



French Prairie Bridge Project Task Force Meeting #2

Draft Meeting Summary
Monday, May 22, 2017
6 PM – 9 PM

Wilsonville City Hall
29799 SW Town Center Loop E, Wilsonville, OR
Willamette River Rooms I & II

Task Force Members Present

Jeremy Appt, Heidi Bell, Steve Benson, Jim Bernard, Jenny Cavarano (Alt. for Karen Houston), Steve Chinn, Andrew Harvey, Tony Holt, Pete Ihrig, Douglas Muench, Samara Phelps, Patricia Rehberg, Michelle Ripple, Leann Scotch, Ryan Sparks, David Stead, Susie Stevens, Steven Van Wechel, Gary Wappes

Project Team (PT) Present

Bob Goodrich, OBEC Consulting Engineers; Zach Weigel, Nancy Kraushaar, Mark Ottenad, City of Wilsonville; Kirstin Greene, Elise Scolnick, Cogan Owens Greene; Karen Buehrig, Clackamas County, Barbara Jacobson, City Attorney; Reem Khaki, Terra Lingley, ODOT

Task Force and PT Members Unable to Attend

Councilor Charlotte Lehan, Blake Arnold; Brian Sherrard, Tualatin Valley Fire & Rescue, Simon Springall

Community Present

Mark Heining, Sophia Pace, Michelle Ratter, Anthony Yeznach, Ross Zimmerman

Conversation summarized by agenda item below.

1. Welcome and Introductions

6 – 6:05 pm

City Councilor Susie Stevens opened the meeting on behalf of Co-Chair Councilor Charlotte Lehan, thanking Task Force members for their participation. She summarized the tour of bridge alignments that took place during the late afternoon, just before the meeting.

Kirstin Greene, Task Force Facilitator with Cogan Owens Greene, invited members to introduce themselves. She noted the two times for public comment on the agenda and invited those who would like to make a comment to indicate that interest on the meeting sign in sheet.

Kirstin stated the goals of the meeting that evening: to finalize the charter, to review the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)'s recommended evaluation criteria and to consider/possibly adjust the weighting of the six (6) evaluation criteria. Finally, she noted that Task Force members will receive an update regarding Alignment W3.

City of Wilsonville Project manager Zach Weigel introduced Barbara Jacobson, City Attorney, who gave an overview of conflict of interest standards. Barbara shared that committee members should state

their conflicts of interest – meaning if they stand to personally benefit from any decision, to state that before any deliberation or decision is made. If anyone has a question about conflicts of interest, Barbara encouraged them to call and discuss it with her. For decision-making, Task Force members should recuse themselves if they can't represent the community interests at large, or state their conflict before the vote, affirming that they are voting not on behalf of that interest, but with impartiality.

One member asked about the difference between being a stakeholder and having a conflict of interest. Barbara mentioned that having a benefit or a friend or relative with a benefit/self-interest would be a conflict. Where Task Force members were appointed due to their stakeholder perspective, they should declare a) when they have a potential conflict, and b) whether or not that conflict affects their ability to cast an unbiased vote on behalf of the community at large.

Steve Chinn mentioned that his neighborhood had a community meeting on this topic. He asked if he could express the view of his community at the table. *Barbara: Yes.*

2. Agenda Review

6:05-6:10pm

Kirstin reviewed the proposed agenda. No changes were made to it.

Zach mentioned these project updates:

- Selection of bridge alignment landing points is moved from June to fall 2017 to allow for additional research requested by the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde.
- There may be a need for additional Task Force meeting(s).

A community member asked when bridge selection would take place. Kirstin went over the project timeline and indicated there would be a future selection process in the fall. This evening is focused on the evaluation criteria alone; without respect to location.

3. Charter Updates and Vote

6:10-6:20 pm

- Kirstin read through the charter changes on page 30 of the meeting packet. She asked for any changes that are proposed. She asked for agreement. Members agreed unanimously to adopt the charter as amended.
- Kirstin also asked for any changes to the meeting summary; none were identified.
- Zach reviewed the W3 alignment and ODOT's request to reserve that right-of-way for future widening of the Boone Bridge. The City looked at whether there can be a shift to the west of alignment W3. Due to the location of existing homes and a natural drainage channel, alignment W3 cannot shift far enough west such that the ODOT property is not impacted. The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) recommended keeping the W3 alignment in the scoring criteria as it is early in the planning process and funding phase is very far out into the future.
 - Tony Holt: Is the full wide area shown on the map needed?
 - Zach: ODOT wants to preserve a large amount of width for right-of-way since it is unknown on what is needed to widen/improve the Boone Bridge.
 - Steve Benson: What is the size of the right-of-way area?
 - Zach: Right-of-way area is about 270 from the west edge of the Boone Bridge to the proposed French Prairie Bridge and 400 feet to the edge of the property.
 - Terra Lingley: It is all about managing risk. ODOT has a potential future project in this area.
 - Reem Khaki: This W3 alignment is closest to I-5 and needed for staging and maintenance. It is high priority to improve Boone Bridge.

