

# Summary – Meeting #4

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

*March 14, 2007, 10:00 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
- 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

- 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
- Anne Peterson – HDR
- 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 #3
- Revised Evaluation Criteria
- Draft Conceptual Bridge Alternatives Report
- Public Open House draft approach

### WELCOME AND AGENDA REVIEW

Jamie welcomed the group and reviewed the purpose of the meeting:

- Review and Discuss/Finalize Evaluation Criteria
- Discuss Design Considerations
- Discuss Approach for Public Open House in April

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

*Sarah Strand* noted that she had expressed interest in involving kids in the project. She brought a suspension bridge model made by her son. She noted the Carquinez Bridge in the San Francisco area as an example signature bridge. She felt strongly that the bridge design should not be divided into different sections over the railroad and the river. She passed around photographs of the bridge and noted that, from Franklin Boulevard, the section over the railroad is more visible than the section over the river. She asked about the project funding sources and the feasibility of community fundraising to benefit the bridge. She also asked whether there had been consideration a design with no piers in the river. Jamie noted that the group had considered no-pier options. Tim Dodson explained the bridge funding sources, noting that roughly \$150 million comes from OTIA III funds and \$30 million come from earmarked federal funds obtained by Congressman DeFazio. He explained that \$8.8 million of the federal dollars were designated for aesthetic considerations. He noted that the construction of the most absolute minimum efficient bridge would cost about \$65 million, including the construction of work bridges. He described the project area as extending from just north of the Paterson Slough Bridge to halfway between Franklin Blvd and Glenwood Interchange.

Trevor confirmed that Paterson Slough Bridge referred to the Canoe Canal Bridge, and asked whether it was going to be replaced. Tim said that it could be replaced or widened. Charlotte Behm noted that Paterson Slough isn't near the project and referring to the bridge as such is confusing for the public. She emphasized that the appropriate name is Canoe Canal Bridge. Tim noted that the names come from official documents, but acknowledged that they aren't always correct and can be changed. He stated that we would make every effort to now refer to the bridge as the Canoe Canal Bridge.

*Charles Biggs* encouraged ODOT to consider hosting a design competition for the bridge, noting the possibility of a better quality product at a lower price. Charles passed around two books with bridge design concepts for the CAG to review.

## **COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

**Summary of Meeting #3** – There were no changes.

**Update on community briefings** – Jamie noted that a briefing was scheduled for Springfield in March; Lou explained that Ray Mabey from ODOT will be conducting a short presentation and work session. He noted that the University will be hosting a design workshop during the 2<sup>nd</sup> week of April and they are trying to involve perspectives on the bridge from experts in the field. Jamie added that the HOPES conference will be at the end of April and noted that efforts are being made to reach out to that group as well as University staff. Renée Benoit noted that the event Lou described was the AIA 150, a charette and work session looking at the Franklin Corridor from the Eugene Courthouse district to Glenwood. She said that the event is the second in a series and will be held April 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> in Springfield. Renée encouraged having staff present to talk about the plans for the bridge, as the event will attract people from the university, planners, and property owners. She directed the group to [www.franklincorridor.org](http://www.franklincorridor.org) for more information.

Jamie reminded the CAG that members of the project team were available to give presentations at neighborhood meetings. Lou said he hadn't heard from anyone yet.

## **PROJECT UPDATE**

**Distribute Final Conceptual Bridge Alternative Report** – Lou noted that while much of what is covered in the report isn't new, it does include explanations on funding and how some recommendations were made in consideration of the project budget. He also noted new example images within the report. Lou explained that some of the bridge types were found to be far outside of the budget and he emphasized the need to be realistic with public expectations. Rich Hazel asked about the authorship of the document. Lou said it was created by OBDP and reviewed by ODOT.

