

Summary – Meeting #10

Community Advisory Group – I-5 Willamette River Bridge Project

*May 6, 2008, 10:15 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.
Singer Room, Eugene Public Library (100 West 10th Ave.)*

ATTENDANCE

CAG Members

- John Barofsky – Co-Chair, Fairmount Neighbors
- Charlotte Behm – Representative, Springfield Neighborhood (and member, CPC for Whilamut Natural Area)
- Dave Carvo – Vice Chair, Glenwood Neighborhood Group
- Pat French – Planner and CPC Representative, Willamalane Park & Recreation District
- Eric Gunderson – Former President, American Institute of Architects SWO Chapter
- Rich Hazel – Co-Chair, Laurel Hill Valley Citizens Association
- Bob Kline – Chair, Harlow Neighbors
- Chris Ramey – Director and Architect, University Planning Office, University of Oregon
- Phillip Richardson – Alternate, Eugene Parks and Open Space Division
- David Sonnichsen – CPC for Whilamut Natural Area
- Scott Wylie – Springfield Resident

Resource Team

- Tim Dodson – ODOT Project Liaison/CPM, ODOT Bridge Delivery Unit
- Lou Krug – Project Manager, Oregon Bridge Delivery Partners
- James Gregory – Environmental Task Leader, Oregon Bridge Delivery Partners
- Jamie Damon – Public Involvement Coordinator, JLA
- Kalin Schmoltdt – Public Involvement Assistant, JLA

Other Attendees

- Charles Biggs – CPC for Whilamut Natural Area (*CAG Alternate*)
- Jody Heady – President, American Institute of Architects SWO Chapter (*CAG Alternate*)
- Chris Henry – City of Eugene
- Don Kahle – Interested citizen

Handouts

- Agenda
- DRAFT Summary of CAG Meeting #9
- Final Summary of CAG Meeting #8
- Final Summary of PDT Meeting #7
- Final Summary of PDT Meeting #8

WELCOME AND AGENDA REVIEW

Jamie noted that the meeting would include an update on the land use hearings, EA status, interim survey findings, public involvement next steps, and an introduction to the A&E firm.

Jamie introduced Eric Gunderson, an architect with Pivot Architecture and former president of the American Institute of Architects, Southwest Oregon Chapter (AIA-SWO), who will be serving as a CAG member. Jody Heady, current president of the AIA-SWO will serve as Eric's alternate.

Jamie led introductions of new members. Current CAG and team members introduced themselves and their interest in the project. Tim noted that he would be serving as the interim project manager.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Charles noted the joint land use hearing held on April 29. He said that he had requested that the public comment period be extended for two weeks to allow for further testimony. The new end date for comments is May 13.

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Summary of Meeting #9 – There were no comments on the meeting summary.

PROJECT UPDATE

Update on CM/GC selection process – Tim said that Hamilton Construction had been selected as the CM/GC (Construction Management/General Contractor) firm in conjunction with Slayden Construction. A contract is anticipated by July 1. While the CM/GC format is new for ODOT and Hamilton, Slayden has experience with CM/GC and public works projects. The Notice to Proceed (NTP) for the A&E (Architecture and Engineering) firm (OBEC) is expected soon.

Eric confirmed that the CM/GC process means that the CAG will be involved through the design phase. Tim said that the committees will remain involved. Jamie noted that the schedule graphic in the most recent newsletter provides a good reference for how the different processes overlap.

Status of EA - James offered an abbreviated summary of the public comment period. About 40 individuals and organizations submitted comments and noted over 100 different issues. Responses have been prepared and recommendations have been made for how the comments should change the EA and overall project. James reminded the CAG of the two alternatives within the EA: a no-build option and a replacement option with a variety of bridge types and pier locations. Approval of the revised EA is expected in June. Final approval and an anticipated "Finding of No Significant Impact" (FONSI) document is now dependent on gaining land-use approval.

