



French Prairie Bridge Project Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #2

Draft Meeting Summary
Wednesday, May 10, 2017
9:30– 11:30 AM

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

Members Present

Carrie Bond, Dan Cary, Terra Lingley, Vince Hall, Scott Hoelscher, John Mermin, Tom Loynes, Tom McConnell, , Chris Neamtzu, Andrew Phelps, Kerry Rappold, Robert Tovar, , Nancy Bush, Julia Uravich

Members Unable to Attend

Rick Gruen, Anthony Buczek, Tod Blankenship, Tom Murtaugh

Project Management Team/ Staff

Karen Buehrig, Clackamas County; Bob Goodrich, OBEC Consulting Engineers; Reem Khaki, Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) Zach Weigel, City of Wilsonville; Kirstin Greene, Cogan Owens Greene; P. Elise Scolnick, Cogan Owens Greene

Conversation is summarized by agenda item below.

1. Welcome and Introductions

9:30 – 9:50 am

City Project Manager Zach Weigel welcomed committee members. Facilitator Kirstin Greene asked members to introduce themselves and briefly describe their role.

- Kirstin announced that the meeting agenda was scheduled until 11:30, but the invitation was until 11. She asked if anyone had to leave before 11:30. Three people said they would need to leave early. Kirstin said that she will manage the agenda to get through by 11.
- Kirstin asked if there were any corrections to the meeting summary of TAC Meeting #1. None were identified.
- Kirstin asked participants to review the charter and if there were any concerns. None were expressed. All in attendance agreed on adoption of the charter as presented in the meeting packet.

2. Review of Project Schedule

9:50 – 10 am

- Consulting team project manager Bob Goodrich reviewed the updated project schedule. The project team has identified a need to consult with the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde and do some field work prior to alignment selection. Accordingly, the schedule has been moved out to select bridge landing points in Fall 2017. The end date for the project has not changed.
- Kirstin and Bob clarified that TAC meetings should be considered in each time the Task Force meetings are shown on the updated schedule. The next set of scheduled TAC and Task Force

meetings are expected in early fall, to apply the evaluation criteria to the bridge alternatives. The PMT will take a first run at applying the evaluation criteria to the alternatives for TAC consideration and adjustment, where needed, prior to Task Force consideration.

Opportunities and Constraints:

- Bob noted that the City had provided the Opportunities and Constraints (O & C) Memo for TAC review prior to the meeting. Notable issues identified include overhead wires, water treatment plant and Exclusive Farm Use (EFU) zoned lands. OBEC expects these all can be avoided, addressed or mitigated if an alternative that impact those constraints is selected.
- As these reports are background and not subject to TAC approval per se, they are foundational and worth correcting if TAC members see anything that needs correcting. Kirstin asked that TAC members who have additional questions contact Zach.
- Bob reminded participants that all the reports are included on the project web site: www.Frenchprairiebridgeproject.com. There is a library on the site with the relevant technical documents. If more information is desired, contact Zach or Bob directly.

3. Work to Date

10:00– 10:30 am

- Bob presented the evaluation criteria proposed by the TAC, Task Force and public meeting which were collected during the previous set of meetings. . The results are part of Appendix A of the Evaluation Criteria report memo.
- Tom Loynes asked if the trails would be allowed for motorized vehicles.
 - *Bob responded that allowing motorized golf carts is a concern of Charbonneau residents. Currently golf cart use is only allowed in the Charbonneau District. It is up to the City to determine whether golf carts can be used outside if the district.*
- Kirstin reviewed the public guidance received associated with the public open house and online. More than 100 people participated in these first events. A summary was included in the TAC packet.
- John Mermin asked how will the team use public input on the criteria going forward?
 - *Bob: There are six major criteria that will be used. The weighting will depend on the criteria that are finally selected at the May 22nd Task Force meeting. He reviewed the formal process for moving forward.*

