



French Prairie Bridge Project Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #3

Meeting Summary
Wednesday, February 28, 2018
10:00– 12:00 PM

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

Members Present

Carrie Bond, Tod Blankenship, Anthony Buczek, Gail Curtis, Scott Hoelscher, Russ Klassen, Tom Loynes, Tom McConnell, Chris Neamtzu, Andrew Phelps, Kerry Rappold, Robert Tovar, Julia Uravich

Members Unable to Attend

Rick Gruen, Vince Hall, Tom Murtaugh, Nancy Bush, John Mermin

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 and Megan Burns, EnviroIssues

The meeting packet included Project Management Team scoring criteria for reference, original scoring with changes in red can be found at the bottom of this document. Conversation is summarized by agenda item below.

1. Welcome and Introduction

City of Wilsonville French Prairie Bridge Project Manager Zach Weigel welcomed Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) committee members and thanked them for staying with this important project. Acknowledging it had been a year since this committee had met, facilitator Kirstin Greene asked members to introduce themselves and briefly describe their agency and perspective. She recapped the purpose of the meeting, to review project team evaluation criteria scoring results and agree upon a set of scores to advance to the Task Force.

Kirstin asked if there were any corrections to the meeting summary of TAC Meeting #2. TAC members did not identify any changes needed.

2. Project Updates

For TAC members, Zach reviewed the project schedule. Since finalizing the evaluation criteria in May, Federal Highway Administration reviews decided that an Environmental Assessment is the best approach for this project to determine bridge location and type. This will be instead of pursuing what's known as a Categorical Exclusion under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Zach explained

this change should not affect the chartered work or schedule for this phase of the project as a whole. Key milestones include the following. Zach showed the updated project schedule. The current schedule, summarized in the bullets below, also is on the website at www.frenchprairiebridgeproject.org.

- The TAC is asked to score each alternative according to the evaluation criteria today. That information will be presented to the Task Force in April.
- The Task Force will consider the scoring, discuss, and will be asked to make a location recommendation to City Council at their April meeting.
- With that information, City Council is expected to select an alternative in May.
- With that information, project team members will work to present bridge types for committee and community consideration this summer/early fall, with a selection on final type by the end of the year.

3. Evaluation Criteria-Based Scoring of the Alternatives

Bob Goodrich, consulting team project manager with OBEC, presented the final evaluation criteria weighting determined by the Task Force last year. The complete methodology and process to develop alignment evaluation criteria are included in the Evaluation Criteria report memo.

Tom Loynes asked for more information on the Task Force evaluation criteria weighting process.

Kirstin offered that committee members spent considerable time on the criteria and associated weighting and reached consensus through discussion. Some, e.g., cost, was considered to be large among all alternatives and not necessarily a differentiator from the community's perspective. Likewise, they assumed that environmental regulations would need to be met for any alternative to be built.

Bob added that, regardless of which alignment was selected, Task Force members understood that the economic impact of the cost and the environmental impact would be given the thorough refinement it needed at the time of engineering and design. This information allowed members to settle on the final weighted criteria that emphasized other aspects that were important to them.

Zach added that the weighting of the criteria does not necessarily reflect those topics that are most important to the community, but rather what the task force thought the topics were most important in deciding between the three bridge locations. For example, environmental impact is important as an overall goal, but there may not be much difference between the three bridge locations, so it is not as important when comparing bridge locations.

Bob then led a discussion of each evaluation criteria vis a vis the rankings for each of the three alignments (W1, W2 and W3). A map of the alternatives is available online. TAC members discussed each criterion and the pre-scoring provided by the Project Management Team (OBEC, City of Wilsonville, Clackamas County, and Oregon Department of Transportation staff). Comments and questions follow.

Category A: Connectivity and Safety

- ODOT noted that the reason they scored A1 (connects to existing bike/pedestrian routes directly or using streets with sidewalks and bike lanes on north side of bridge) for Alignment W1 higher than the project team was due to existing bike lane facilities. Zach pointed out that

the current bike lane ends north of this project site and becomes a shared lane where traffic volumes decrease.