John Barofsky noted that based on the estimated bridge costs and assumptions within the report, it appeared that creating a continuous structure type (of a more aesthetic type) over the railroad and river was out of the question. Lou noted that considerations had to be made. John expressed concern at limits being placed so early in the process. Tim noted that not all of the options assumed different types of spans. Jamie noted that the footnote was a qualifier for the data, and noted that the list doesn't necessarily describe the only menu of options. Tim noted that the original assumption was that the river was the more important visual element, though there have been numerous recent statements that place the emphasis on the Franklin crossing. He noted that figures within the report are only examples of how the money could be divided up. John explained that he wants to make sure that nothing is precluded. Tim noted that the Franklin viewpoint is being considered.

Renée asked about the \$100 million in the budget beyond the \$70 million for just the bridge structure. James said that it covered elements outside of the bridge.

Jamie noted that the table in the report is intended to put the costs in perspective. Lou explained that cost gap between different types of bridges can be quite large. Tim noted that they were looking at spending \$200-\$400 per square foot on this bridge, while the Sundial Pedestrian Bridge in Redding, by contrast, cost \$1400 per square foot. Jamie noted that it was important to not lead people down an unrealistic path.

Lou noted the handout with the renderings of the bridges discussed at the last CAG meeting. He emphasized that the bridges in the renderings weren't the only options to choose from and that it was still early in the process.

Trevor Taylor asked whether there were assumptions regarding the number of piers. Lou said that all of the bridges included at least one pier in the river, though he noted that the use of two piers in the river could decrease the cost per square foot. Lou explained that a no pier option would probably need to be cable stayed or suspension and would be substantially more expensive. He added that none of the bridge types under consideration require more than two piers—substantially fewer than the old bridge or the detour bridge. Lou noted that using two piers to make three span openings could serve to center the view and be more pleasing to the eye.

Rich Hazel noted that some of the illustrations use descriptions that don't appear on the table page. He noted that Figure 4 doesn't correlate with Table 1 and suggested using the same terminology to make the references more obvious.

John Barofsky asked whether the costs accounted for one or two piers. Tim said that the analysis wasn't that specific and that the cost estimates were averages. He explained that the use of two piers

tends towards the lower end of the average. Chris Ramey clarified that the bridge concepts would have one or two piers per bridge, for a total of two or four piers total in the river.

Jamie asked whether it was possible to provide a sense of cost variability. Tim said that prices could go about 5% either way. Lou said that inflation rates have been assumed, but noted that those rates are hard to guess.

## **DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS/CONSTRAINTS**

Jamie explained how the group needs to consider the design considerations and constraints. She explained that the considerations were based on the visual preferences as recommended by the CAG and PDT. She noted examples of considerations such as rail treatments that aren't jersey barriers, good views for through-travelers, and views from below. Jamie introduced Anne Peterson who will be able to listen to the design considerations and discuss how they might relate to the bridge type. She asked each member of the CAG to briefly state what they're looking for in the bridge so that the team can bring a list of considerations to the public meeting and ask for the public's opinions as well. Jamie acknowledged that some of the ideas may conflict with each other. Anne offered that she will be looking for common threads that might make individual positions more apparent. Jamie noted that the idea is to lay out expectations and constraints early in the process to prevent selecting a bridge type that ultimately won't work. Lou encouraged the group to lay out unique considerations that might not be apparent to people from Salem or Portland.

Chris Ramey asked that members distinguish the considerations important to their constituencies from their personal priorities. Tim noted that the CAG will be the primary resource to the PDT and responsible for providing input on which bridge types are the most acceptable for consideration. He noted that the goal is to take something close to what the public wants along to the public meeting. Jamie emphasized that the list is not intended to be exhaustive.

*Chris Ramey* – Travelers need to understand that they are geographically located at the beginning of the valley and the river. Considerations need to be made for the people in the area who use the park, the river, and Franklin Street. Consider what the bridge looks like underneath and what will make the park a better place to be. Consider stewardship of public resources in building and maintaining the bridge; leave a legacy for the people who will someday have to replace the bridge. The bridge should look intentionally designed and appealing. The bridge should contribute positively to those who pass underneath. It shouldn't be a dust shelf or a leftover space that drips things.

