# Summary – Meeting #3

## Community Advisory Group – I-5 Willamette River Bridge Project

***Feb. 26, 2007, 10:30 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.***
***Bascom Room, Eugene Public Library (100 West 10th Ave.)***

### ATTENDANCE

CAG Members

- Charlotte Behm – Representative, Springfield Neighborhood (and member, CPC for Whilamut Natural Area
- David Sonnichsen – Chair, CPC for Whilamut Natural Area
- Bob Kline – Chair, Harlow Neighbors
- Pat French – Planner and CPC Representative, Willamalane Park & Recreation District
- Trevor Taylor – Natural Resources Supervisor, Eugene Parks and Open Space Division
- Rich Hazel – Co-Chair, Laurel Hill Valley Citizens Association
- Dave Carvo – Vice Chair, Glenwood Neighborhood Group
- Renée Benoit – Membership Director, Springfield Chamber of Commerce
- John Barofsky – Co-Chair, Fairmount Neighbors
- Chris Ramey – Director and Architect, University Planning Office, University of Oregon

Resource Team

- Lou Krug – Project Manager, Oregon Bridge Delivery Partners
- Tim Dodson – ODOT Project Liaison/CPM, ODOT Bridge Delivery Unit
- Ann Sanders – ODOT Project Leader/Area Representative for Lane County, ODOT Region 2
- Melissa Hennessy – OBDP Senior Bridge Engineer
- Jamie Damon – Public Involvement Coordinator, Jeanne Lawson Associates
- Kalin Schmoldt – Public Involvement Assistant, Jeanne Lawson Associates

Other Attendees

- Charles Biggs – CPC for Whilamut Natural Area (alternate for David Sonnichsen)

Handouts

- Agenda
- Summary of CAG Meeting #2
- Revised Goals and Objectives
- Draft Conceptual Bridge Alternatives Report
- Draft Evaluation Criteria
- Project Information Sheet

## WELCOME AND AGENDA REVIEW

Lou noted the morning field trip as the reason for the later start. Jamie said that the field visit would be debriefed later on. She said the group will be looking at some computer generated simulations of various bridge types and introducing the draft evaluation criteria.

## PUBLIC COMMENT

*Dave Doris* – Eugene resident. Dave noted that the question of on and off-ramps at the bridge has been considered, and while he isn't concerned with how the bridge looks, he does want ramps on either side. He also encouraged that the lanes be extended as per the Washington Street Bridge.

*Sarah Strand* – Eugene resident and artist. Sarah said she was happy to see the potential for involving high school students and said she wanted to see aesthetics given an appropriately important place. She expressed hope that the bridge won't be just a utilitarian project and could be very special.

*Charles Biggs* – Lives at 540 Antelope Way. Charles expressed concern that the comments gathered at the fall workshops have been "sanitized" for content. He noted that he had submitted requests for looking at specific bridges that he has not seen. He was concerned that the committee hasn't seen the un-sanitized version and asked that looking at bridges be postponed until the committee sees the full comments. He also noted that there needs to be more clarity regarding FHWA's expansion needs. He noted that while the current average daily carrying capacity was known, the 2050 assumptions were unclear.

Jamie asked Lou to follow up on distributing the original comments. Ann Sanders said that she believed that all comments had been posted on the public section of the site.

Visitors in the audience introduced themselves.

## COMMITTEE BUSINESS

***Summary of Meeting #2*** – Rich Hazel clarified that the discussion of a pedestrian facility over the railroad tracks was intended as a possible addition to the I-5 Bridge, not just an independent structure. Lou agreed that it should be clarified that there were two distinct concepts discussed. Rich noted that the discussion was intended to frame a connectivity issue that there and recognize an opportunity to improve safety for individuals. Lou summarized the discussion from the previous meeting. He noted the proposals to create a new structure or tie it to the new bridge. Jamie suggested that the issue be raised at the next Laurel Hill neighborhood meeting. Rich noted the next meeting would be in May.

Chris Ramey noted that he had written the protocol regarding "consider different life spans for different bridge components," not James.

Jamie noted that the PDT meeting summaries had been added to the meeting packets as requested. She also noted that the meeting had been advertised on both city websites and in the Eugene Register Guard.

***Update on community briefings*** – Lou noted that while no specific meetings have been scheduled with the neighborhood groups, he encouraged the groups to be aware that they do have access to the project team.