Land use coordination/Hearing summary – Applications for land use plan amendments have been submitted and staff have recommend adopting the amendments as proposed. A joint planning commission meeting was held on April 29, with the planning commissions of Lane County, Springfield, and Eugene. Tim presented project background and Mark Greenfield spoke to the specific requirements of the land use amendment. A joint hearing to deliberate the amendments will be held on June 3. Pending approval, the next step will be to present the amendments to the city councils and the Lane County Board of Commissioners. Approval will be necessary before ODOT can submit the Revised EA and a FONSI (if that is the outcome) to FHWA for approval.

John asked about the questions raised by the planning commission. James said that the questions were largely specific to land use. The commissioners also provided an opportunity to explain the estimates for fill and excavation quantities. One commissioner had suggested limiting fill quantities, but ultimately indicated that it would not be advantageous to the project to limit amounts of fill. Tim noted the locations where fill would be added and removed. The commission also had clarifying questions about the placement of the bridges themselves.

Dave Carvo asked whether any fatal flaw comments had been received on the EA. James said that he did not see any, and that the issues raised have been generally explicable in the context of the project. He noted that there have been concerns about the ultimate width of the bridge, though the width comes directly from FHWA. There have been comments about bridge type preference, but no red flags. There have been no findings that would shift the project into an EIS or indicate court challenges. The planning commission was comfortable with the narrowed field of bridge types.

Lou asked whether public comments would be accepted at the July 3, meeting. James said it was his understanding that the meeting is only for the commission to deliberate information received to that point. James noted that four written comments were submitted at the hearing.

Issues Tracking List - Jamie explained that the Public Concerns List (formerly “Issues Tracking,”) is to ensure that the underpinnings for the Goals and Objectives are not lost as the process moves forward. CAG members should review and comment on whether the document accurately reflects their concerns.

Conversation with the A&E firm – (No members of the A&E firm were present.)

BRIDGE TYPE SELECTION PROCESS

Decision steps - Tim explained that the final authority for choosing the bridge type will rest with the Bridge Operations Committee (BOC). The BOC is anticipated to accept the recommendations of the PDT who are sensitive to the suggestions of the CAG. A decision matrix will be used to choose between the types. The first task of the A&E firm will be to determine how different elements differentiate between the bridge types. Differentiators could include aspects such as necessary staging areas, traffic impacts, cost, appearance, and public input. The A&E firm may make a recommendation on how the factors should be weighted, though the CAG will decide their relative importance. It may be necessary to revisit the weightings of the criteria in order to yield a type that makes the most sense. The decision matrix will be helpful in justifying the eventual selection. The PDT will present the findings to the BOC for approval. Jamie noted that they had initially used an evaluation matrix to help narrow the types, but this version would include new information including technical input and public values.

Tim noted that while they had wanted to leave the bridge type selection open through the land use process, the type will need to be selected by September in order to accommodate the in-water work period beginning in June 2009. Permit applications cannot be submitted until advanced designs move forward.

Eric asked how much of the design will be dictated by the bridge type. Tim said that the selection would provide a basic concept design that would almost bring the project to the Design Acceptance Package (DAP) stage. Some features would be known, such as the bridge footprint, pier locations, the number of arches, through-arch materials, and the magnitude of retaining walls needed.

Architectural elements will not be decided because they do not affect aspects of the bridge that are environmentally regulated. Jamie noted the previous discussions about tradeoffs associated with each type and suggested that it may be possible to recommend against a bridge type based on public feedback. Eric confirmed that the architectural discussion would continue after the type selection. Jamie said it would. She noted that the CAG has been clear about wanting to see the design possibilities for each type with the guidance of the A&E firm.

Chris Ramey noted that there could be more than four final type combinations, as there are several different spans to consider and each span has the potential to employ a different type. Tim noted that the primary focus has been on the spans over the river. The remaining spans have been less discussed, but can be designed to blend well with the river spans. Scott noted that the public will be thinking of the bridge as a single, unified structure.

Dave Carvo described the bridge type choice as the selection of a bridge “silhouette” that does not include design details, and confirmed that the full design cannot begin without the EA. James agreed, noting that the bridge “type” refers to a form with no specific color or design elements.

