point in the process do we look at costs again and what should we present to the public regarding cost. Jamie suggested we present information on the major categories of costs: 1) the bridge over the river, 2) other elements to clearly describe the various elements of the project and the costs of each. Lou noted that the numbers are inflated to the year 2010 to account for when construction would begin.

Dave Carvo observed that the “bridge” for this project is the 1,800 foot section of I-5 over water and land (including Franklin, railroad, off ramps) that is part of a two-mile-long project. He thought the name “Willamette River Bridge Project” limits the scope of project in the public’s mind – presenting the overall budget helps put the project into perspective.

Chris asked if there will there be value engineering process for the project. Tim answered yes, and it could change things in the process.

For public presentation, Tom suggested an elevation graphic as a good way to illustrate the project and provide perspective. He also asked when ODOT would need to know if there are extra funds for the bridge: Tim answered that June '08 is when we'll be beginning final design. At that time we'll need to know if there are funds for doing something more. This is important for us to consider as we define the bridge for NEPA – we will need to be able to “flex” from the alternative we define for NEPA and to properly define “box” that we are working within.

Tom asked if, as cost estimates are refined, potentially “saved” dollars go to the project? Tim answered: no, they go back to bridge program. Tim also pointed out that, as the project is refined, the contingency tends to “migrate” into other project elements, and as they go up, the contingency goes down. Construction can eat up a lot of contingency.

Jamie summarized that there are two key messages to take to the public: 1) there are fixed project costs with limited flexibility and 2) the OTIA III funding for the bridge is \$70M. She also suggested showing the cost comparison so people see how the various elements relate to the total project cost. Molly suggested that the project information presented to

the public include other issues besides cost that could affect the selection of bridge type, such as the environmental concerns such as the number of piers in the river. Chris added that it will be helpful for the public to understand the gap (in dollars) between bridge types, and the magnitude of that gap in order to provide perspective on the total project cost.

Charlotte pointed out that one of the members of the public brought a book on bridges that presented some very impressive bridges, but they were set in a different environment. Carl suggested that we look to future of what Franklin would be like, which may be substantially different from today.

PROJECT UPDATE

Design Considerations/Constraints

Jamie review what was offered by CAG for aesthetic/bridge type concerns and noted that this was the beginning of a discussion on what influences the selection of bridge type(s) and ultimately the design of bridge. She asked the PDT to share the same vision as was shared by the CAG.

- Matt:
 - Twin structures seem appropriate for the setting
- Al:
 - If girders, use haunched girders
- Chris:
 - Concept of “elegant” -- flowing lines, integrating of all elements, no hard angles or incongruent massing.
 - If cable stayed, look for “floating” perception (“magical”).
- Anthony:
 - Design consideration depends on what would look good and be functional
- Tim:
 - Form follows function.
- Molly:
 - Discourage camping of transients, that diminishes some peoples experience of bridge
 - Some element of bridge above deck to be special/beautiful
 - Supports bat habitat
- Tom:
 - Bridge needs to “communicate place” and quality of the region
 - Reiterated Molly’s point about building something beautiful that compliments the natural beauty of the area.

- Charlotte:
 - Reiterated the most common theme from CAG -- needs to “look natural”, not high tech. Doesn’t hear that people want a cable stayed bridge, public message shouldn’t just be that we don’t have the money to build a cable stayed bridge, but also that people have not expressed an interest that type of bridge.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

James reviewed the draft screening and evaluation criteria that had been distributed to the PDT and noted several changes from what had been presented at the previous meeting. The criteria had been presented to the CAG and there was considerable discussion of how the criteria incorporate the goals and objectives that had been developed by the CAG and PDT. Several CAG members offered suggestions by email and the team had incorporated them to the extent possible for discussion with the CAG. James explained that the "screening" criteria were intended to help the PDT determine which conceptual bridge alternatives should be considered further (and taken to the public for the open house). The Initial Conceptual Bridge Alternatives Report is a useful resource for this determination, as it presents information on costs of various bridge types. Chris observed that cost seemed like the only differentiator between the bridge types that were currently "on the table." James noted that the other screening criteria were based on the purpose and need and it was likely that all alternative would meet those criteria. The PDT discussed how to include bike/ped connectivity and suggested changing the criterion to "bike and ped connectivity will be maintained and safe at all times during construction."

The PDT applied the screening criteria to the basic categories of the bridge types documented in the Initial Conceptual Alternatives Report. The following bridge types met the criteria and will be presented to the public:

- Girders, constant depth
- Girders, haunched
- Box girders
- Segmental boxes
- Deck Arch
- Tied arch over Franklin with haunched girders over other spans

The evaluation criteria will be applied to these bridge types in order to determine which type or types should be considered in detail in the EA.

The PDT endorsed the screening process and results.

NEXT STEPS

The next PDT meeting will be on Thursday, May 17th from 11-2 at the LCOG Room (note the different day and time than previous meetings). Jamie is in the process of planning the open house for the week of April 30th. She will contact the PDT regarding open house plans. She noted that the CAG asked whether they should attend the open house, and she had indicated yes, they should.