Jamie noted that ODOT is pulling together a project briefing packet and distributed a fact sheet that will be included. Pat French asked whether the packets will be available on an individual basis. Lou said they would be made available to the CAG members after they are reviewed, and noted that they are intended to give an overview of the project with regard to schedule and other matters.

Jamie passed out a reference list of commonly used acronyms and definitions as well as a copy of a recent Register Guard article on the bridge project. David Sonnichsen noted that the article said that the bridge was "near" Alton Baker Park instead of passing through it.

## PROJECT UPDATE

***Distribute draft Conceptual Bridge Alternative Report*** – Lou said that the conceptual bridge alternatives report had been distributed to the PDT and is being currently being reviewed by a technical group at ODOT. He said that the document is close to being finalized and will be distributed when completed.

***Finalize Revised Goals and Objectives*** – Jamie noted the feedback from the group at the last meeting and asked the CAG whether the revised draft accurately captures the concerns of the group.

For the sake of the public Lou described the evolution of the goals and objectives and how they had emerged from a long list of issues gathered by ODOT at open houses and through public comments. He explained that the issues had been reviewed by the CAG and the PDT and will be used to form the evaluation criteria for narrowing the bridge options.

John Barofsky noted that the language for objective 5G didn't come across as he understood the issue. Chris Ramey said that he was referring to the differing life spans for different parts of the structure and that the wording wasn't quite what he meant. John suggested adding language to the effect of increasing the life spans of bridge features in sensitive areas. Chris suggested that if it's built, it should be built once and then the same base structure can be used again. Ann Sanders proposed adding language to the effect of "paying close attention to parts of the structure in environmentally sensitive areas." Dave Carvo said that "environmentally sensitive" might be too broad and that the focus should be on the features that are in and on the ground. Lou suggested adding an example. Chris suggested that the deck might be the future focus, leaving the more permanent structure and piers as the foundation for future efforts.

There were no other changes to the goals and objectives. Jamie said they would be amended and distributed.

## BRIDGE TYPE OPTIONS AND DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

***Debrief field visit*** – Lou described the morning field visit. He said that they wanted to look at the site with the group and identify viewpoints from which the bridge is likely to be seen. He gave examples of viewpoints from I-5, Franklin, and as a pedestrian from below. He said they want to take into consideration the perspectives of people who will be looking at the bridge over the next 50

years. Lou said they had received good input and he invited members of the group to highlight any issues they had discussed.

Bob Kline noted the viewpoints from the bike path area and Glenwood and observed that the existing bridge was rather sterile. He added that the bridge will be highly visible from Glenwood after it is redeveloped with paths.

David Sonnichsen noted that they had seen four herons starting to nest in the rookery tree.

Charlotte Behm described the tour route. She said they had discussed ideas for the pedestrian detour, environmental impact, and water runoff.

Bob Kline said they had talked about phasing and how the old bridge would come down first. Lou said that while the detour bridge was built quickly, it will take longer to tear down two bridges and build a single wider bridge or two bridges side by side. He noted that it could take three construction seasons. He agreed that there is a need to maintain pedestrian and cycling traffic during the construction and deconstruction, and he acknowledged that the detours will be in place for some time. Renée Benoit asked how long a "construction season" was. Tim Dodson said that the season is year long but that in-water work can only proceed from the end of June to the end of August. He noted that they were restricted during periods critical to the migratory fish. Jamie noted that there is also coordination with the rookery season.

Bob Kline noted the discussion of river hydraulics. Lou said that there had been some discussion of eliminating or reducing the number of piers. He noted that some of the more aesthetically pleasing bridges might include a pier in the middle of the main channel, which should be avoided. He also noted that Franklin Blvd limits the location of piers as there is the need to consider future expansions of the road in terms of width and vertical clearance.

David Sonnichsen noted the discussion of bridge height. Lou explained that the permanent replacement bridge could be 5-10 feet taller than the detour bridge.

Rich Hazel asked whether the bridge's "intolerable" rating on the evaluation table referred to the clearance over Franklin. Tim said that the rating came from the clearances over Franklin and the railroad.

Trevor Taylor asked for clarification on the work season. Tim Dodson said that it's still up in the air and that once a design firm is onboard, more thought will be given to what can be accomplished in one season, or in-water work period. He noted that one season is a short time for demolishing a bridge, but said that construction will probably be continuous once it begins.

Charlotte asked whether the bike path would be closed for the duration of the construction. Tim said it is possible as it is likely that the staging area will cross the bike path. He noted that there will be considerations for bike facilities and accommodations for bicycles would add to the attractiveness of build plans. Ann Sanders noted examples of when access had been restricted in the past.