- Kirstin addressed the TAC asking if A1 W1 should be adjusted. Members agreed and A1 W1 was bumped up to a 7.
- TAC members did not have comments or changes to A2 or A3.
- ODOT scored A4 (connects to planned bike/pedestrian routes on south side of the bridge) for Alignment W3 a 3.
 - Karen Buehrig asked for why PMT scoring and ODOT scoring were significantly different.
 - Tom McConnell responded that ODOT thought the disparity should be greater than one point because W3 offered substantially less connection to regional bicycle and pedestrian network.
 - TAC members agreed to lower A4 W3 to 5.

Category B; Emergency Access

- ODOT scored B1 (connects to emergency routes directly, minimizing out of direction travel and response time at and near the south terminus) for Alignment W3 a 1.
 - Tom McConnell said that ODOT wanted a larger distinction between the three alignments.
 - TAC members agreed that the difference should be greater to better emphasize the capabilities of each alignment, and lowered B1 W3 from a 2 to a 1.
- Anthony Buczek asked if with B2 (connect to emergency routes directly, minimizing out of direction travel and response time at and near the south terminus), there was information on where emergency responders are typical heading on the south side of the river.
 - Zach responded that the Charbonneau community is a frequent, daily destination.
- TAC members did not have any other changes to the PMT scores for emergency access.

Category C: Environmental Impacts

- Tom Loynes suggested that since all criterion had a 10% weighting, Category C responses should have a greater spread between the points for each alignment as there also are fewer subcategories. Tom suggested that considering the variation of vegetation on the south landing, that C1 (avoid or minimize adverse impacts on wildlife habitat and trees) and C2 (avoid or minimize adverse impacts on waters and wetlands) for alignment W3 be lowered.
 - Tom McConnell said that ODOT had C1 alignment W1 scored at 7 and alignment W3 scored as a 2 because of the existing trees and vegetation on the south landing that would be impacted.
 - Gail Curtis suggested that the text for that category be changed to reflect the environmental impact of that route.
 - TAC members agreed and decided to change the scoring for C1 to 7 for alignment W1, 8 for alignment W2, and 2 for alignment W3.
- Russ Klassen asked why alignment W1 was less favorable for impacts to wildlife compared to alignment W2.
 - Bob responded that there will be tree impact for both W1 and W2.
 - Russ asked whether a creek flows through that area.
 - Bob didn't think there was a creek but noted that there is a railroad track.
- Carrie Bond felt that for category C2 (avoid or minimize adverse impacts on waters and wetlands) alignment W1 with its proximity to wetlands warranted a lower score than

alignment W2.

- TAC members agreed to lower C2 alignment W1 to a 6 due to wetland impacts. They lowered alignment W3 to a 2 due to the potential impact on the tributaries.
- TAC members discussed C3 (avoid or minimize adverse impacts on cultural and historic resources).
 - Tom McConnell justified ODOT's lower ranking of each alignment due to the unknown impacts for this category, especially because of the high probability of cultural resources in this area.
 - Chris Neamtzu and Carrie Bond gave the alignments scores of 6-6-7 also due to the unknown factors.
 - Karen Buehrig said that given alignment W1's location on the historical Native American crossing and the high probability of archaeological potential, W1 should be ranked one lower than the other two alignments.
 - Given the unknown factors and alignment W1's proximity to highly probability archaeological cultural resources, TAC members agreed to score alignment W1 a 5, and alignments W2 and W3 6.

Category D: Compatibility with Recreational Goals

- TAC members agreed to lower D1 for Alignment W3 from a 4 to a 3, which matched ODOT's score, to better reflect the much less positive user experience.
- The TAC had no change to D2.
- TAC members agreed to lower D3 alignment W3 from a 10 to an 8 due to the impacts on parking, both current parking infrastructure and projected parking from the community driving to the new bridge to walk and bike over it.
- They agreed to lower the score for D4 alignment W3 from a 4 to a 3 due to poor river access.

Category E: Compatibility with Existing Built Environment

- TAC members agreed to lower the score for section E2 alignment W1 from a 7 to a 6 due to the close proximity to a private resident.
- No other changes to the Project Management Team scoring were made in this Category.