4. Public Comment

6:20-6:30 pm

- Sophia Pace, Riverside resident, stated that Butteville Lane is too narrow. Is the project to build a bigger Boone Bridge, which is her preference? There is no infrastructure to handle tourists. The neighbors are not prepared to deal with tourists.

Kirstin noted that in addition to the public meeting where Sophia and other members contributed these perspectives, Task Force members will take Sophia's comments under advisement.

Work-to-Date-Bob Goodrich, OBEC

6:30-6:45 pm

- Opportunities and Constraints Memo
 - In his presentation, consulting team project manager Bob Goodrich, OBEC, showed a map indicating the risks/constraints shown in the Opportunities and Constraints memo. These risks include overhead power lines, Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) land and a water treatment plant discharge pipe. There are also historic and cultural resources in the area.
 - Kirstin mentioned the goal exception process for land use.
 - Tony: The two west alignments land in EFU zones on the south sides.
 - Jim Bernard: They also land in the Urban Reserves. Existing roads can be widened but not new roads under the state statute for urban reserves. The legislature may have to address this. The urban reserves don't exist yet, but they will by tomorrow when a decision is expected.
 - Bob: The Opportunities and Constraints report is multidisciplinary; geotechnical, hydraulics, etc. The report can be found on the project web site at www.Frenchprairiebridgeproject.com.
 - Steve C: Question about the Project Update map; orange sections on map indicate historic resources on the end of each alignment, according to the legend.
 - Bob: Red areas are historic resources, not the orange ones. Orange is actually bridge, retaining wall, or path to be further determined following a location decision. Yellow areas are the main bridge spans.
 - David Stead: Is this Task Force to decide the preferred alignment or recommend not to build a bridge?
 - Zach: Yes, a recommendation for one of the three alignments, which will go to City Council.
 - Kirstin: It's up to City Council to pursue. She acknowledged Sophia's question about why not widen the Boone Bridge; that option had been previously studied and not selected by the City of Wilsonville in a preceding process.
 - Steve C: How long a timeline until construction? Three, four years?
 - Kirstin: Longer than that; more like ten.
 - Susie: It's been in discussion since the 1990's. There is not yet funding for it. Many surveys have indicated public interest in a new bridge. It is a huge project.
 - Nancy Kraushaar: It could be 8-10 years from now, or longer. It will have to go through many reviews.
 - Reem: Expanding I-5 bridge is an option.
 - Heidi Bell: had a question about funding for widening I-5.
 - Reem: ODOT doesn't have funding yet.
 - Terra: The Regional Transportation Plan goes out to 2040 and it not even on that list.
 - Kirstin: Council will make ultimate decision on the preferred French Prairie bridge alignment.
 - Michelle Ripple: Asked ODOT to say when this bridge will likely be planned.
 - Jim: It will be well over \$1B. Many other bridges need to be earthquake retrofitted and updated first. The Boone Bridge is way, way off in the future.

- Mark Ottenad: During the research on congestion that a southbound lane, bridge is not on the State Transportation Improvement Plan (STIP). Study of auxiliary lanes, WES, French Prairie Bridge is needed to see what makes the most sense.
- Steve C: Wishes this info would have come out sooner in the process. He and his neighbors didn't know that bridge construction is way off in the future. Three of his neighbors have already put their houses up for sale.
- Kirstin commented that everyone should do due diligence on properties.

5. Evaluation Criteria-Bob Goodrich, OBEC

6:45-7:15 pm

Bob described work-to-date has included feedback from the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), Task Force (TF), public open house, City Council, and Clackamas County Board of Commissioners. In the Task Force packet, there is an Evaluation Criteria memo with listed criteria that was reviewed by the TAC at their meeting last week. He showed a slide on how the evaluation, scoring, design and weighting criteria and appendices are listed in the memo. Compliance with Americans with Disabilities Act, earthquake, environmental requirements and other federal criteria are not explicitly mentioned in the evaluation and weighting because they are basic design criteria which must be met, no matter what.