Charlotte noted that both she and Bob were concerned about project noise.

Lou said that there were three groups to consider when considering viewpoints: I-5 traffic, pedestrian traffic below the bridge looking up, and people viewing the bridge from a distance. He noted that the total length of the bridge was 1,800 feet and noted that it is important to consider whether bridge treatments should be applied to the whole bridge even if some of it isn't visible.

Tim Dodson noted perspectives from Glenwood, Franklin, from the south, mid-river, and from the northwest looking under the bridge.

Dave asked whether it was only important to make the portion of the bridge over the river look nice whether it was important to make the whole thing look good. He noted the distinct sections of the bridge passing over the river and over the land. He noted how options are somewhat restricted by the location of Franklin, the railroad tracks, and the main channel. He suggested that taking those constraints into consideration would restrict the available options. Lou noted that there are few points where the whole bridge will be visible. He also noted that an arch might be appropriate over the river, but would be difficult to make work with the railroad tracks.

John Barofsky suggested a "tie-in" of some sort that would give a continuous feel to the whole structure: a continuum of bridge.

Chris Ramey noted the significance of the crossing for through travelers on I-5, framing the river and the beginning of the valley. He suggested that it would be a missed opportunity for passengers to cross the state's major river without recognizing the view. He added that it might be more of an experience for the northbound traveler.

A member of the public expressed that he didn't want to see distractions for drivers. Jamie acknowledged the comment and explained that there will be time at the meeting's close for public comments.

Charlotte Behm noted that she was surprised at the small space between Franklin and the bridge.

Rich Hazel noted an important viewpoint above Franklin looking towards both spans without obstruction. Jamie said that Lou was planning to look at that viewpoint in the afternoon. Ann Sanders agreed that the view from Franklin was important for through travelers. She added that because the budget is set, more money spent on one perspective means less spent on the others.

Jamie summarized the list of suggested viewpoints. Lou also noted that the group had suggested a view from the "top of the Prairie" section of the park.

Ann Sanders suggested a view from I-5 traveling across the bridge. Jamie noted that the I-5 perspective—as also suggested by Chris—uses the bridge as a "gateway" experience to Eugene or the valley. She noted that such features emerged as popular in many conversations around the state.

***Signature bridge discussion*** – Lou said they would be describing the tools they intend to use for bridge types. He encouraged the group to discuss what constitutes a signature bridge and whether such a structure must always jump out, or whether it should blend in.

***Visual simulations*** – Lou showed some early on examples of bridges placed in the setting and described some of the evaluation techniques. He emphasized that the examples were just ideas.

Lou introduced Melissa Hennessey, senior bridge engineer with OBDP.

Charlotte asked about the location of the spans for the example bridges. Lou said the spans were movable and could vary in length to accommodate needs. He said the spans could be locate don the banks or 50 feet inland.

Melissa noted that a 250-300 foot span was being considered for crossing the main channel on the northern side of the river. Ann Sanders asked about the maximum length of a span built with haunched girders. Melissa said it could cross about 400 feet.

Chris Ramey asked whether a new EA would be required if a new deck could be installed on the existing piers. Tim Dodson said that an EA would be necessary because a work bridge would be built. He noted that construction poses the largest impact for the project. Ann Sanders pointed out that the piers would need to be refitted to meet seismic standards. Tim noted that the bridge might also not be wide enough. He noted that they've had a hard time defining a no-build option.

Charlotte expressed concern with the number of piers per bridge and asked whether treatments that reduce or hide the piers would be beneficial. Melissa showed examples of bridges that only required one pier on each side of each span.

Melissa noted that the depth of the haunch would be deeper if the spans were longer and would give the impression of an arch. She also noted pier designs that can add character. As examples, she showed "V" piers similar to the Woodrow Wilson Bridge in Washington, DC. She also showed examples of 360 foot spans.

Chris Ramey suggested the possibility of extending the piers above the bridge deck to make it clear that a bridge is being crossed.

Dave Carvo noted that an arch bridge would not work over Franklin and the railroad, and would require a different design on that side. Lou noted that there have been preferences for centering the river within a three span arch bridge. He noted that even a steeper arch would not provide consistent adequate clearance over the entire width of Franklin.

Melissa noted that an arch bridge could be built with or without vertical column elements as necessary.

Lou explained a visual simulation image and the process for recreating with a computer what the setting could look like. He said that such simulations will give a good sense of where to take the actual pictures.