Category F: Cost and Economic Impact

- Since there are no actual numbers to work with for cost and economic impact, all scoring is relative to one another based on potential cost difference. Lowest scores received a 10, higher costs were proportionally scaled downward.
 - Russ asked if the numbers included the cost for easements and property acquisitions.
 - Bob responded that F2 addresses those impacts and costs.
- Decimal points for F1 were used because the relative costs for the three alignments were very close.
 - TAC members advised to remove the decimal points to avoid overstating the level of accuracy for costs at this early planning stage of the project.
 - TAC agreed that final scoring for F1 should be 9-9-8 due to environmental mitigation expected for alignment W3.
 - Gail advocated for the lowering of the final score and wanted to be sure that the task force be explained the consideration for environmental mitigation costs are the reasoning behind the change.
 - Bob will rewrite the narrative to explain the scoring is a combination of the

proportioning of costs and a qualitative consideration of environmental mitigation.

- TAC members agreed to lower F2 alignment W3 from a 7 to a 6.
 - Reem had a change to the note for W3, and would like it to say, 'moderate impact to ODOT maintenance facility and future I5 bridge expansion.'
 - Bob confirmed that he expected that maintenance functions should not be impacted and will put in the notes 'moderate impact to ODOT maintenance property but facilities will not be impacted.'
- TAC members agreed to lower F3 alignment W3 from a 3 to a 1 because of the highest potential for a significant utility impact: The City's wastewater outfall. Relocation would be very expensive.
- Participants discussed the cost of displacement of the wastewater outfall and where that cost should be represented. In the end, TAC members decided to omit the cost from F1 and modifying the F1 narratives to clarify/limit the costs that are included for that score.

Kirstin closed the scoring evaluation criteria agenda item by recapping what was decided (outlined above). Kirstin then asked if the TAC was comfortable recommending the decided upon scoring to the task force. All TAC members agreed they were comfortable advancing that scoring to the Task Force.

4. Next Steps

Zach advised TAC members of the Task Force meeting date scheduled for April 12th.

Kirstin mentioned that a meeting summary would be provided and encouraged folks to leave their comment forms and notes to be incorporated. Kirstin also said that a packet would be put together providing Task Force members with the TAC recommendations, who will use this information to make an alignment selection recommendation for City Council.

Bob recapped the upcoming steps:

- Bridge type selection is the next milestone after a bridge landing recommendation is approved.
- Bob updated the TAC on the project timeline.
 - Task Force meeting on April 12th
 - Final bridge landing recommendation to City Council in May
 - Towards the end of summer/early fall the City will host an Open House to present bridge types to community members
 - In the fall, the City will host another round of TAC and Task Force meetings for bridge type selection, narrowing to two bridge types, and finally recommending a preferred bridge type to City Council by the end of the year.

With no other business, Kirstin adjourned the meeting.



French Prairie Bridge Project

Scoring for Task Force Review
March 23, 2018

A		Connectivity and Safety			W1	W2	W3	Notes
A-1	Connects to existing bike/pedestrian routes directly or using streets with sidewalks and bike lanes on north side of the bridge	7	3	4	Assume Boones Ferry Road connection slightly higher priority than I-5 undercrossing trail. W1: No pedestrian facilities. Direct connection to SB bike lane on Boones Ferry Rd. W2: Connects east & west via Tauchman St, with no pedestrian or bicycle facilities. W3: Non-direct connection along Tauchman St. to a path towards Memorial Park.			
A-2	Connects to existing bike/pedestrian routes directly or using streets with sidewalks and bike lanes on south side of the bridge	2	2	3	No bike/ped routes exist on the south side. All connect directly to Butteville Road. W3: Connects to north side Butteville Road. No need to cross road to travel west or access marina.			
A-3	Connects to planned bike/pedestrian routes on north side of the bridge	10	6	5	W1: Directly connects w/ regional Ice Age Tonquin Trail (IATT). Connects to EB local trail. W2: Non-direct connection to both IATT and EB local trail. W3: About the same as W2. Further from regional IATT.			
A-4	Connects to planned bike/pedestrian routes on south side of the bridge	8	7	5	W1: Direct regional bike connection west and local ped/bike trail connection east. No planned ped. connection west. W2: Same as W1, but located further from regional connection. W3: Non-direct regional bike connection west and local ped/bike connection east. No planned ped. connection west.			
20.0% Criteria A Weighting		13.5	9.0	8.5				