*Renée Benoit* – The bridge should be without jersey barriers. The bridge must be approached holistically as a structure that comes together and looks good as a whole.

*Trevor Taylor* – When crossing the bridge quickly, it is important for the traveler to know that they are arriving in Eugene or the valley. There should be a feel that they have come to something that's different. There should be a gateway element. Looking perpendicular to bridge from a distance, the bridge should integrate with the landscape; the mountains and the forest. It should not be a super modern structure that stands out starkly against the landscape, nor should it have a dramatic lighting system. It should be integrated with nature with softer curves. It should not be boxy and linear. Driving and walking under the bridge are different experiences. Walking under the bridge could be an artistic experience and could capture walkers' interest to

the point where they want to stay there and experience it. The wrought iron fence under the DeFazio Bridge is as an example. Aesthetics are important, but environmental concerns and sustainability are more important.

*Dave Carvo* – The Glenwood perspective will change as the riverfront changes. A square, utilitarian bridge design would not complement the new development. The bridge should be a uniform style from abutment to abutment without two different aesthetics. There should be balance and smooth clean lines. Anything is better than the existing utilitarian construction.

*Charlotte Behm* – Springfield neighbors need park access and it's important to focus on the perspective of those who walk under the bridge. The park made a choice to bring the Kalapuya influence and theme into the park, and it would be important to invite the Kalapuya people to contribute and let the bridge reflect those people and their values. There are no straight lines in nature, so curves are good. Charlotte noted the design of the "Talking Stones" and the shapes of natural forms, how the river flows, and the simple elegance of natural arches. Any art should reflect the people who have been here before.

*John Barofsky* – The bridge should be a clean looking and clean feeling structure. Minimizing piers is important. The design should continue above the roadway, possibly with arches. A flat bridge doesn't convey the gateway feel. People should be able to see the park and the natural areas from I-5. Color is a good way to set the bridge apart. The bridge could be sage green; it doesn't need to be brown. All considerations should be holistic.

*Rich Hazel* - Recognize that future generations will be looking at the bridge and that today's uses may not be the same as those in the future. The bridge crosses an active, flowing river, and should not look like simply an elevated causeway. The bridge should have an arch or curving quality about it. ODOT should look for inspiration from the McCullough bridges on the Oregon Coast.

*Pat French* – The bridge should not be dark and dingy when viewed from underneath. The underside should not be cold and damp. The underside should be interesting, but not overpowering or enclosing. There should be graceful curves, not a straight concrete thing. The river should be visible and the superstructure should indicate a river crossing. Colors should be subtle and match the environment. Aesthetics should not override the environment. One pier is the better option, or whatever protects the river the most.

*David Sonnichsen* – The V-pier concept is attractive, though a no pier option would be best. The river should be honored with an elegant, simple structure. An open bridge should link Springfield and Eugene through Glenwood instead of acting as a fence. ODOT had promised to remove the fill at the northern end of the bridge. As the fill takes up a lot of space in the park, it should be trucked out and the north end of the bridge should be supported by something more open.

Anne summarized the considerations: the bridge can be viewed from slow, fast, or static speeds, from a distance or close up, and the bridge form from these different perspectives should be considered as the bridge evokes an identity unique to the area. She noted that the arch is a timeless form that creates visual connections. Arches slow down eye movement, frame views of what lies beyond, and connect points. She noted that people seem to want something above the bridge to

create a long distance identity. She noted that the shape of piers can direct the eye, and it makes a difference how the pier engages the river or land. She explained that bridge types can affect the form of the piers. She noted that changing some elements can affect other features in a ripple effect. The number of piers can affect the bridge depth which would in turn affect the bridge height. She also noted the need for safety considerations. She noted that there are other barrier shapes besides jersey barriers. Anne said that she heard a lot of common ground.

