

Approved March 3, 1993

BOOK 153 PAGE 0292

MINUTES

ROADS ADVISORY COMMITTEE/BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
JOINT MEETING ON BRIDGE STREET BRIDGE PROJECT

February 10, 1993

7:00 p.m.

Walterville Elementary School  
40589 McKenzie Hwy., Walterville

BOARD PRESENT: Steve Cornacchia, Ellie Dumdi, Marie Frazier, Jack Roberts

BOARD ABSENT: Jerry Rust

RAC PRESENT: Jim Brown, Jim Branch, Sky Chamard, Brian Churchill, Tom Poage, Leo Stapleton

RAC ABSENT: Laura Olson

STAFF PRESENT: John Goodson, Ollie Snowden, Tom Stinchfield, Sonny Chickering, Doug McCart, Don Maddox, Vern Gunderson, Emery Marko, Lloyd Holtcamp, Bill Van Vactor, Vonnie Rainwater

OBEC PRESENT: Gale Harley, Larry Fox

Commissioner Cornacchia called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and introduced Board members present.

Jim Brown introduced Roads Advisory Committee members present.

Ollie Snowden introduced staff present.

Commissioner Cornacchia turned meeting over to Commissioner Frazier to conduct hearing since Bridge Street Bridge project is in her district.

Snowden stated that this is the third time he has been here to speak on this topic. Commissioner Frazier and I were up here once and the Board was up here as well. What we're going to do tonight is give you an opportunity to comment on three alternatives that the Board is still considering: 1) Rehabilitation, which would essentially make the existing structure structurally sound, but not really solve some of the width deficiencies and alignment deficiencies, 2) Replacement Alternative 1, and 3) Replacement Alternative 2.

Gale Harley, OBEC Consulting Engineers, discussed rehabilitation alternative, which is the result of the first study which looked at four various alternatives to rehabilitating the existing the structure. At that time the structure had several deficient areas structurally and also was functionally deficient in that the roadway width was narrow for the current daily traffic and projected daily traffic. We looked at traffic counts that may occur in 2010 and we were concerned with trying to take care of those kinds of problems. This alternative addresses some of those problems. We would take care of the structural deficiencies by taking the existing steel truss and raising the overhead bracing which has been hit several

times in the past, we would install a new rail system, the current rail is a timber rail which is substandard, we would bring it up to standard. It would also involve rebuilding the approach span. What we would try to do to help with the sight distance problem. The existing bridge is about 400 ft. long on a 16 degree curve which is quite tight so you can't see from one end to the other. So what we try to do is widen the approach spans to allow two lanes of traffic in the south approach so that the cars at this end could see to the other end before they enter the narrow structure. Also along with that we would add a right-turn lane so the people here would have a chance to stop also before they entered onto the truss. That way there wouldn't be conflicts on the truss which is the main problem because it is narrow and it gives you the narrow affect where cars up to now have been able to negotiate it, but trucks when they meet it makes it difficult for them to pass. The other part of this alternative would involve a project that ODOT has been looking at and would involve a 90 degree angle and improving this access into Hwy. 126.

[Van Vactor present.]

This alternative was in the final design stage when the 11-week closure that would be required to construct it, it was felt at that time that 11 weeks were too long, emergency services expressed dissatisfaction that they would not be able to handle emergency calls readily enough. So at that time we backed away from that and looked at alternatives to handling the 11-week closure. As part of this rehabilitation alternative right now it includes a detour structure that will carry two lanes of traffic and be built out of timber by the contractor doing the construction on the main bridge. The two lane detour structure is about \$230,000 which would be added on to this. That would alleviate the emergency services problem. This alternative also uses basically the same alignment. The bridge obviously stays in the same place so the impacts to the surrounding area are minor. Some widening of the fill area here is minor, right-of-way impacts are minor although with the right-turn lane rather than filling to the river side the widening of the roadway would be to the north side of the road, trying to keep the impacts to the river side at a minimum.

