



Oversight Team

ATTENDEES:	Dan Clem/City of Salem, Sam Brentano/Marion County, Lloyd Chapman/Salem-Keizer Transit District, Richard Walsh/City of Keiser, Cathy Clark/City of Keizer, Emily Lawton/FHWA, Tom Richey/Polk County
STAFF PARTICIPANTS:	Dan Fricke/ODOT, Julie Warncke/City of Salem, Richard Schmidt/SKATS, Dave Simmons/CH2M HILL, Tim Burkhardt/CH2M HILL, Ed Chamberland/WH Pacific
GUESTS:	Darlene Strozut/Highland Neighborhood Association, Eunice Kim, Statesman Journal
DATE:	January 18, 2008

Introductions and Agenda Review

Following self-introductions, Tim Burkhardt indicated the key meeting agenda item was a presentation and discussion on bridge types.

Public Comment

Darlene Strozut read a statement from the Highland neighborhood regarding their interest in and concerns about the project with respect to neighborhood impacts. The neighborhood has not identified a preferred alternative but intends to. Dan Clem asked that the neighborhood continue to share their concerns directly and early rather than holding them until the end.

Project Updates

Tim provided the following project updates.

- CETAS: The project team (Rod Thompson, ODOT) presented to CETAS on January 15 the alternatives for the EIS. There were relatively few comments and nothing to indicate this group would not “concur” with the direction taken by the Task Force and Oversight Team. Official concurrence comes about 30 days after the meeting.
- Section 4(f) Evaluation of Yellow Alternative: Tim indicated that in response to the discussion at the previous month’s meetings, the project team was continuing to evaluate Yellow with respect to Section 4(f) issues, with the goal of determining as soon as possible whether Yellow is or is not “fatally flawed” from a 4(f) perspective. This includes meeting with FHWA.

- Project Schedule Update: Tim discussed the issues with funding for the next phase of work (writing the EIS document) for the project and the fact that the funding delay will result in a several month delay in the overall project schedule.

Bridge Type Discussion

Dave Simmons led a bridge type discussion which included a review of the types of bridges appropriate for the project, the staff's preliminary recommendation, and gathering Oversight Team feedback. He explained that a selection of bridge types needs to be made at this point in the process because a study of the impacts needs to be a part of the EIS. And he said that it is desirable to study more than one type in an EIS document. Impacts of bridge types include natural resource (location/number of piers in water and land), aesthetics (visual impact), and cost. Dave differentiated between bridge type and bridge design pointing out that bridge *types* are defined by the general form of their load carrying structure. The selection of a bridge type establishes the overall shape and character of the bridge. Bridge *design* establishes the size, shape and proportion of the bridge elements based on engineering requirements and aesthetic goals.

Bridge types need to be considered now for inclusion in the EIS. After the EIS, design of aesthetic elements such as lighting, railings, and façade treatments and design of bridge and street connections into the neighborhood will be considered. Dave said that bridge type attributes to consider are aesthetics (view of and character of) and engineering criteria (span lengths and geometry/alignment). A new bridge will include both main channel spans (over the river) and overland spans (over the floodplain and built environment). As indicated in the graphic in the slide show, the overland spans cover significantly greater distance than the span over the river.

Dave then went on to show a number of examples of three bridge types that could be considered for the Salem River Crossing project: Beam/Girder bridge types, Arch Bridge types, and Suspension Bridge types. He said the basic issue is cost vs. aesthetics. Dave reported that the preliminary staff recommendation is a concrete segmental girder and steel girder for the main channel spans (and possibly also study a through arch or deck arch) and a pre-cast pre-stressed girder and post tensioned girder for the overland spans.

Tim shared the results of the Task Force discussion with the group, which was agreement to study the girder types with general interest in applying the more aesthetic versions of them to the locations where they would be most visible. Tim said among the Task Force there was also some interest in the deck arch types with some limited interest in the through arch.

Following brief discussion, the Oversight Team recommended studying only the beam/girder bridge types in the EIS document. The key factors in this decision were:

- Increased cost – Team members were concerned about both the increased cost required to build the other bridge types and the increased cost of the EIS document associated with studying more types
- Public support – Several members were concerned about trying to get public support for a project that included "extra" features (such as an arch bridge) that added to the already high cost. There was also concern that a through arch structure would be

visually too intrusive, and that stakeholders generally preferred something that was low-profile.

- Consistency – Team members favored consistency with Marion and Center Street structure types, which are box girder. Even though the new bridge would be relatively distant, it was felt that with only three bridges, they should all be similar, unlike Portland which has so many and they are all different.
- Cost-benefit - Although there was some interest in the arch types for aesthetic reasons, the group agreed that due to limited visibility the benefits wouldn't justify the costs.
- There was strong interest in applying aesthetic elements to the parts of the bridge that would be most visible, and belief that this can be accomplished using the bridge/girder types

Next Steps

The finance workshop will be on Wednesday March 5.

The next Oversight Team meetings will be:

- Friday, February 22 – Public Works Building, Rm 325: Finance workshop preview
- Friday, April 4 – Public Works Building, Rm 325: Follow-up on finance workshop.