Anne referred the group to the images in the packets. She noted examples of how a V-pier could be coupled with a straight deck or with haunched girders. She noted how curved piers could direct the eye above the deck or how gateway features could occur on the river or before it. She noted that an above deck treatment for the I-5 traveler may not translate into a suitable long distance view.

Lou noted a segmental box girder as an example of incorporating a curve. Anne noted the clean lines used in the haunched girder and how the bridge deck is integral to the girder structure. John Barofsky suggested continuing the V-pier above the deck to create complete arch forms. Charlotte Behm asked whether it was possible to round out the bottom side of the deck. Lou said it might be possible to create a rounded look even if it's not structural. Anne noted that there are other ways to incorporate curved lines into the piers and give the appearance of an arch.

Dave Carvo asked whether it would be possible to use deeply haunched girders to create an arch with no piers. Tim noted that while the curvature of the arch can be moved closer to the water, the span is too wide for a haunched bridge. He confirmed that without more money, none of the options currently on the table could completely span the river without piers.

Lou noted that haunches can impede roadway clearance, creating some limitations for the placement of piers and spans. He emphasized that the crossing above Franklin is important to consider and that they are designing to accommodate a future potential seven lanes on Franklin because they want to be conservative in allowing Franklin to grow in the future. Chris Ramey asked if the seven lane figure can be revisited if it becomes a design concern. Tim explained that although they were starting with a conservative assumption, if it affects affordability, it might need to be modified.

Jamie encouraged the group to continue the discussion of design considerations over subsequent meetings

## **EVALUATION CRITERIA**

Jamie noted that the PDT has already given input that has been reflected in the evaluation criteria, and it is important to make sure that the CAG's concerns are reflected. James noted that the criteria have been divided into screening criteria and evaluation criteria. He explained that the screening criteria are pass/fail criteria to eliminate unworkable options while the evaluation criteria are designed to further compare alternatives. He noted that the NEPA document will discuss how the criteria are applied, but for the purpose of the discussion, the goal is to determine bridge type, size, and location. Jamie noted that the screening and evaluation criteria don't replace the goals and objectives, which cover broader but less evaluative content.

James explained that the first three screening criteria were essentially a restatement of the purpose and need. Tim asked whether a "no" for the evaluation criteria constitutes a fatal flaw. James noted that they wouldn't necessarily be fatal flaws, but the evaluation criteria will help differentiate

between the alternatives and to determine tradeoffs. He said that evaluating the consequences of not meeting a certain evaluation criteria is the next step.

Charlotte suggested using square-footage of habitat affected instead of “approximate area” in measuring disturbances to Alton Baker Park.

Chris Ramey suggested separating temporary construction impacts from permanent impacts. He suggested that as paths are required to be open during construction, the issue should be “how many” paths are safe and open during construction, not whether or not they are. He asked if keeping the paths open should not also be a screening criterion. Lou agreed that there is a commitment to making a safe commuter route available, though not all of the paths may be open during construction. Tim agreed that the question is in how to judge the impact. Chris proposed measuring the permanent impacts to the paths. Trevor Taylor suggested using the duration of closure as an easy to quantify measurement for path impacts.

The CAG expressed concerns that there was no language about enhancing environment. There were also concerns about including perspectives beyond auto traffic. Pat French noted that while meeting future capacity need is a given, it appears from the language used that it is only an assumption that the paths will be kept open. Tim proposed adding a new screening criterion: “safe bicycle commuter path open during construction.”

Jamie suggested structuring the criteria by permanent and temporary construction impacts and suggested that it might be helpful to have a preamble connecting the goals and objectives to the screening and evaluation criteria.

Dave Carvo asked whether the screening and evaluation criteria are used separately from the goals and objectives and whether the goals will be used again. James explained that the goals and objectives are the long-term guiding principles for the project. He noted that they provide guidance in shaping the criteria, but once the initial decisions about the alternatives are made, the goals and objectives will help guide the design process. He noted that the evaluation and screening criteria reflect only the quantifiable parts of the goals and objectives. Trevor Taylor noted that the NEPA process will help determine which alternative to pick and help determine whether one alternative does something better than another. He noted that NEPA requires looking at several alternatives and defending why one was selected based on measurable criteria. He added that any additional goals and objectives that can be measured should be included.

