

Summary – Meeting #20

Community Advisory Group I-5 Willamette River Bridge Project

April 15, 2009, 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.

Tykeson Room, Eugene Public Library (100 W. 10th Ave)

ATTENDANCE

CAG Members

- Charlotte Behm – Representative, Springfield Neighborhood and member CPC for Whilamut Natural Area
- Dave Carvo – Vice Chair, Glenwood Neighborhood Group
- Eric Gunderson – Former President, American Institute of Architects SWO Chapter
- Rich Hazel – Laurel Hill Valley Citizens Association
- Greg Hyde – Willamalane Parks & Recreation District
- Bob Kline – Chair, Harlow Neighbors
- Vicky Mello – CPC for Whilamut Natural Area
- Chris Ramey – University of Oregon
- David Sonnichsen – Fairmount Neighbors
- Scott Wylie – Springfield Resident

PDT Members

- Chris Henry – City of Eugene
- Ann Sanders – ODOT, Project Lead

Handouts (available at meeting)

- Agenda
- CAG #19 meeting summary (*Draft*)
- CAG #18 meeting summary (*Final*)

Resource Team

- Megan Banks – Public Involvement, LCOG
- Douglas Beauchamp – Lane Arts Council
- Jamie Damon – Public Involvement Manager, JLA
- Larry Fox – Project Manager, OBEC
- John Ferguson – Asst. Project Manager, T.Y. Lin
- Larry Gescher – Asst. Project Manager, Slayden
- Kevin Parrish – Project Manager, Hamilton
- Kalin Schmoldt – Public Involvement Coordinator, JLA
- Jiri Strasky – OBEC
- Dick Upton – ODOT Project Manager, Bridge Delivery Unit

Other Attendees

- Charles Biggs – CPC for Whilamut Natural Area (CAG Alternate)
- Jacob Callister – LCOG
- John Horn – OBDP
- Don Kahle – AIA
- David Lewis – Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde
- Suzanne Roberts – OBDP
- Rick Satre – ASLA
- Eran Schlesinger – ASLA
- Jyll Smith - ODOT

WELCOME AND AGENDA REVIEW

Meeting purpose: Hear project updates, discuss upcoming design steps, construction schedule and public outreach opportunities.

Public Comment – Charles Biggs requested more information about the Section 6(f) property transfer, specifically with regard to the usefulness and fair market value of the properties being considered and why other properties were not used. Dick Upton offered to provide further information to Charles at the CPC meeting on Apr. 16.

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Summary of CAG #19 Meeting – The summary was approved with no changes.

PROJECT UPDATE

Schedule and Budget – Dick explained that five permits still need to be approved. Four should be in hand by mid-May. The remaining 6(f) approval from National Parks (NPS) is taking longer because of revised requirements surrounding the 6(f) process. Tentative agreements are in place to address those requirements. Work may begin on May 15 outside of the park on the south bank in preparation for the July 1 in-water work. Project costs are currently being re-estimated and detailed figures should be available at the next meeting. The project is currently within budget.

Community Presentations – A presentation was made at the Laurel Hill Valley Neighborhood. A mailing and polling letters will be sent to neighborhoods affected by upcoming soundwall decisions. Dick and Susan Vickers will make a presentation to the Whilamut CPC on Apr. 16 regarding the 6(f) lands exchange. A meeting is scheduled with the Harlow Neighbors on May 13. A presentation before the Springfield City Council is scheduled for May 4. The team is trying to provide as much information as possible to local jurisdictions in advance of visible project work.

6(f) Update – Section 6(f) rules apply to parks that have accepted 6(f) funding. A condition of accepting those funds is that impacts to those lands must be compensated. Even though the impacted lands will be returned to the park after the project is over, compensation is required because the haul road and work pad will be used for more than 180 days. The current agreement is looking at transferring property to parks from near the Bertleson Natural Area. This property was originally acquired for the West Eugene Parkway and includes a substantial amount of wetlands on about 27 acres. The impacted area of the park is about 15 acres. National Parks requires a public process surrounding the land transfer, and these requirements will be met through notice in the paper and meetings with the CPC. Other ODOT land near the Bertleson site may also be transferred to Parks because of maintenance costs. Some of the other properties in the area may be sold on the open market. Properties granted in compensation will also become 6(f) properties.