Larry Fox, OBEC Consulting Engineer, stated that the total for the rehabilitation project is \$1 million. Table 1 outlines initial costs for these various alternatives, Table 2 depicts life-cycle costs. When it was determined that the only feasible solution to the closure problem was to build a detour structure across the river at a cost of approximately \$230,000, it was at that point, the Commissioners felt it might be prudent to look at replacement alternatives to see what they would cost just to compare the two and see what would be the best solution for Bridge Street. With that in mind, we went back and studied replacement alternatives for the existing bridge and looked at replacing the bridge at alignments other than the alignment that the bridge presently is on. Purpose of the study was to look at feasible alignments and feasible structure types and come up with costs so that a reasonable decision could be made about this. We looked at three basic alignment alternatives and those basically being upstream of the existing bridge, we looked at an alignment immediately downstream of the existing bridge and we looked at this alignment that is depicted here, which is also shown in Figure 2 of your handout, which is this straight diagonal alignment that crosses Holden Creek Lane on the west end. For the immediate upstream and immediate downstream alignments, we looked at two alternatives for those both "T"ing into Holden Creek Lane as the present bridge does now as well as carrying those alternatives through to the Highway. And we did the same thing for the immediate

downstream alternative. So basically we had five alignments and from that point we looked at feasible structure types of the kind of construction and modern construction could stand bridges of this length of crossing and come up with a structure cost and from that we put together eight feasible alternatives marrying alignments to structures and coming up with final costs which we presented to the Board of Commissioners on December 15. We have two recommended alternatives out of those eight and the Board did select those two recommended ones as the ones we are presenting here tonight. You'll notice that neither of the "T" intersection alternatives are the chosen alternatives and the reason is. One of the driving factors for the height above the river that a new bridge is placed has to do with the 100 year flood elevation of the river. The way the bridge is configured right now, the 100 year flood is approximately two feet below the existing bridge. Any of the new bridge structures we build today for this kind of length of span requires that the structure be located below the road surface is a lot deeper than what's presently existing in this main span. The main reason for that is that the structure that carries this bridge across the river is all located above the roadway. Any modern bridge structure that we put in here we have to basically raise the road surface significantly higher than the road. When you try to "T" that in to Holden Creek Lane, because basically Holden Creek Lane meets the bridge, it involves putting a lot of fill to raise the road up to meet the new bridge. We're talking about 10-13 feet of fill out here, that starts having a significant impact not only to the property owners on the north side of the road but also to the river along here, you'd have to build a retaining wall to retain that fill therefore wiping out a good deal of the trees along here as well as adding a lot of expense to the project. This explains why we're carrying through to the highway and not "T"ing into Holden Creek Lane. Another reason for that as well is that by ideal standards today it's not safe for safety reasons to have a "T" intersection right at the end of a bridge, so carrying straight through to the highway is better from that perspective as well.

Larry Fox: Replacement Alternative #1 - downstream diagonal alignment that goes through the west end and connects directly with Highway 126. It would basically impact one property on the corner. It would create a new intersection with Highway 126. The existing intersection would no longer remain. The remaining properties on Holden Creek Lane would gain connection through this frontage road. At the south end of the bridge there's minimal impact to the park on the southeast corner. The potential exists to create boat ramp access from the park side to that downstream corner. Because of raising the grade of Bridge Street here, raising the roadway, the driveway that connects to this private drive along the river would have to be reworked to connect these people back up. The bridge structure type that we're looking at for the replacement alternative is a concrete girder type of bridge. Because it crosses diagonally to the river, the length of the structure is fairly long. This replacement bridge has two main spans; the first span basically crosses the main channel, would have one pier located toward the south bank of the river. This would maintain the main channel for boaters. Two main spans and three short approach spans at the south end to make up the 550 feet. The initial estimated total project cost for this replacement alternative is \$2.3 million, including right-of-way costs and a 10% contingency for the preliminary nature of this study. It's all broken down in Table 1 of the handout.