Bob reviewed each of the evaluation criteria with the Task Force. Comments on each section are below:

Refinements to TAC-Recommended Set

- **A-Connectivity and Safety**

- Michelle: On A2 and A4, she asked if there were any bike and pedestrian facilities planned on the south side of the bridge?
- Heidi said she had done some research on Clackamas County and Marion County Transportation System Plans (TSP). This bridge was mentioned in the Marion County TSP. [Note: the bridge and widening Butteville Road are in Clackamas County's TSP.]
 - On A-4 she wants to see folks come together to write a grant to do a feasibility study for bike paths.
- Michelle: A4 should be tied to the Clackamas County Transportation System Plan (TSP). Marion County doesn't have a plan yet.
- Bob: We are looking at regional and county plans for bike/ped facilities for connectivity.

- **B-Emergency Access**

- Heidi: B-1 (north), B-2(south) are not weighted fully. Why aren't they lumped together?
- Bob clarified how to score separately for direct connection from the north and south.
- Kirstin: The Project Management Team (PMT) will take a first crack at scoring, then make a recommendation to the TAC who will do the final scoring. This information will be presented to the TF to inform their location recommendation.
- Andrew Harvey: B-2-Emergency vehicles-do we know which alignments have better access?
- Bob reviewed the direct and indirect connections of the alignment options, and how they might be scored.
- Tony: His biggest concern is getting to the south. Is this taken into account somehow? One of the problems of Charbonneau is that emergency response time is not currently being met on the Boone Bridge. It is key to get to the south. Is it key to get to the north?
- Zach: Yes, for a variety of reasons, if the Boone Bridge is impassible.
- Michelle: The connections from the north or south is important.
- Susie: It's not just fire and ambulance. It could be the police, tow trucks, or National Guard.
- Jeremy: He's not seeing the earthquake need as being as great. Emergency services will be busy within the City, not serving north or south outside the city.

- Nancy: We might need fuel, helicopters, water, and power generators being delivered. This bridge could serve the community not just in a seismic event, but long term.
- Jeremy: Is there consideration of going straight up to the highway for rapid access instead of through Old Town?
- Bob: That has not been considered yet. For example, W3 could consider that, but it is unlikely because the access point would be within the I-5 traffic jam.
- **C-Environmental Impacts**
 - Steven VW: Are there concerns and input from the Confederated Tribes of Grand Rhonde?
 - Bob: This is an area of historical interest, from prior to European settlement; this area was a canoe crossing. More investigation is needed. The tribes want to know more before selection of an alignment. The first priority is avoidance of cultural resources. There is potential for impact these resources. An archaeology report would be done first, before selection. The report will address potential resources that are above ground and below ground.
 - Heidi: Signage or wayfinding information would be good to have in the river area about the historical and cultural importance of the place.
- **D-Compatibility with Recreational Goals**
 - Steven VW: Is the parking issue related to recreation? The bridge and recreation would increase parking.
 - Zach: Parking is not related to the bridge criteria. It is more a design issue. All alignments will need parking.
 - Kirstin: Mentioned Metro's concern about impacts and benefits of tourism
 - Bob: Criteria for tourism are in Category F.
 - Susie: Why are we providing for exceeding design criteria?
 - Bob: Exceeding minimum design criteria can provide for a better user experience. As an example, a slope of 5% meets minimum criteria, but a less steep slope would provide a better experience, better access.
 - Gary Wappes: Asked a question about improving access to the river.
 - Zach: We wanted to capture the impact of improving access to the river.
 - Steven VW: Wants comments from Parks & Rec about the impacts to Boones Ferry Park.
 - Kirstin: The Master Plan for Parks is on hold now for completion of the bridge plan.
 - Zach: The Boones Ferry Park master plan has just kicked off and the bridge project is being coordinated with Parks & Rec.
 - Steve B: We don't have anything on the bridge that has been brought to the Parks Advisory Committee yet for the Master Plan. What will make a good park?
 - Heidi: Consider getting comments from DEQ regarding any conflicts with providing river access near the discharge pipe.
 - Michelle: Shouldn't access be measured separately for the park and for the marina. The impacts might be very different.
 - Steve VW: Agrees with the difference in impacts.
 - Kirstin: Records a suggestion to amend D-2 to separate parks and marina (New D-3) on each side of the river.
 - Michelle: The marina is on the south side of the river.
 - Steve B: New park may have docks for boats (kayaks, canoes, etc.) on the north side.
 - Zach: The intent is to capture impacts of recreational uses of the river. If you split out you may be missing other recreational uses of the river.