Upcoming Work – Larry Fox explained that the early work package has been completed, including temporary work within the parks necessary to get the contractors started in the first season. The design team is moving forward with final design and an additional work package is coming in early summer that will focus on completing the southbound arch and ribs to facilitate work outside of the in-water work period and subsequent work on the northbound bridge. The GMP package is expected in October with the post-GMP package in April of 2010. The design is ongoing and the team is now focusing on how to incorporate the ideas from the February design workshops.

Jiri Strasky explained several modifications to the approach spans. While the overall concept and configuration remains the same, cast-in-place multiple cell box girders will be used instead of four separate pre-cast box girders. Jiri indicated that the change should improve the appearance of the

structure and keep it slender. Jiri noted that due to environmental constraints, two columns will be used on the south side of the railroad instead of a single column.

Public Involvement – Megan Banks reiterated that construction would begin in mid-May on the south bank across from the park. The PI team will be providing detour information in Alton Baker Park from 4-6 p.m. on Friday and 9 a.m. to 11 a.m. on Saturday. The stations will be by the entrance to the park, at the Knickerbocker bridge, Canoe Canal, and near the boat ramp. Temporary kiosks have been placed in the park with preconstruction notices. They will eventually display detour maps. Outreach is planned to the Lane County Board of Commissioners and the Eugene City Council. Event planning surrounding the groundbreaking is underway. A construction update mailer is being created and will be sent to a broad distribution area.

Press Conference – Larry reminded the group that a press conference was held on April 2 to formally mark the transfer of the outcomes of the February design workshops to ODOT. The event received good media coverage from the Register Guard and KEZI.

David Sonnichsen complimented Hamilton on the installation of the kiosks in the park. He noted that the installations look sturdy.

Greg Hyde asked about work on the detour path in the Eastgate Woodlands. Dick noted that NPS will not allow any work in the park until the permits are in hand. Current estimates are that the package will be submitted at the end of May and work can begin on June 15.

Charlotte Behm noted that the artists rendering of the completed bridge inaccurately portrayed the pathway connections. Larry noted that the rendering showed current conditions but would be revised to show the agreed upon offset intersections.

MASTER PLAN PRESENTATION

Larry explained that the Design Workshop Steering Committee had spent time solidifying a list of ideas to move forward from the workshop in the form of a “Master Plan” that would try to provide a unified document to guide design decisions.

Rick Satre briefly addressed the highlights of the plan. The workshops yielded a number of good ideas and the Master Plan represents an effort to refine and focus those concepts into more actionable items. The phases of the plan correspond with ODOT’s implementation schedule: Phase 1 focuses on elements over the next several months while Phase 2 focuses on longer term elements. Rick noted that the project includes much more than the bridge and has the capacity to become a signature place. Rick shared some of the ideas from the document:

Railings – Including bridge railings and fences over the railroad. While the barrier above the railroad must be solid, it could incorporate atypical elements to show a theme of water, passage through time and space, or the camas flower. The root of the flower could be represented in tinted concrete and the bloom could be portrayed on the fence itself.

Walls – Including slopes, retaining walls, and sound walls. Walls offer opportunities to portray the context of the surrounding area. Exposed basalt is particularly prevalent. Rick suggested that the

walls could tie into the transportation corridor so it looks like the roadway grew out of the place. Plant pockets and terracing could also be used to break up the mass of large walls.

North and South Banks – Including the area under the highway, the intake for millrace, the exit of the Glenwood Slough, the railroad, I-5, Franklin Blvd, and Knickerbocker bridge. Opportunities exist to improve the bike path system on the south side. A trailhead and restored area could be connected with the slough. There are many opportunities for landscape enhancements that fit the character each bank of the river.

Other ideas included opportunities for enhancing the sign-bridge and reusing materials throughout the project.

Rick noted that ODOT has been open-minded about listening to the ideas from the workshops and has indicated that they want to see something physical as a result. The Master Plan is intended to serve as a guide for future work, though all of the ideas contained therein will be subject to further refinement and discussion.

Bob Kline said that the plan looks good but would require more details to be the most useful.

Dave Carvo expressed concern over the use of the term “Master Plan” because it typically implies inflexibility within the context of Oregon land use laws and is likely to be a concern to others. Rick explained that the term was used to connote a coherent perspective throughout the project and avoid letting design elements become isolated.

