



## BRIDGE REPLACEMENT PROJECT

---

### EIS Working Group Meeting #3: Meeting Summary

Thursday, May 23, 2019 | 4-6 p.m.  
Port of Hood River, Commission Board Room  
1000 E Port Marina Drive, Hood River OR 97031

#### In Attendance

**Committee:** Tim Counihan, City of Hood River; Jon Davies, ODOT Reg. 1 ACT; Lorrie DeKay, Gorge Commission; David Poucher, City of White Salmon; Dale Robins, SW RTC; Brian Shortt, Port of Hood River.

**Consultants:** Scott Polzin, WSP; Chivanna Pot, WSP; Anne Pressentin, EnviroIssues

**Members of the Public:** John Everitt, Port of Hood River Commissioner

**Staff:** Michael McElwee, Executive Director; Kevin Greenwood, Bridge Replacement Project Director; Kristin Stallman, ODOT; Jana Scoggins, Recorder

**Media:** None.

#### Meeting Objectives:

The meeting began with member and public introductions.

Anne Pressentin reviewed the objectives of the meeting which included gaining not only member perspectives on bridge type identified in the Bridge Type, Size and Location (TS&L) Study, but also input on Oregon and Washington roadway connections to the bridge. Ms. Pressentin also noted that bike and pedestrian connection options from the bridge would be reviewed at this meeting.

Ms. Pressentin asked the Committee for any comments related to the February meeting (meeting #2) summary. None received, and the Committee members approved the February 21, 2019 meeting summary.

Ms. Pressentin turned to Kevin Greenwood to provide project updates. Mr. Greenwood commented that he travelled to Seattle, WA, to provide an update on navigation survey to the U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) and District 13. As a part of the NEPA process, it is necessary to survey all the river users including governmental, recreational, educational, and commercial. Mr. Greenwood continued that during the prior studies, the clearance was determined to be 80 feet vertical and 450 feet horizontal. During the survey process it was noted that there were some vessels that are higher than 80 feet. Mr. Greenwood presented a visual describing that the bridge design includes a slight parabola as a part of the bridge deck. The top point of the parabola is about 90 feet, and if it is corresponded with navigation opening, would provide about 250 feet of horizontal clearance. The current horizontal clearance is 246 feet. This design appears to meet the U.S. Coast Guard requirements as well as requirements of the other river users.

Brian Shortt asked if the USCG will be endorsing this design at some point. Scott Polzin replied that USCG will be one of the agencies issuing a permit. Mr. Polzin emphasized that these are only initial discussions.

Mr. Greenwood continued that another surveyed user was SDS Lumber Company. This company has barges with tall anchoring devices, but the spuds can be lowered. He also said the U.S. Corps of Engineers' (USACE) Dredge Yaquina was surveyed and the Corps said the vessel doesn't travel to the bridge area.

Mr. Counihan asked if all U.S. Department of Defense, including the U.S. Navy, were surveyed. He said some vessels travel to Hanford. Mr. Greenwood noted that they were notified of the survey, but a follow up discussion will be scheduled.

Mr. Greenwood turned to Mr. Polzin to review the progress of the environmental technical reports. Mr. Polzin noted that 14 different resource areas included in the 2003 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) are being updated. The first reports will be available to the Port and Oregon Dept. of Transportation (ODOT) for review in the next coming days. Mr. Polzin commented that letters asking agencies for participation were sent out, and currently there are eight agencies who responded. The Impact Assessment Methodology Memorandum, describing the process of preparing these reports, will be sent to these agencies for review and consideration. Mr. Polzin reviewed the project schedule and emphasized that all is on track.

Mr. Polzin provided an overview of the TS&L Study that was completed in 2011. Mr. Polzin stated that past records were reviewed to determine the path that was taken to select the Segmented Concrete Box Girder Bridge design as the preferred bridge type. In 1999-2002, the feasibility study was conducted, and a variety of bridge types were looked at. Bridge types were also discussed in 2003 Draft EIS, which focused mainly on alignments. In 2011, the Bridge Type, Size and Location Study was conducted to narrow in on the type of bridge that would be preferred.

### **The Feasibility Study:**

Mr. Polzin provided an overview of the past decisions with the Steering Committee and the Local Agency Committees during design workshops in 2001. The committees held multiple workshops to identify the bridge types that would work for the crossing in three different corridors. At the time, they were not looking at alignments. These corridors included a West Corridor, a City Center Corridor, and an East Corridor. The Committee was asked to consider bridge types that would work within those three corridors. The Committee identified these bridge types: a cable stayed, tied arch, concrete haunched girder segmental, and steel girder. The cable stayed design was removed from consideration due to being aesthetically distracting for the national scenic area. During the Draft EIS, preferred alignments were identified. Because all three bridges would work for all three alignments, they were advanced within the Draft EIS. The preliminary preferred alignment was determined to be directly downstream of the existing bridge. During the 2011 TS&L study, similar design workshops were held and the conclusions were consistent with what had been determined back in the 1999 to 2003 Draft EIS. Three bridge types were evaluated, and with cost and aesthetics serving as key evaluation criteria, the concrete segmental box girder bridge was determined to be the recommended bridge type.