Lou noted that the CAG will remain involved from the type selection through the design process. The design is likely to take a year or so during which time the various project groups (CAG, PDT, CM/GC, A&E) will work together.

John suggested that due to the length of committee commitment, it might be appropriate to schedule a point where committee makeup could change. Jamie noted the addition of members at this time and indicated that it made sense for the group to remain together through type selection. She noted the importance of maintaining group representation and avoiding any turnover that results in a lack of experience or knowledge of the process.

Scott requested a glossary of relevant committee terms.

Community Engagement – Jamie outlined the following schedule:

- **May 15** – Survey closes.
- **June 17** – CAG, Evaluation Matrix (will come with a meeting template from the A&E firm.)
- **June 20** – PDT, Evaluation Matrix.
- **July 1** (Week of) – CMGC contract (will be useful for addressing the construction impacts of each bridge type.)
- **July 7** (Week of) – Public info: newsletter, etc.
- **July 21** (Week of) – Type selection workshop (includes data from June conversations and public input. Results in a good sense of direction for the project.)
- **September** – CAG/PDT, discussion of type to PDT.

Interim results of survey – Kalin encouraged the CAG to take posters and stickers advertising the May 15, survey close date. He noted that he wanted to give a general impression of the survey without divulging too much about the results too soon in order not to influence future input.

There have been around 1,100 responses. Most survey respondents are from the Eugene and Springfield area. Almost half of respondents are from the 97401, 97403, and 97477 zip codes surrounding the bridge itself. A good mix of age groups have responded to the survey, with a fairly even response from each age category. The predominant use of the bridge involves driving across it

on I-5, although 80% report driving under it on Franklin Blvd, and roughly half of respondents reported using the trails and park. Seventy percent of respondents reported using or seeing the bridge at least once per week.

Respondents have used the open ended sections to list concerns, values, and issues that correspond largely with concerns already expressed through the project Goals and Objectives. Respondents have responded well to questions about their values, what words they would associate with the future bridge, and they have provided good insights into the different bridge types. There have been a number of recommendations for example bridges, and comments have been generally positive regarding the survey itself.

David Sonnichsen said that he was concerned about people being able to provide multiple responses on the survey and forcing people to rank all four bridge types before being allowed to advance. Kalin explained that the forced ranking was intentional and allows the data to show not only which bridges are favored by the most people, but also which bridge is the most unpopular. Kalin explained that efforts to block multiple responses can unfairly exclude people who share a computer, as at a library. It is also possible to identify repeat surveys by looking at IP addresses, survey dates, and demographic information. Repeat surveys are generally uncommon, and would need to be substantial (and correspondingly more obvious) in order to affect the survey outcome considering the number of responses.

Chris Ramey asked whether the survey was more of a questionnaire. Kalin agreed that it was, noting that it was not created to be statistically valid, and should be considered in the same way as an open house comment form. Chris asked about the targeted demographic for the survey. Jamie noted the CAG's conversation about seeking a range of responses and getting the perspective of a range of users who see and use the bridge. Demographic questions were added in order to determine where the responses were coming from and how well they represent the community. So far, the findings appear relatively balanced. Chris suggested that it might be appropriate to consider filtering for certain "ideal bridge user" demographics when analyzing the findings. Jamie noted that the data can be used as a tool, but the findings should not be treated as statistically valid. Kalin noted that it is possible to do live cross referencing of the responses to determine if different demographics had different preferences. Dave Carvo discouraged separating the results based on Eugene and Springfield residency, noting that it could be unnecessarily divisive.

Dave Carvo asked how people are finding out about the survey. Kalin said that most people found out through newspaper articles. Other reported sources include newspaper ads, postcards, emails, the project website, community fliers, and television news.

David Sonnichsen asked how many people responded anonymously to the survey. Kalin said that about two-thirds of respondents did not give their names.

Jamie offered to provide a draft survey report to the CAG and solicit refinements before making the results public. She also offered to send out a thank you to people who joined the email list.