Larry Fox: Replacement Alternative 2 - which is shown in Figure 3 in handout. The alignment would place the new structure immediately upstream from the existing bridge. It would basically cross the river at a 90 degree angle, therefore the bridge is similar to the existing bridge length, and it connects directly to

Highway 126. It would basically impact this one property. There is still a bit of resolving to do about the access that would be left for these remaining properties on the west end of Holden Creek Lane. Presently, the Highway Department has adopted new guidelines for access control to state highways and we would need to consult with them by creating this new access they might require us to create access to these properties in some other way than through the highway. The remaining residences on Holden Creek Lane would maintain access similarly through this frontage road that comes down off of the bridge. This alternative has a larger impact to the park on the southeast corner. It goes right over where the upstream boat ramp presently is located, but again the possibility exists to create access below the new bridge so people could access this. The structure type being proposed for this replacement alternative is basically the same structure type as Alternative #1. It's a 440 foot structure consisting of two spans of 210 feet each. No approach spans on the end. The pier location would be further south than the existing bridge pier, from the boaters perspective this is great. The estimated total project cost for this alternative is \$1.9 million.

Larry Fox: In comparing the alternative project costs, obviously the rehabilitation alternative is by far the cheapest, but it's important to keep in mind that we're not comparing apples and apples in the sense that we can spend \$1 million on the existing structure but we still end up with a narrow 160 foot length of bridge, which from some people's perspective is not a problem and other people think it is. A replacement bridge structure is totally up to today's standards; we're talking about a 38-40 foot roadway for the new structure. The south replacement approach is only 28 feet wide. The new bridge structure would allow ample room. We have two 12-foot lanes with 8-foot shoulders allowing pedestrians and bicycles to come through.

Citizen: Of the other alternatives rejected, were the structures all the same type of construction. Larry stated that none of them were truss construction; we looked at pre-stress concrete type of girder bridges and steel girder bridges. In regard to a truss type of bridge, the only times you look at that as a feasible structure alternative is when you're talking about very long span bridges. Due to the initial cost, because of fabrication of steel to build a truss bridge like that is very expensive and the maintenance expenses that are involved in painting it and maintaining it, make it an unfeasible construction type in this day and age.

Citizen: Are you still going to have to replace the bridge anyway if we revamp the existing bridge today? Larry stated that eventually, yes. We have put an estimated life on the existing steel truss portion of this bridge, we estimate that it could last another 40 years if regular maintenance is done to it.

Citizen: It was my understanding that you could only get nine years out of the existing bridge.

Citizen: In 1991 you strongly recommended Alternative #1 (Rehabilitation) costing \$224,000. Why is that alternative not viable now? Ollie stated that the Board was listening to comments that we were getting from the school district for one, from the emergency service providers. They were saying that the existing bridge was too narrow for their purposes. On the rehab proposal it would be the same width. What the difference is what the Board decided to do was to widen the south approach span to the truss giving you a little bit less distance you would have to traverse at that narrow width. So that was why the decision was made to look at this more elaborate rehab than just the minimal approach that only addressed the structural

needs; it didn't address more of these functional and operational problems that we have with the bridge.

Ollie stated that the reason we're here is because the bridge needs repair. If the Board elects to go with the rehabilitation alternative and they make that decision fairly soon we would like to try and get that work done this summer. If the Board chooses to go with either one of the replacement alternatives, then the earliest we'd likely see any construction would be some time in 1994 with a probably completion date in 1995. So it's a lot more complex in permitting, right-of-way acquisition and a number of other issues if we elect to go with the replacement alternatives.

Citizen: Is the cost of \$230,000 for the temporary bridge included in the Alternative total? Larry stated that it's included in the total cost.

Citizen: What is the cost for repairs to the bridge without doing any approach work? Larry stated \$224,000.