- Michelle: One alignment may have good compatibility with the park on one side or the other, but another may not.
- Bob: We limited sub-criteria to 3-4 items to keep each sub-criteria meaningful. Too many in a list would dilute the importance of each one.
- There was extensive discussion on the options for rewording the criteria.
- Susie: Lack of access to the river is concern to the community.
- Michelle: Reword for each side of the river.
- Bob: **The consensus is to keep D-3, make it D-4 and revise D-2 and D-4, to be D-2 & D-3. These last two will focus on maximizing compatibility and flexibility on the north and south sides of the river. Specifically:**

D-2	Maximize compatibility with and flexibility for recreational uses including parks and the river on the north side.
D-3	Maximize compatibility with and flexibility for recreational uses, including parks, the marina and the river on the south side.
D-4	Maintain or improve river access.

- **E-Compatibility with Existing Built Environment**

- Steve C: Has the railroad expressed any concerns?
- Zach: Yes, they have concerns. We are meeting with them next week.

- **F-Cost & Economic Impact**

- Gary: How will we know how to make these judgements? How will we get enough information on total costs?
- Bob: There will be qualitative analysis of costs for each alignment. We don't yet have enough information on costs. We can provide order-of-magnitude cost estimating. The project team will use design information and come up with relative costs. The TF will only be asked about the weighting of the criteria.
- Kirstin: As a community representative, you will not be asked to score the criteria.
- Steve C: Sought to clarify Gary's question and Kirstin's response.
- Kirstin: The Task Force will only comment on and weight the criteria, not score it. The TAC will be scoring .
- Michelle: If Task Force disagrees with the TAC, can we comment on disagreements?
- Gary: He thought the Task Force would evaluate the criteria and make a recommendation for decision-making.
- Kirstin: That is not the process.
- Jim: Has someone already determined what we're going to do re: bike/ped/golf cart/emergency access, correct? Is that based on wanting to get money from ODOT, FHA?
- Kirstin: Yes.
- Zach: That decision was made years ago when applying for the grant for this bridge planning.
- Michelle: She was on the original committee when the bridge was first proposed. Bike/ped/golf cart/emergency access was desired by the community from day one. There have been years of study and input on this. It would be cheaper if it was just bike/ped.
- Steve B: As a community we are limited by I-5 and river for cross access.
- Jim: Five Eugene bridges have been built, mostly bike/pedestrian.

- Steve C: He would feel better if the Task Force makes recommendation on the evaluation criteria, then compares it with the Project Team, and present both to the City Council.
- Kirstin: Even the TAC members have different expertise to be used for scoring and weighting. The Project Team are the technical experts. Task Force comments are relevant, but not necessarily made with technical expertise. Comments are germane to the discussion.
- Steve C suggests having both Task Force and TAC participate scoring.
- Kirstin: The Task Force will recommend changes to criteria this evening. The Task Force will consider and use the TAC scoring to facilitate Task Force bridge alignment discussion and recommendation. Ultimately, the Task Force makes the recommendation to City Council on the final alignment, which does not have to match the TAC scoring.
- No changes to economic impact piece were proposed.

6. Alternatives-Bob Goodrich, Kirstin Greene

7:15 – 8:50 pm

- Any Weighting-Should there be any difference in weighting? All criteria are currently weighted evenly (at about 17 percent).
 - Susie: What would be less
 - Patricia Rehberg: Is this weighting for the greater good or personal opinion?
 - Kirstin: Yes, for the greater good.
 - Steve B: An emergency access example given. Some criteria may be diminished. What about conflicts with other criteria? How will that be considered? If looking at the representation, all should be weighted equally.
 - Heidi said she doesn't agree. The Main reason for the bridge is emergency access. That should be weighted more. A & B are more important.
 - Steve C: None of this will be done without economic impact known. Criteria F, Economic Impact, is more important.
 - Steven VW: We should also look at economic impact that the bridge can bring to Wilsonville. If done right, it will bring in enough to pay for itself. He's conservative but is not concerned about the cost. Cost should be considered, but balanced with benefits.
 - Tony: What are the bridge project objectives? Safety, emergency access, recreation are the objectives. Can we afford it or not is the question.
 - Susie: Asked for clarification on if costs vs. benefits are even out yet? Her concern is environmental impacts (trees, wildlife, birds, water, etc.). We need to do this in way that protects them.
 - David: His initial thoughts were with the costs. We're really here because the community spoke about emergency access and connectivity. Keep perspective on these two items.
 - Steve B: How do you go about scoring something like the fact that a bridge would go through the middle of a park versus on the edges of the park?
 - Bob: Current uses compatibility and flexibility of future uses are addressed in the criteria. There are several pages of scoring guidance that will help in the scoring decisions.
 - Jeremy Appt: Criteria A & B should be weighted a little bit heavier. If there are impacts you can mitigate for them.
 - Bob: If there are options that have less impacts, they score better.
 - Kirstin: Think about what would be diminished.
 - Steve C: He understands raising A & B higher. He wants E-Compatibility with Existing Built Environment, raised an equal amount. Leave them all at 17% and go with it.
 - David: A, B & D should be more important. We weren't brought here to look after the needs of Steve C's community, we are here for connectivity, safety and recreational opportunities,

which are A, B and D. He is still concerned with the impacts on the community, but that is not why we are here.