John agreed that the results would be useful for the public and suggested a press release in mid to late June. John also suggested sitting down with a newspaper and providing them the data. Eric agreed that a press release would spur interest.

Type selection workshop – Jamie explained that the type selection workshop is only loosely formed at this point because there hasn't been input from the A&E firm yet. The workshop will involve a presentation to ground people in the project and will be more than just an open house. A tour of the bridge site would be ideal. Jamie suggested a Saturday or evening event.

John suggested contacting Lane Transit District and using their boardroom facilities. He also suggested incorporating a bus tour of the bridge.

Artist involvement – Jamie noted the conversation at the last CAG about adding an AIA representative and filling gaps in representation from artists and Springfield. Jamie said she had received a good list of possible representatives from Charlotte and Bob. When the Springfield Chamber of Commerce declined to offer a representative, Bob invited Scott Wylie, a Springfield resident, husband of a Springfield city councilor, and an artist. Jamie noted that the other CAG members had all been selected by their organizations, but there did not seem to be an appropriately representative organization for the arts community. She noted subjectivity of selecting one artist to represent all forms of art. As a solution, Jamie suggested adding artist involvement at the type selection workshop where multiple artists could participate in a public panel discussion or roundtable about how to proceed. Artists could then work with the tables and hopefully result in some broad agreement on how to advance art as part of the project.

John questioned whether adding artist involvement at the workshop would be enough to appease elected officials and others who want to see arts incorporated into the project. He felt it would be helpful to have an artist's perspective at the table and he suggested that the workshop might help recruit one or two new arts CAG members. Tim agreed, but reiterated the challenge of objectively selecting a good representative. John suggested that the artists could provide a statement of interest that indicates what they could bring to the CAG.

Charlotte said that she had spoken with Doug Beauchamp, the director of the Lane Arts Council. Doug had offered to help hold an informal meeting with artists and clarify the responsibilities associated with serving on the CAG. Charlotte said that she would like to have an artist selection discussion independent of the workshop.

Eric noted that it would be important to distinguish between the input an artist provides to the CAG, and the art that may eventually go on the bridge itself.

Jody asked about the influence of the artist CAG member. Tim said he felt the artist member would advise the group on how to involve artists. Jody suggested expanding the definition to include other arts, such as landscape architecture or lighting design.

Scott suggested that both structurally integrated and non-integrated public art is important and art and architecture should not be segregated. Both types of art contribute meaning to structure and place. He encouraged integrating art at all levels, and suggested that an artistic presence on the CAG could help promote that.

Jamie offered to take the lead in finding a CAG arts representative member based on the discussion.

Bob asked Scott to elaborate on how he might approach art within a project like this one. Scott explained that he tries to integrate art and design within the same process and he tries to take cues

from established programmatic needs and parameters. He suggested that it would be appropriate to begin with perspectives on the bridge and artistic ideas that arise from those different points of view. He noted that the artistic seeds can't be divorced from the functional art and engineering, but the art will almost certainly grow from existing conditions. Jamie agreed with taking a holistic approach and encouraging a perspective of artful ideas.

Chris Ramey suggested that it might be more useful to create a process whereby designers are actively engaged alongside artists instead of having artists work within the CAG itself.

Jamie offered to write out the intent of artist involvement, call Doug Beauchamp, and report back. This would not preclude using artists at the July workshop.

Artist Involvement (whiteboard notes)

- Experience working with public art, government entities in Eugene, Springfield.
- Could include landscape or lighting experiences.
- Someone who brings “artful ideas” to our discussion.
- No commitment to doing the work; member would advise us of how to include artists.
- Jamie will outline time commitment, protocols, and role. She will work with Doug Beauchamp at Lane Arts Council to help organize an informal event to talk with artists.

Jamie explained that Megan Banks from LCOG will be working with her on the July workshop. LCOG will be leading the public involvement efforts after the type selection. Jamie suggested that the workshop could be held onsite and could include tours. Several committee members suggested trying to hold the event on the decommissioned bridge itself.