4. Evaluation Criteria

10:30 – 11 am

- Bob stated that Zach has presented the evaluation criteria to City Council. Today, Task Force Members will discuss the evaluation criteria and scoring guidance.
- Scoring of Alternatives will be done by the project team and TAC. Weighting will be done by the Task Force. Bob described the Evaluation Criteria elements by category. He referred the TAC to the memo for details.
- Reem Khaki: Should there be one on feasibility?
 - *They all seem feasible; and all have some property owner concerns. Bob said that the TAC will be getting to the discussion of alignment W-3 later in the meeting.*

Category A, Connectivity & Safety

- Bob reviewed the listed criteria and asked for questions or concerns.
Questions:
- Karen Buehrig -It appears that if you connect to the regional route you get more points than to the local route. For scoring between 7-10, it should read connecting to “regional or local

planned bike/ped facilities”. Score at 4-6 for connecting to “local or regional facilities”. More points should be assigned if connecting to both. By adding these two together, you would get a better score.

- *Bob proposed that the 7-10 scoring should be “regional and local” connection.*
- Karen: Is this direct connection or more broadly defined? The word “connect” might need a little more definition.
- *Bob: Leaving some discretion may be helpful.*
- Zach Weigel: It is a range of scores.
- Reem Khaki suggested that the team add another criterion for impact on long-term planning into Category E.
 - *Bob suggested the TAC discuss this when Category E is reviewed later in the meeting.*
- Terra: There is a need to address out-of-direction travel, which may not be direct, but will get one to their destination. It is addressed for emergency traffic, but not for general bike/ped connectivity. Bob said he’d adjust the verbiage to reflect more direct connections should receive a higher score.

Category B-Emergency Access

TAC members reviewed the three proposed criteria in Category B.

- Andrew Phelps: Seismic and flood hazard should be addressed. He suggested the addition of a new B-4, mitigate against seismic/flood hazards. Clarify design criteria.
- *Bob Goodrich: The bridge will be designed to survive a Cascadia event. It is a basic design criteria for the project regardless of alternative. The Memo will be revised to reflect those considerations which are design criteria.*

Category C-Environmental Impacts

TAC members reviewed the three criteria proposed in Category C.

- Tom Loynes: Some alternatives would have more streamlined permitting than others. Some would not be permissible. There should be a comparison between easily permissible and not permissible for scoring. This may need a new scoring guidance to address Endangered Species Act (ESA), Division of State Lands (DSL), a Goal Exception, or other review.
 - *Bob Goodrich asked if there are there other issues like this?*
- Scott Hoelscher: A goal exception will be a different process for EFU lands. That would go into the permitting process. If W-3 is selected, that doesn’t involve EFU land and hence not a goal exception process. Where would that fall in the criteria? Would it be a separate category?
 - *Bob Goodrich: Programmatic or permitting-we weren’t looking at it differently. These are processes either way. This is open to discussion. If it’s not permissible that shows in the scoring. We are looking at the raw impacts on different resources. There is a lot of time to consider this.*
- Carrie Bond suggested a change in scoring criteria under 4-6, changing the wording from “minimizes adverse impact” to “minimal adverse impact”.
- Bob: Will look at adding a C-4 to catch permitting and programmatic process issues.
- Tom Loynes: Our (ODOT) scoring would be opposite of Scott Hoelscher’s agency (Clackamas County).
- Kirstin Greene: Routes with additional permitting complexity certainly will take more time. Clarify that Goal Exception in scoring criteria to allow that to feed into the score.
- Reem Khaki: The evaluation criteria have a focus on avoiding. Maybe we should add in mitigation strategies for clarity for evaluators (TAC/TF).