Vicky Mello suggested including a more detailed list of participants in the process to show connections to the whole community. Listing names would also allow for the roots of the plan to be traced in the future. Megan noted that a full synopsis of the workshop is planned as an addendum.

David Sonnichsen asked about the membership of the Steering Committee. Rick noted AIA representatives Eric Gunderson, Randy Nishimura, Chris Ramey, JF Alberson, Shaughn Jenkins, and Eric Bishoff; ASLA representatives Rick Satre, Eran Schlesinger, and Matt Kohler; Arts representative Douglas Beauchamp. Don Kahle and Megan Banks helped to lead the group and Larry Fox and Dick Upton were also present.

David Lewis noted that the presentations and contributions from the artists and other cultural resources should also be cited in the document. Megan offered to include the presentations as an appendix. She described the Master Plan as a piece of the final product.

David Sonnichsen asked whether the Steering Committee Meetings were public and whether CAG members had been invited. Jamie noted that Eric Gunderson and Chris Ramey had participated. Larry said that the meetings were not considered public.

Charlotte Behm expressed concern that no women were present at the Steering Committee meetings and that relatively few had attended the design workshops. Eran Schlesinger noted that invitations had been extended to design professionals throughout the community and that the attendance reflected the gender ratios of design professionals in the area.

Eric Gunderson explained that the design workshops were intended to allow design professionals to share their ideas about the bridge and the Steering Committee was intended as a means to organize that event. He considered the Master Plan to be a synthesis of the workshop activities and an extension of the workshop. The CAG has the ultimate say in determining whether the plan moves forward. Larry Fox noted that the Steering Committee's work on the document was not intended to be secretive but merely the means to organize and package the workshop findings for CAG review. Jamie acknowledged that the next steps were not clearly articulated at the last CAG meeting and that the term "Steering Committee" connotes a misleading level of authority. Rick Satre emphasized that the group has now finished its work. Charlotte said that although the process worked well, she was concerned at the origins of the Steering Committee and their role in the process.

Charlotte Behm suggested that the names on the inside cover are misleading and do not include other contributors to the process.

Bob Kline noted that he felt good about the process after his exposure to the design workshops.

Jamie noted that the team is challenged by how to remain transparent while also accommodating the tight project schedule. She noted that it is now the CAG's role to carry the recommendations forward or not.

Ann Sanders encouraged the CAG to let the team know if they perceive any similar process problems that need to be addressed in the future.

Greg Hyde complimented the work and thanked the professionals who contributed their time. Charlotte also complimented the format of the document, noting that it appeared to capture the essence of the design conversation without giving too much direction.

Charlotte Behm asked for an explanation of the matrix at the end of the document. Don Kahle explained that the matrix is derived from the words and images in the document and tries to organize the ideas visually to show whether adequate weight is being given to the elements throughout the project. The matrix is also intended to help show whether any of the design areas have been neglected. Charlotte noted that she also did not like the term "Master Plan," and suggested that "Summary" would work better. She also noted that the "Implementation Tools" title for the matrix doesn't seem to fit.

Vicky Mello noted that the document does not seem to bring adequate attention to presence of the Whilamut Natural Area. David Sonnichsen suggested adding additional text next to the aerial photo in the introduction and he noted that the name 'Alton Baker Park' does not appear anywhere in the text. David also suggested noting areas outside of the park that would be improved by the process, such as the millrace intake.

David Sonnichsen noted the prior work by the "Theme Team" – which developed and proposed the 'Whilamut Passage' theme – as well as the CPC's work to enhance the Canoe Canal. The report seems to indicate that the AIA came up with the ideas on their own. David requested that the CPC also receive credit for efforts to naturalize the Canoe Canal area.

Dave Carvo asked about the intended audience for the document. Don Kahle said the plan was intended to provide a summary of the workshop findings for the CAG and PDT. Larry noted that

the plan is a guidance document that should demonstrate a coherent vision for future use by architects, landscape architects, and artists.

Bob Kline suggested that the document might not need supporting documents in an appendix if it is only for CAG use. It may be more useful to move on towards implementation and begin narrowing the ideas so they can be used in RFPs. David Lewis suggested that a guidance document should reflect the work by the communities involved its creation and should represent the underlying themes that run throughout the process.