Commissioner Frazier raised the question regarding speed. If we replace the structure there will be a two-lane versus one-lane structure. One of the reasons there hasn't been more traffic accidents on there is that everybody is going at a speed that allows them to negotiate even in the narrow width. Have you ever, since you've been building bridges, experienced that when these structures are in place that there has been a history of increased speed and is there a problem with that or is that a perception rather than a reality? Gale stated that part of it is true; the speed has a tendency to increase because the familiarity and comfort level of the drivers increases because they have more bridge to work with; more roadway. In this case the speed cannot be extremely high because they're coming to a stop sign at this location and they're coming off a road that's not that long. So I don't see it as a large problem but it is going to be faster than the 20-25 mph that currently uses it because the bridge restricts them. Most people are comfortable with that speed right now. The speed does increase as the comfort level with the bridge width increases.

Citizen: Can you compare the cost of trusses versus the impact of wiping out that whole piece of property? Larry stated that Table 1 in the handout outlines the costs and is broken down by the structure cost. For the rehabilitation alternative it includes the temporary bridge cost. We've broken out the roadway costs. We've obtained right-of-way cost estimates.

Don Maddox stated that property to be acquired is first appraised, and by Oregon law we offer what that appraisal value is. Any estimates provided for this analysis was very thumbnail, only an estimate because we don't know yet actually what might need to be acquired.

Citizen: What is the cost for additional access to isolated properties on Holden Creek Lane. Is this cost included in the total estimate. Larry stated that a 10% contingency has been added to each alternative to cover unknown costs.

Commissioner Frazier opened the public hearing.

1. Leon Buffington, 41843 Holden Creek Lane, Springfield -

[Dumdi present.]

Expressed concern regarding access to cut off section of Holden Creek Lane, dike in front of his property on the east side, curvature on connecting road. He feels the value of his property will go down., Stated it's a sharp turn going onto Holden Creek Lane and gets slick. There's not much sight distance with new intersection pulling onto Highway 126. Wondered how the road naming for the new sections will occur. Prefers Replacement Alternative 1.

2. Sandra Frank, 41818 McKenzie Hwy., Springfield - Thought at the last meeting it was said that the existing bridge would last nine years, now it's 40 years. Has lived there for 36 years; house is 70 years old. If you would just repair the bridge. New road would be about 100 feet from her door. Replacement alternative will devastate property. Prefers Replacement Alternative 2.

3. Chet Sewcyck, 41595 Madrone, Springfield - Has been a resident for 14 years. Originally favored Replacement Alternative 1, but after looking at the plans now prefers Rehabilitation Alternative primarily for safety. Has a very good safety record at this bridge probably because it is hazardous and drivers know that and slow down. Concerned with intersection with park due to children and pets. The rehabilitation alternative will save approximately \$500,000. By not doing Replacement Alternative 1 you would save about \$1,330,000 and that money could be used elsewhere; Alternative 2 would save almost \$1 million. The rehabilitation alternative would impact hardly any owners; slight impact maybe with owner at approach. Alternative 1 would impact one owner; Alternative 2 impacts 3 owners - two would be eliminated completely. Where would we go to create new building sites. I don't think we should be eliminating present building sites or residences. Also have the wetland problem and a big rock that makes a nice swimming hole; you'd be eliminating that present boat landing.

Commissioner Frazier turned meeting over to Jim Brown for any discussion by the Roads Advisory Committee. Jim polled committee and asked when a response is needed. Roads Advisory Committee will prepare recommendation at their next meeting.

Commissioner Frazier stated that the record will be left open for seven days for any additional written comments.

Commissioner Frazier closed the public hearing and turned the meeting back to Commissioner Cornacchia.

Commissioner Cornacchia reiterated that the record will be left open for seven days. Comments will be given to the Roads Advisory Committee to discuss at their next meeting. The Committee will then in turn make a recommendation to the Board of Commissioners. The Board will then consider the Roads Advisory Committee's recommendation, probably in about 6-8 weeks. The Board will not have a public hearing but citizens can speak under Public Comment on the day this item is discussed to express any additional comments.

Meeting adjourned at 7:52 p.m.

*Janice Kainulata*  
Recording Secretary