

# FINAL

## Summary – Meeting #7

### Project Development Team – I-5 Willamette River Bridge Project

*October 24, 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 #6 summary to Lou Krug via email (no comments were offered by the PDT at the meeting).

##### The project team will:

1. Prepare meeting summary.
2. Prepare for upcoming PDT and CAG meetings.
3. Further analysis of through arch bridge.

#### ATTENDANCE

##### Voting Members

- Tim Dodson – ODOT Project Liaison/CPM, ODOT Bridge Delivery Unit
- Don Angermayer – Transportation Maintenance Manager, ODOT District 5
- Molly Cary – ODOT Region 2 Environmental
- Chuck Lemos – ODOT Region 2
- Philip Taylor – ODOT Liaison Engineer, FHWA
- Al Heyn – Senior Bridge Engineer, ODOT Region 2
- Chris Henry – Transportation Planning Engineer, City of Eugene Public Works
- Charlotte Behm – Community Advisory Group (CAG) Representative, Springfield Neighborhood and CPC for Whilamut Natural Area
- Kent Howe – Planning Director, Lane County
- Ann Sanders – Project Leader, ODOT Region 2

##### Resource Members/Voting Member Alternates/Observers

- Ed Moore – ODOT Region 2 Planning
- Carl Deaton – Designer, ODOT Region 2 Roadway
- Ann Peterson – Landscape Architect, Oregon Bridge Delivery Partners

- 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

## **HANDOUTS**

- Agenda
- Meeting #6 Summary (draft)
- Slides from presentations on EA status and A&E and CM/GC procurements.

## **WELCOME AND AGENDA REVIEW**

Lou Krug welcomed the group and reviewed the agenda.

## **COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

### **Meeting #6 Summary Review**

The PDT members had no comments on the draft notes for PDT meeting #6. Lou asked members present to email comments, if any, and he would finalize prior to next PDT meeting.

## **PROJECT UPDATE**

### **EA Briefing**

James reviewed the process and status of the preparation of the Environmental Assessment document for the project. Presentation highlighted purpose and need, goals and objectives, description of alternatives, and provided a preliminary summary of the anticipated environmental effects of the project and proposed mitigation measures.. The EA has been drafted and the “Study Committee”, which includes the PDT, ODOT technical specialists, and Federal Highway Administration, has reviewed the draft and provided comments. The project team is presently working on incorporating the comments. The team anticipates the EA will be available for public review in mid-December. This would be followed by a public comment period that would be open through the end of January (to account for the holiday season) and a public hearing in mid-January. ODOT and FHWA would review public comments, revise the EA, and anticipate completing the NEPA environmental process in mid-June.

Charlotte expressed concern about where the noise readings were taken in the East Alton Baker Park Neighborhood northeast of the bridge. She asked for information on where the readings were taken. James said that the EA is being revised to explain the noise analysis (including maps showing locations of noise readings) more clearly.

### **Design Process and Schedule**

Tim presented an overview of the project delivery process. ODOT (Agency) will have two contractors that work collaboratively during the design and construction process:

- The Architecture & Engineering firm (A&E), responsible for design; and

- The Construction Manager/General Contractor (CM/GC), responsible for construction.

This is an innovative approach where the Agency, A & E, CM/GC will collaborate on all elements of design and construction. This allows the team to be creative and efficient in delivering the project.

The process will define risk during design and negotiate/agree to a guaranteed maximum price (GMP) from the CM/GC for construction of the project. This will probably occur between 60% and 100% plans. If no agreement on GMP, then ODOT can bid the project through a more typical process where ODOT prepares design plans which are bid on by contractors. The CM/GC will need to perform at least 30% of work and must sub-contract at least 30% of work.