Chris Ramey suggested that it might be hard to hold people's attention with an onsite workshop and suggested taking tours at the beginning and end. He noted that perspectives from above and below are important. Chris asked about the goal of the workshop. Jamie said that the workshop is intended to present the possibilities and opportunities for the different bridge types and to present the information gathered from the survey as a tool for forming a preliminary recommendation. The workshop will provide an opportunity to work with designers and various bridge “packages” to know what is gained and lost by each type. For example, if it becomes clear that the through arch is a popular choice, it may not be clear that there are fewer design options available to that type. The design matrix may or may not be helpful in making the decision. The workshop will include invitations to interested parties and will be open to the public.

Rich noted that the event should foster educated and informed opinions, and should not be drop-in. Jamie agreed, noting that the event would be structured to allow people to work towards a specific end. Tim cited the example of a previous workshop that included a 20 minute presentation and small focus-group discussions that addressed relevant questions. Jamie requested further ideas from the group.

I-5 GLENWOOD INTERCHANGE

David Sonnichsen requested information about the Glenwood Interchange improvements. He asked about who is involved and how it is being coordinated with the bridge replacement. Tim explained that the connection between the freeway and the local transportation system in the vicinity of Glenwood and Franklin is largely a planning issue. Congressman DeFazio procured \$400,000 that is funding a planning study conducted by the two cities, the county and ODOT on how to make

connections in the area. That effort is underway now, called IGAPS (I-5 Glenwood Area Planning Study). Terry Cole with ODOT planning in Region 2 is the ODOT representative. Terry has been engaged in this project and feels that the two processes are compatible as long as the bridge project does not preclude future expansions of Franklin Blvd. The current plan is to be able to accommodate up to seven lanes in an extreme case scenario; improving connection potential while not diminishing existing conditions. Chris Henry pointed out that he is a Eugene member of the IGAPS team. Tom Boyatt of Springfield is also a member.

Charles asked whether accommodating future expansions of Franklin Blvd had raised the bridge costs to the point of excluding any bridge types. Tim said it did not.

Rich asked about the new deck height compared to the existing bridge. Lou said it depends on the bridge type but is roughly eight feet higher than the decommissioned bridge.

Chris Henry noted that the planning study is intended to identify any problems to be solved prior to moving into a NEPA (National Environmental Policy Act) study. Representatives from ODOT and consultant CH2M Hill will hold an IGAPS (I-5 Glenwood Area Planning Study) event in June. Jamie offered to connect with Terry Cole and forward info on the IGAPS process to the committee.

David said that he felt that the interchange issue is integral to the bridge but has not been discussed enough. Rich agreed, noting that the two projects had been discussed together at one time, but public information has been sparse. Tim noted that the IGAPS process is separate and a difficult problem that is not for this group to resolve. He reiterated that Terry Cole has indicated that the bridge project need only provide space to accommodate future improvements at this time. Tim suggested contacting Tom Boyatt (Springfield) and Chris Henry (Eugene) for more information.

The committee noted that they were interested in having good information on the IGAPS scope even if they were not directly involved in the project.

Jamie noted meetings with the Harlow Neighborhood on May 21, focused primarily on soundwall and noise issues, and Laurel Hill on May 28, focused on bike/ped issues. Lou noted that they would be meeting with Eugene Parks and Open Space in the afternoon to talk about access and staging.

Jamie confirmed that Scott should serve as a Springfield representative to the CAG. The CAG was generally supportive, though Rich questioned the importance of the Springfield/Eugene parity issue, noting that agency representation appeared adequate. Jamie suggested that Scott could serve in lieu of a Springfield Chamber of Commerce representative.

NEXT CAG MEETING

To do:

- Survey results prior to next CAG, will seek feedback on how to parse information.
- Jamie will follow up regarding an Arts representative.
- Jamie will follow up with Terry Cole about IGAPS.
- Jamie will work on the content of the July Workshop with Megan Banks.
- Draft Evaluation Matrix.
- Jamie will follow up with the Eugene Chamber of Commerce.

The next meeting will be held on June 17.