- *Bob: The scoring guidance is intended to provide what you are describing here. It's not simply "avoid" for exactly that purpose, which gets a maximum score. It is minimal impact is the medium score.*
- Kirstin asked if "minimize" would include mitigation?
- *Bob Goodrich stated that you would have to mitigate to minimize.*
- Carrie Bond: From a permitting perspective, you don't look at compensatory mitigation. You are always looking at a mitigation sequence of avoid and minimize. We prefer to look at impacts in general for the preferred alternative, then narrow down the mitigation.
- Dan Cary: Agrees with Carrie. The minimal impacts and adverse impacts, then add in substantial impacts: explain these more clearly. There would be mitigation in 4-6 as well as 0-3 scores. He compared the scoring definitions to being "a little bit pregnant".
- *Bob explained the intention. If you need less mitigation, there are less impacts to be reflected in the scoring. At 0-3 there is a lot of impact and more mitigation is needed. At 4-6, less mitigation would be needed. We could add language to this affect.*
- Dan Cary: Is the mitigation doable for something that is bigger, costlier? What if there is mitigation bank credit available for substantial impact? What about onsite mitigation for lesser impacts? What about if nothing can be done because there is no credit is available? That is something to think about.
- Carrie Bond: We don't want to choose an alternative with adverse impacts just because there is cheaper mitigation.
- *Bob suggested minimal impacts vs. minimizing impacts and removing mitigation altogether.*
- Dan Cary: It's good to know what you're talking about. If you are going to mitigate for seismic?
- Carrie Bond: If you are having adverse impacts, if there are not mitigation options...it seems hard to think about all of that.
- *Bob Goodrich: We should use "avoid", remove "minimize" and use minimal, to make the scoring cleaner.*
- Tom Loynes: Use something less than total avoidance. Not one of these avoids impacts.
- *Bob proposed that at the 7-10 range, use "avoid or minimal impacts". For a score of 4-6 use "moderate impacts" and use "adverse impacts" for a score of 0-3. Members agreed.*
- Kerry Rappold: Some categories have three, and some four, criteria. That would weight some more than others.
 - *Bob Goodrich: The intent is to use an average weighted score, not a numerically weighted one.*
 - Kirstin asked if the TAC agrees with the use of "moderate impacts" in the 4-6 scoring criteria? TAC members agreed.
- Kirstin asked for a TAC vote on adding new criteria:
 - Add new criteria C-4 related to permitting: **0 Votes.**
 - Leave proposed criteria as-is (at 3 criteria) **Vote: Unanimous approval.**
- Kirstin: The Project Management Team will consider how best to incorporate the permitting discussion and comments.

Category D: Compatibility with Recreational Goals

- John Mermin: Sub-criteria D-1 (positive user experience) impacts number of people who will use the new bridge and thus provides benefits beyond recreation. When the task is force is considering how to weight different criteria, consider that some provide greater benefits than just the category they're housed within.

- *Bob though this was a good idea and this guidance/recommendation will be shared with the Task Force.*

Category E – Existing Environment

- Karen: Is this is where we would add new criteria for long-term impacts on ODOT facilities, the railroad, marina, or other facilities?
 - *Bob Goodrich: Would that be an E-4?*
 - Karen Buehrig said she thinks it would. We think we would be getting at the impacts on the marina. We don't know how you'd fold in the railroad. Are we going to change Criteria E-3?
 - Bob Goodrich thought the marina is important enough to score separately. What else could be built that we'd have to consider for impacts.
 - Kirstin asked if TAC members wanted to add long-term planning for other existing or planned future infrastructure uses, e.g. railroad (in addition to the marina). The TAC agreed to add E-4 addressing long-term planning impacts on other existing facilities.