This is a new delivery process for ODOT that is “on cutting edge” of contracting. Procurement of the A&E firm is a two step process that involves (1) a request for qualifications (RFQ) and (2) request for proposal (RFP) from the A&E firms. Statements of Qualifications (SOQ) have all been submitted and, within a few weeks, ODOT will have a short-list of firms from which it will request proposals. The short-list firms will be precluded from competing for CM/GC team. ODOT plans to have the A & E on board in April 2008 so it can help with completing the NEPA process and can begin doing some preliminary engineering work.. The A & E selection will be based on three scores: (1)SOQ, (2) proposal, and (3) the interview. The CM/GC procurement will be a single step process with an RFP and an interview as the basis for selection.

The A&E RFQ included the project goals and objectives and the A & E will need to demonstrate an understanding of the process to incorporate the goals and objectives into design and construction.

Tim reviewed schedules for A & E and CMGC processes. Thirty firms attended the mandatory RFQ meeting, and ODOT ended up receiving five SOQs. The short list will be set by November 5 and the RFP will be released about three weeks later. Proposals will be due in January.

Tim explained that A & E selection needs to be qualification based, but contractor selection needs to be cost-based. These are requirements of state law.

Bridge type selection is planned by Aug/Sept 2008, so that ODOT can move forward into final design and start looking at the design details that affect how the bridge looks. ODOT will be getting input from public on bridge type selection and final design details. They will be looking to the CAG to help generate public input on this process.

Tim also described potential “early work packages” such as starting on the demolition of the decommissioned bridges prior to completion of design.

Charlotte asked about when mitigation measures need to be finalized and when construction activities would first potentially affect trails in park. Construction activities may begin by

2009 (May timeframe), which allows time to refine and finalize the mitigation concepts that would be commitments made in the EA.

Charlotte also commented that the A & E and CM/CG need to have people/firms on team that have experience in dealing with parks and trails, and specifically keeping trails safe and open during large scale construction, like will occur on this project.

PDT members also suggested that the design effort should involve the local arts community. Chris Henry said this was suggested by the Eugene City Council and had been mentioned at the October CAG meeting.

### **Next Steps for Public Involvement**

Jamie reviewed upcoming public involvement steps that include:

- CAG meeting in November to review and discuss bridge types
- CAG meeting in January to discuss comments on the EA prior to the hearing
- Public hearing mid January.

The project team has been discussing web survey to help w/ bridge type selection.

Jamie asked about expectations for another PDT meeting in November. The PDT member indicated that a November meeting would be useful. The date was set for November 30<sup>th</sup>. Lou will send notice. The CAG meeting in November will be on November 19.

Jamie introduced the idea of a web survey to get public input on bridge types and design interests of the community. Given that the EA is looking at selecting between a build and no-build alternative, and is not getting into design details on any particular type of bridge, it appears that a February 2008 timeframe may work best.

### **Bridge Renderings**

Lou summarized recent work to enhance renderings of the bridge type options from the three key view points in the project area. These are the “next step” in developing the information that will be presented in the EA. The renderings will give the public a more developed idea of what the possibilities are with each of the bridge types. Lou presented new visual simulations that had been developed. This included simulations of a through arch option.

The PDT discussed the need to show a view from I-5 to show how the above deck elements of the through arch differ from the other bridge type options. Ann Peterson noted that all bridge types present opportunities for some type of “gateway” feature. Tim suggested that could use illustrations existing bridges that provide outstanding examples of a particular bridge type could be used.

There was additional discussion of through arch bridge. Recent cost analysis has indicated that through arch bridge option would be feasible (it was previously eliminated from further consideration because estimated costs exceeded the project budget). Since the structural elements (the above deck arch) are outside the roadway area used for travel lanes, the through arch bridge would have a larger footprint than the other bridge types under

consideration. Retaining walls may be required to avoid taking park land. Lou said the team is reviewing the implications/trade off of through arch. This includes evaluation of possible limitations due to the proximity of the adjacent overhead power lines.

Molly mentioned that the team will need to consider what FHWA will say if one of the trade offs involve taking parkland.

PDT members suggested that the team look at existing bridges as examples of gateway features above the deck. These included OR 126 North Fork Siuslaw Bridge, east of Florence, and the Whitson Bridge.

The PDT recommended that the through arch option should be evaluated in more detail and considered as an option for the project.

### **Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned shortly after 1 pm.