Dave Carvo asked how the non-measurable elements of the goals and objectives are factored in to the decision. Tim explained that the criteria go beyond the NEPA process and will be used to refine the alternatives and will eventually be used to realize the final placement. He described goals as high level and philosophically based, while objectives are the means to the goal and the criteria are measurable subsets of the objectives. Jamie noted goal 3(D) as an example of an objective that doesn’t relate to selecting the bridge type itself and doesn’t have a corresponding set of criteria. She noted that the criteria are for helping to make the initial selections, but once those are made, there will be a return to the overarching goals and objectives as the final alternatives get closer.

David Sonnichsen noted that the eventual return to the goals and objectives was unclear in the context of how the criteria were stated. Jamie apologized for any miscommunication. Lou noted that the misunderstanding helps to clarify what needs to be explained at the public meeting.

Jamie offered to work with the criteria, add a preamble, and use language closer to the original goals and objectives. Trevor Taylor offered to send out suggestions for measurable criteria to the group. Jamie said she will send out the criteria and seek feedback via email within a week or so. She encouraged that suggestions be sent by Friday.

David Sonnichsen asked whether a CAG meeting was planned before the open house. Jamie said there was not. Jamie passed around a draft open house plan. The plan proposed two open houses: one in Springfield, one in Eugene. She noted that the open houses would cover the goals and objectives, the evaluation criteria, bridge types under consideration, costs, design considerations, and possibly a background information slideshow. She noted that there wouldn't be anything that the CAG hasn't already seen. David asked how responses will be gathered from the public. Jamie said that responses will be gathered on flipcharts and on comment forms. Jamie encouraged comments on the open house plan within the next week as well as potentially conflicting events during the week of April 23<sup>rd</sup>. Jamie said she would respond with a revised plan, and noted that there would be a role for CAG members at the open house.

John Barofsky noted that the city budget committee meets Monday through Wednesday.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

*Sarah Strand* said that she liked the idea of incorporating Native American or trees/wood themes.

#### **CLOSE**



## FLIP CHART NOTES

### Design Considerations

- Understand geographically where the traveler is when coming to the area on I-5; adding something positive to my experience
- How it looks from the underneath, “Intentionally Designed”
- Sustainable materials
- Something other than Jersey barriers for rails
- Holistic look – hang together – not disparate entities
- Gateway – “You know you’ve arrived” for the I-5 traveler
- Together with the river and the setting – River/Mountains/Forest
- Integrates with the natural landscape – subtle – compliments a natural view – softer curves
- Close up/personal experience under the bridge... interesting, artistic, artwork, touch
- An open feeling - Connect the communities of Eugene and Springfield rather than a “fence” between the communities
- Need to leverage Peter Defazio’s influence as much as possible
- Remove the fill in the park – northern end of bridge supported by something else
- Consider how design may change in the future if, for example, freight considerations change
- Rolling river – active – emphasis crossing a river – not a causeway – use inspiration from other Oregon bridges
- Arch structure above the deck
- Light under bridge – upbeat feeling – not cold, damp, dark
- Not overpowering – Not enclosing
- Not straight concrete thing over river
- See the river
- No piers – honor river with a pillar-less, elegant, simple structure
- Give up aesthetic if needed for good environmental stewardship – understand the trade-offs
- Compliment the “high end” condos that could be in Glenwood – something better than what we typically get from “dirt-to-dirt”
- Continuity of form – style- smooth, clean lines
- Leverage available funds to the max
- Potential for bridge to “look like the natural area”
- Ask the Kalapuya people how to integrate their values
- No straight lines in nature – no points
- Use form found in natural areas – simple, elegant
- Intentional design above the roadway
- See the park – See the natural area
- Color – Sage green? Not just sandstone brown