French Prairie Bridge Project

Scoring for Task Force Review
March 23, 2018

B		Emergency Access			W1	W2	W3	Notes
B-1	Connect to emergency routes directly, minimizing out of direction travel and response time at and near the north terminus	10	6	2	W1: Direct route from Wilsonville Road to Boones Ferry Rd. W2: Some out of direction travel through the park onto Tauchman St. W3: Significant out of direction travel through the park onto Tauchman St.			
B-2	Connect to emergency routes directly, minimizing out of direction travel and response time at and near the south terminus	5	7	6	W1: Longest distant from I-5/Miley Rd. Slow access loop. W2: Fairly direct connection to I-5/Miley Rd. via Butteville Rd. with a less constrained access loop. W3: Closest access to I-5/Miley Rd., but requires out of direction travel.			
B-3	Minimize emergency response impacts on residents, park activities, and marina operations	6	2	3	W1: Furthest from and least impact to residents, minor impact to marina access, minimal impact to parking. W2: Closer to residents on both sides of river, minimal impact to marina operations, major impact to middle of park. W3: Closest and most impacts to residents, no impact to marina, potential for impact to east edge of park facilities.			
20.0% Criteria B Weighting		14.0	10.0	7.3				



French Prairie Bridge Project

Scoring for Task Force Review
March 23, 2018

C Environmental Impacts		W1	W2	W3	Notes
C-1	Avoid or minimize adverse impacts on wildlife habitat and trees	7	8	2	W1: Some tree and vegetation impacts on south side. W2: Mostly avoids wildlife & trees impact. W3: Moderate impacts to wildlife & trees on both sides of river.
C-2	Avoid or minimize adverse impacts on waters and wetlands	6	7	2	W1: Minimal impacts to river with potential wetland impacts. W2: Minimal impacts to river with potential wetland impacts. W3: Minimal impacts to river with likely impacts to wetlands and tributary crossings.
C-3	Avoid or minimize adverse impacts on cultural and historic resources	5	6	6	W1: Known resources are present (orchard and ferry crossing). Moderate to high potential for impacts. W2: Moderate potential for impacts, but most areas are previously disturbed. W3: Avoids known resources. Moderate potential for impacts. Area is undisturbed, so unidentified resources possible. *Each assessment based on potential for impacts as identified in the Opportunities and Constraints Report dated April 5, 2017.
11.5% Criteria C Weighting		6.9	8.1	3.8	



French Prairie Bridge Project

Scoring for Task Force Review
March 23, 2018

D	Compatibility with Recreational Goals	W1	W2	W3	Notes
D-1	Provide a positive user experience (e.g. noise, aesthetics, view, security, compatible with other travel modes, exceeds design standards for turns and slopes)	8	9	3	W1: Secure/visible, view of RR bridge & river, some noise impact from train. Very good user experience. W2: Secure/visible, located away from existing bridges, least noise impact. Great user experience. W3: Natural setting, but less secure/visible. I-5 noise, least favorable views, wastewater plant nearby. Poor user experience.
D-2	Maximize compatibility with and flexibility for recreational uses including parks and the river on the north side.	9	4	8	W1: Compatible with existing park being located on edge of existing undeveloped park land. Easily integrate into future uses. W2: Minor displacement of existing open lawn and picnic area. Splits open lawn in half, limiting flexibility for future uses. W3: Compatible with existing park being located on edge of existing undeveloped park land. May limit incorporating local trail and existing drainage channel into future uses.
D-3	Maximize compatibility with and flexibility for recreational uses, including parks, the marina and the river on the south side.	3	5	8	W1: Compatible with existing use, but limits flexibility for marina parking, ramps, and slips. Limits use of land beneath bridge. W2: Similar to W1 with less parking impact, but potential building impacts. Parking impacts are more concerning to the County. W3: Avoids all related impacts.
D-4	Maintain or improve river access	8	6	3	W1: Provides new river view from bridge. Provides best opportunity to improve river bank access via old ferry landing. W2: Provides best new views of river from the bridge. Limited opportunity to improve public access to the river bank. W3: Provides view of river to the west from the bridge. Little opportunity to improve river bank access due to I-5 Bridge, Wasterwater Treatment Plant outfall, and drainage channel.
20.0% Criteria D Weighting		14.0	12.0	11.0	