Charlotte Behm asked whether it would be possible to move the ends of the arches further from the riverbanks. Melissa said it would be difficult for a concrete arch with a 360 foot span. Lou noted that Franklin sets the standard for the spacing of the piers if they want to be symmetrical. Charlotte asked about treatments over the pedestrian areas. Lou said that there would be another span on either end, one passing over the trail. He said that although the trail wouldn't be right next to the water, it will be close.

John Barofsky asked whether a single bridge structure was not being considered. Lou said a single bridge was not out of the question, but did not have the same advantages as two bridges. He explained the advantages of structure, detour options, and light. John asked for renderings of a single span bridge. Melissa said that they would look fairly similar to the images being shown, particularly from the side view. John said he was concerned about the number of piers being less on a single bridge. Tim said that the piers on a single bridge would either be very wide, or there would be two. John asked for examples of where it might be different and noted that the impact might be reduced for building one pier instead of two.

Dave Carvo asked whether there was a seismic advantage to a particular style of bridge. Melissa explained that all of the designs must comply with the same standards. Chris asked whether some of the designs were considered more efficient at resisting seismic impacts. Tim said that seismic efficiency made little impact on materials used. Melissa pointed out that some examples are more cost effective than others.

Bob Kline asked whether it would be impractical to consider no piers. Melissa said that the span would need to be about 1,000 feet and would limit the bridge types to cable-stayed or suspension bridges that would be much more expensive. She added that such a bridge would increase the overall bridge length because it would be necessary to balance the section over the water.

***Design ideas to consider*** – Lou explained how a 3D CAD model may be created and placed in a photographic scene. He explained that the 3D designs are not exact, but are engineered to the extent that they know they'll work and will fit within the budget.

John Barofsky noted that the piers in the models all seem to be symmetrical flat forms and asked whether there is ever engineering that is designed to work with the hydrodynamics of the river. Tim noted that the examples show only elementary details and said that the real bridge will deal with more specific architectural elements. He explained that they are looking to establish general bridge design so the EA can be completed. He said it might mean—for example—defining places where piers shouldn't go or a specific number of piers, that will help to define the extent of the environmental impact. He noted that the design decisions won't be cast in stone and there will be another 1 ½ years of design effort to follow.

Lou emphasized that the plan was not to design a cheap bridge and make it look nice, but rather to approach the bridge holistically with built-in aesthetic treatments. He noted that the detour bridge itself represents the most economical structure, but it's not what is being sought.

Chris Ramey said that he appreciates the emphasis on form but also wants to keep some funds for aesthetic treatments and potential treatments above the deck. Ann Sanders asked the group to provide example pictures of variations on existing structures. Lou said they had collected a variety of treatment examples.

Tim asked whether it would be possible to use two longer spans with the central pier set off-center in the river and the northern pier farther from the shore. Melissa said it might be possible with a segmental haunch bridge. Lou noted that such a structure would still require a pier close to or within the main channel. He noted that while there is efficiency and aesthetics in having the spans be the same length, they don't need to be that way.

## INTRODUCE DRAFT EVALUATION CRITERIA

The draft evaluation criteria were passed out for discussion at the next meeting. The next meeting will involve discussion of how the criteria will affect the bridge types. Jamie noted that they were looking for feedback on whether the criteria cover the goals and objectives. Tim also asked the group to think about measurable ways to determine whether the criteria are being met. Jamie emphasized that they don't want to lose anything along the way.

## NEXT STEPS

Jamie noted that the next meeting will be from 10am-1pm in the same location. Lou said that they will need to narrow the potential viewpoints before the next meeting as there are currently have too many. Jamie asked Lou to send out a digital picture from each potential viewpoint and allow for an email discussion of the range of photos.

Bob Kline asked whether there was consensus for a single pier or two. Jamie suggested bringing it up at next meeting.

Lou noted that they were tentatively planning for a public meeting to be held in April. The meeting will allow the team to present bridge examples for the public to comment on, while giving the team the opportunity to explain the process schedule. Lou said that there is still the need to reach a wider audience and the group's help is needed in capturing the work to date.

Charles Biggs asked what will be covered by the PDT. Jamie said that the conversation will probably focus on the evaluation criteria and that the PDT agendas are basically identical to the CAG agendas. Charles asked that copies of the PowerPoint presentation be sent out. Lou said he would. Lou encouraged the group to let him know if they see anything they like.

## CLOSE