One member asked if the bridge would need to be higher if the steel girder bridge type was selected. Mr. Polzin said, no, but there may have been more questions from the USCG.

Ms. Pressentin asked members if the process had been reasonable. Members agreed that the process had been reasonable to select the bridge type. The box girder should not be revisited.

Dale Robins asked about the number of lanes on the bridge. The project team confirmed the design has one 12-foot lane in each direction, with two 8-foot shoulders and a 12-foot wide multi-

use path. Mr. Robins said the new bridge could be here for 100 years. During previous studies, he said, the project team sought to maintain flexibility for a directional third lane.

## Connections to/from the Replacement Bridge

Chivanna Pot presented three alternative connections to SR-14. All three options have a roundabout. The first alternative is at Dock Grade Road (EC-1), another is west of existing intersection (EC-2), and the third is east of existing intersection (EC-3). Mr. Pot continued that the Dock Grade Road alternative is not preferred due to the need to significantly cut the rock on the north side as well as raise the elevation of the approach by 40 feet. The preliminary preferred alternative is EC-2 which connects to SR-14 on the west side of the existing intersection. This alternative will require only about 2.5 feet increase in elevation for the roundabout. The third option EC-3 on the east side poses a problem to Washington DOT who expressed concern about access management.

David Poucher noted that the City of White Salmon is currently planning to build about 9 acres of park underneath the existing bridge. Mr. Poucher proposed a staircase from the new bridge to the park south of the railroad tracks. The ADA access will be from the east end of the existing Park and Ride near the Chamber of Commerce site.

Mr. Poucher said the City of White Salmon prefers a traffic circle.

Mr. Robins said EC-2 was chosen as a preliminary preferred alternative because it was easier for construction. EC-3 would require construction materials to be shipped under the existing bridge.

Mr. Robins inquired about snow management. Mr. Poucher noted that the shared use lane may have to be closed during winter season to allow for snow storage until it can be removed. Mr. Polzin added that the presented location of the stormwater facilities is preliminary. The design criteria for these facilities will address the snow management and water quality.

Discussion by the group on the roadway connections further reinforced EC-2 as the preferred alternative due to grade differences in Washington with EC-1 and property acquisition in Oregon and construction challenges with EC-3.

Mr. Pot continued to present renderings of the bicycle and pedestrian pathway options and how it aligns with East Marina Way connection.

Michael McElwee stated that the presented design would involve a property acquisition due to the pathway leading across the Port's current Maintenance Building. The area of disturbance would be much larger than if the pathway is redesigned to connect to existing infrastructure.

Brian Shortt inquired about the acreage needed for construction staging. Mr. Polzin replied that the currently identified area of potential construction disturbance is estimated to be about 15-18 acres.

Tim Counihan emphasized that in order to make a rational informed decision about the shared pathway connection, important information was needed. If required, in order to score each alternative, the current ADA infrastructure, property acquisition, circulation of traffic in relation to the boat launch, parking lot, and Port offices must be reviewed.

Kristen Stallman  noted that bicyclists can connect to the existing road coming off the bridge.

Jon Davies stated that the trail next to the Marina Office Building has to be redesigned due to stairs intercepting the trail.

Michael McElwee noted that it is essential to consider past ADA projects that are currently in place.

Project staff agreed to bring additional information on bike/ped connections. The Working Group requested a comparison matrix for the three options with plusses and minuses so members could better understand and provide advice.

## Public Comment

Michael McElwee recommended that current stormwater facilities owned by ODOT be reviewed for potential collaborative utilization.

Brian Shortt noted that this is his last Working Group (WG) meeting. Mr. Shortt thanked the members for their time commitments and the sacrifices that are going to continue over the next few years to keep moving with the NEPA process. Mr. Shortt emphasized the need to collectively approach the planning process. Mr. Shortt commented that in order to receive the federal funding, all the preliminary work must be completed. This includes the engineering, transportation rates studies, governance and grant applications. Mr. Shortt stated that this exercise will not be inexpensive; however, enough due diligence must be accomplished, and the better the community is as a region putting emphasis on this project collectively, the better chance the community has to receive the finances to build a new bridge and keep tolls within a reasonable range.

Mr. Poucher thanked Mr. Shortt for bringing it up. Mr. Poucher suggested if tolls were raised to get matching funds that only the toll is raised only under the cash toll payment option. This would avoid most local residents from having to experience the toll increase. Mr. Davies said idea of revenue raising needs to be discussed along with governance.

## Adjourn:

Anne Presentin summarized that additional public outreach plan is needed to review impacts of the shared user infrastructure on the existing facilities. More information is requested on designs involving the tolling needs of the new bridge. The next meeting is planned to be in fall, but all members will be notified to find the best available date.

-###-