French Prairie Bridge Project

Scoring for Task Force Review
March 23, 2018

E	Compatibility with Existing Built Environment	W1	W2	W3	Notes
E-1	Minimize bridge location and access impacts on residences in Old Town	6	5	6	W1: Close to residents on Boones Ferry Rd. W2: Close to residents on Tauchman St and requires travel through the neighborhood, which includes underrepresented populations. W3: Not close to residents, but requires the most travel through the neighborhood, which includes underrepresented populations.
E-2	Minimize bridge location and access impacts on residences at south terminus in Clackamas County	6	2	3	No underrepresented populations identified south of the river. W1: In close proximity to one residence. W2: Directly impacts two small lot, waterfront residences. W3: Directly impacts two large lot rural residences.
E-3	Minimize bridge location and access impacts on marina facilities	6	5	10	W1: Potential impact to parking that can be mitigated. Impact to marina slips and operations not anticipated. W2: Impact to marina operations or building is anticipated, but can be mitigated. Impact to marina slips and parking not anticipated. W3: Avoids all marina impacts.
E-4	Minimize bridge location and access impacts to possible future infrastructure improvements (e.g. Railroad, ODOT)	6	10	5	W1: Located on railroad property, but can accommodate future improvements. Meeting w/RR provided confidence moving forward. W2: No impact to future infrastructure improvements. W3: Located on ODOT property, but can likely accommodate future
17.0% Criteria E Weighting		10.2	9.4	10.2	



French Prairie Bridge Project

Scoring for Task Force Review

March 23, 2018

F		Cost and Economic Impact			W1	W2	W3	W2
F-1	Minimize total project cost (e.g. bridge, retaining wall, on grade path, environmental mitigation). This project cost does not consider architectural features or amenities.	9	9	8	<p>Design Team initial calculation based on relative cost as determined by the proportion of bridge (most expensive), wall, and on-grade path (least expensive) for each alignment. Then potential environmental mitigation qualitatively considered.</p> <p>W1: 1200-ft bridge; 5100-sq ft wall; 850-ft on-grade path. W2: 1160-ft bridge; 11400-sq ft wall; 740-ft on-grade path. W3: 1180-ft bridge; 2400-sq ft wall; 1400-ft on-grade path. Most significant</p>			
F-2	Minimize property acquisition (e.g. right-of-way, easements) and avoid displacement of residences and businesses	9	3	6	<p>W1: Minor impacts to two properties with no displacements anticipated. W2: Major/moderate impact to three properties with potential displacement of a residence and business. W3: Moderate/minor impact to three properties with no displacements anticipated. ODOT property impacted, but maintenance facility avoided.</p>			
F-3	Minimize the displacement of utilities	5	4	1	<p>W1: Adjacent to underground gas line. Overhead power lines that can be easily relocated. W2: Crosses underground gas line. Overhead power lines on Butteville Road/River Vista intersection that can be easily relocated, but intersection presents more challenges. W3: Potential impact to wastewater treatment plant outfall pipe that cannot be easily relocated. Might conflict with bridge foundation even if in proximity rather than directly.</p>			
F-4	Maximizes economic benefit through tourism and access to commercial and regional destinations and trail system connections	9	9	6	<p>W1: Provides significant benefit to local and regional economies. Closest to regional trails and parks, directly connects to Boones Ferry Rd, some noise impact from railroad. Also see D-1. W2: Provides significant benefit to local and regional economies. Good connection to regional trails and parks, good views, limited impact from I-5 and railroad. Also see D-1. W3: Provides some benefit to local and regional economies. Furthest from regional trails and parks, close to I-5, noise impacts, some out of direction travel. Also see D-1.</p>			
11.5%	Criteria F Weighting	9.2	7.2	6.0				
100%	Total, Weighted Score	68	56	47				