- Kirstin: Bob has a program to see how the pie chart changes with new inputs from the Task Force.
- Michelle: Understands the concerns of people's homes being impacted. If we weighted A & B at 20 percent, and 15 percent on the rest of the criteria, then that would reflect why we are here.
- Douglas Muench agreed with Michelle.
- Steve C: Everything said benefits the city of Wilsonville, it does nothing for the people being most impacted which are the people on the south side of the river. With that said, you guys do what you want.
- Reem: ODOT must look at the project from a variety of aspects. The original concern was emergency access. She supports Steve C in leaving the criteria evenly weighted. The Federal Highway Administration on this project and they said they will provide a permit only for environmental aspect (recreational use) because the bridge is impacting the connectivity between parks. Emergency use is not a major aspect.
- Nancy: At the Metro funding meeting, part of the application was bike/ped, emergency access.
- Jenny Cavarno: The compatibility of the recreational goals is a big piece. When talking about more weighting of A & B, we are not talking about recreation at all.
- Heidi: Her constituents don't want people to come on rural roads and get injured. Look at A-20, B-20, and 13 percent for the rest.
- Tony: Stay with the 3 objectives. Supports A, B and D.
- Steve B: Supports D being up there with A & B as well. Since cost is going to be enormous, just put \$0 for cost.
- Terra: She has no preference in weighting. This is just a tool, and gives us a perspective. Use the spreadsheet to show scenarios and see if there is a difference. There may be a wash in the end.
- Kirstin: City Council asked for weighting or not from this Task Force.
- Steven VW: All six criteria are in the discussion. What is the real difference if one is 20% or one is 15%? Are we splitting hairs that don't need to be split?
- Steve B: It could be mathematically different.
- Kirstin: If Task Force considers one element is more important than another, it could be significant to City Council.
- Steve B: You could leave them the same and express the opinions.
- Jeremy: Steve B tossed out \$0 cost, but taxpayers will want to know what they are. We could diminish C, with mitigation. Keep A, B & D, + C & F (minus).
- Steve B: We have 4 scenarios that should be proposed for a vote. *[Informal motion]*

• **Vote #1**

7 votes	Option 1. Leave criteria equal as is in 5/18/17 Evaluation Criteria Memo.
5 votes	Option 2: Elevate A, B & D (20/20/20%) [diminish, F, C @11.5%,x2; E@ 17%]
2 votes	Option 3: Elevate A & B, 20/20 > rest of criteria @15, 15, 15, 15%
2 votes	Option 4: Elevate A, B, D, E (18%) (F, C @14%)

• **Vote #2**

6 votes	Option 1. Leave as is.
10 votes	Option 2: Elevate A, B & D (20/20/20%) [diminish F, C @11.5% each; E@ 17%]

- Other Changes: None presented.
- Public Comment
 - None
- Task Force Recommendation for City Council
Task Force members recommended this change:

D-2	Maximize compatibility with and flexibility for recreational uses including parks and the river on the north side.
D-3	Maximize compatibility with and flexibility for recreational uses, including parks, the marina and the river on the south side.
D-4	Maintain or improve river access.

Regarding weighting:

- *Elevate Criteria A, B & D to (20/20/20%); diminish F, C @11.5% each; E@ 17%.*
- Alternative 3 (ODOT), Task Force Recommendation
 - No discussion or action was taken on this item.

7. Next Steps-Zach Weigel, Bob Goodrich 8:50-8:55 pm

- We will finalize the technical research including the archaeology report.
- The Task Force’s recommendation will be communicated to City Council.
- The TAC will score the criteria which will be brought before the Task Force to assist with their location recommendation.
- Considering the Task Force’s recommendation, the City Council will make the ultimate decision on the alignment. .
- Next meeting will likely be in September.
- We will let Task Force members know of the next TAC meeting; they are welcome to be present for the scoring discussion. .
- We expect a recommendation on the alignment to City Council in October.

8. Closing Comments and Adjourn-Co-chairs Bernard 8:55-9 pm

- Co-Chair Bernard thanked Task Force members for coming, appreciating their valuable work. He looks forward to making a decision on the bridge.

We adjourned the meeting at 8:31 PM.