Category F: Cost of Economic Impact

- Carrie: Doesn't understand what environmental mitigation costs?
 - *Bob: Suggested a change to "environmental project costs" to clarify that the intent is to reflect total project cost for baseline comparison of the alternatives.*
 - Karen Buehrig.: On F-2, property acquisition, the difference in the amount of costs should be reflected, also easements should be considered as part of acquisition. Figure out how to differentiate costs. None of them would get 7-10 points as currently crafted.
 - Terra agreed.
 - Bob Goodrich: With F-1, the lowest cost would score highest. For F-2 should we consider the number of properties or square feet of property?
 - Terra Lingley: We need to differentiate between displacement costs and acquisition costs.
 - Dan Cary: We need real numbers to determine the actual costs.
 - *Kirstin-The project team will be taking a first look at the acquisition costs guidance in the scoring guide.*
 - Vince Hall: There will be right-of-way costs associated with public meetings, technical experts, etc. for acquisitions and displacements that should also be considered.
 - Robert Tovar: For (F-2), look at the number of properties. Stay away from square footage. Look at the intervention with the properties, including easements. Sometimes it takes as much effort to acquire easements as to acquire whole properties.
 - *Bob Goodrich Displacements will have to be addressed too. Suggests looking at the number of properties. Displacements will have to be looked at as well.*
 - Kirstin: Would these both be in F-2.
 - Bob Goodrich: Yes.
- Kirstin: This will be something for the PMT to work out and bring back to the TAC in the emailed version to be presented to the Task Force on May 22.
- Zach Weigel said that there are 6 main categories, A-F. Is there anything missing we didn't capture?
 - Terra: Environmental justice (EJ), Title VI.
 - Kirstin noted there are Latino community members present; additional outreach to reach and inform those residents is anticipated.
 - *Bob: will add it to E-1 & E-2.*
 - Terra Lingley: There could be benefits and adverse impacts to different communities.

- *Kirstin: The PMT will work this in for scoring. She thanked Terra for bringing this up.*

5. Alternatives

11 – 11:20 am

- Bob noted that the alignments haven't changed from the last meeting. In coordination with ODOT, ODOT has communicated to the project team that there is a portion of property owned by ODOT on the south side of the river for which ODOT wants to retain access. They also would like to retain their full ROW for expected widening and improving the Boone Bridge and I-5 in the future.
 - Reem spoke about plans to widen I-5 at the Boone Bridge in the future. There is ODOT concern about the land needed for widening and for maintenance (on the north side). This is the only place to access underneath the Boone Bridge.
 - Terra: One of the priorities of the City is to widen the Boone Bridge. A new bridge wouldn't preclude it from happening, but ODOT wants to make sure this concern is addressed.
- Kirstin: Knowing that this alignment is proposed for removal by ODOT, the question is whether we should maintain or remove the W-3 alignment in the scoring criteria? Should the Task Force consider W-3?
 - Carrie: If the bridge is being widened, are there going to be planned bike/ped improvements?
 - Terra: Yes, we are considering bike facilities. There are no plans on a map yet though.
 - Robert: Don't we discourage bikes on the Interstate?
 - Terra Lingley: Bikes are allowed everywhere unless they are specifically prevented. Carrie: Can we shift bike/ped to a widened I-5 Bridge?
 - Terra Lingley: We don't have a timeline yet.
 - Robert: We have a seismic retrofit program. No plans are currently in place, but those things can change. When widening is considered, both retrofit and widening bridges at the same time would be considered. We don't want to preclude this in the future. ODOT is currently working with the Legislature on seismic improvements statewide.
 - Vince: In the last meeting, wasn't there a proposal to put a bike lane under, or attached to, the existing I-5 bridge?
 - Zach Weigel: That was considered in the previous studies. The conclusion at that time was that a stand-alone bridge is preferred.
 - Vince Hall: The experience of the I-5 bike path would be different than a stand-alone bridge.
 - John Mermin: Widening /adding a lane to the I-5 bridge is not in the adopted Regional Transportation Plan. If ODOT and the City desire this widening it should be discussed within the context of the update to the Regional Transportation Plan currently underway. A major investment like that needs public input. Karen Buehrig: We would benefit from keeping it (W-3) in the analysis. We should keep it in the analysis. If we don't, we won't have the info on that alternative.
- **Kirstin took a straw poll:** Remove W-3 from scoring: (4 yes votes). Keep W-3 in consideration (8 yes votes). Abstain (1 vote).

6. Next Steps

11:20 – 11:30 am

- The PMT will make these changes for the Task Force packet. Their meeting is May 22 at 6 pm with an optional tour prior.

Kirstin thanked members and adjourned the meeting at 11 am.