Vicky Mello asked whether it was possible to review the document further before approval. Larry said that he would need feedback before the next CAG meeting. Jamie suggested that the CAG should provide feedback by April 22nd and copy the other members of the group with their suggestions. Megan will compile the comments and send to Rick Satre. The CAG's comments to date will be summarized on Friday for the PDT.

Bob Kline suggested that the CAG could accept the document and then allow time to incorporate concerns. He noted that the refinement of the design elements would still be subject to supervision as the process moves forward.

Greg Hyde suggested that the document could be acceptable as a *report* from the workshops. David Sonnichsen said he could support the document as a report if it were just used internally and not as a document for the public or release to the press. Dick agreed that the document is not complete enough to release to the press. Chris Ramey described the document as a snapshot along the process continuum. He noted that the intent of describing the document as a "master plan" was to impart how the ideas should all fit together. Chris also expressed support for the document as a report.

Rich Hazel acknowledged the time constraints but noted that documents requiring approval by the committee should be distributed in advance. He noted that some elements seemed to be missing from the report and could be lost if the document is adopted now. Rich said that he did like the document concept. Larry said that the report is intended to capture key ideas and other ideas can be recaptured later if needed.

CAG recommendation to the PDT – Most of the committee expressed support for adoption of the document as a *report* pending additions in the form of an appendix or supplemental documentation.

PROPOSAL FOR UPCOMING WORK

Schedule and design packages – Larry Fox distributed a summary of the project schedule and the latest design elements matrix. The schedule for the design work packages shows when plans must be completed for each phase. Early Work Package 2 includes temporary work, detour paths, and bridge demolition. Early Work Package 3 includes southbound foundations and arches, approach spans, ramp, retaining walls (not soundwalls), and grading for the southbound mainline. GMP is due in October and will involve work on the southbound arch superstructure in preparation for the traffic switch to allow work on the northbound alignment. The final work package - post-GMP - will include northbound work and elements such as permanent paths. The project will be at 50% of progress plans by the end of October. GMP was originally postponed to extend the design

conversation and most of the ideas that have come forward do fit within the GMP or post-GMP timeframes. The schedule dates indicate when 100% of advance plans must be available for review.

Matching emerging design concepts with construction opportunities – The design decision matrix reflects the elements from the design workshop report and how they fit into the GMP or post-GMP timeframe. Coordination with stakeholders is still needed and CAG representatives should be involved in each of the groups listed on the matrix. Larry reiterated that the matrix is a living document.

Scott Wylie noted that the matrix lists the railing types as limited to two options, though Rick had indicated there were other possibilities. Dick said that the matrix refers to basic open railing for the bridge span, but he noted that it may be possible to add design elements to those railings as well as the fence above the railroad.

Design Review Panel – Larry noted the success of the design workshops and the benefits of both ODOT's guidance and the assistance from the AIA. Larry proposed the possibility of employing a Design Review Panel (DRP) of design professionals to help maintain oversight of the process and implement design elements in way that is cohesive and adheres to the overall project themes and ideas. This panel would be able to react more quickly to the needs of the project than a larger group.

Bob Kline suggested that non-design professionals be allowed to attend the DRP meetings to stay in touch with the process. Larry said that the team had discussed inviting representatives from the CAG as appropriate resources for the DRP discussions.

Charlotte Behm asked for more information about the group. Larry explained that the proposed panel would consist of eight members who had participated in the design workshops. Don said that the suggested membership includes: Scott Wylie, Eric Gunderson, Chris Ramey, Randy Nishimura, JF Alberson, John Rose, Rick Satre, and Eran Schlesinger. Charlotte disagreed with the premise of having too much representation from only one portion of the community. She noted that the panel does not seem inclusive of park interests or the Kalapuya theme. She suggested revisiting what expertise needs to be involved in the DRP and which interests need to be represented.

Larry clarified that the purpose of the DRP is not to create designs – that will be the job of design professionals in the community. The DRP is predicated on the need to move quickly and guide how selections are made. He noted that any RFPs that affect specific areas will involve collaboration with the relevant entities. Designs will not happen in a vacuum. The timeframe does not allow reliance on CAG meetings for these decisions to be made.

Dave Carvo suggested that the general concept is good and that he would be comfortable in using design professionals. He noted the need for ongoing communication with the CAG.

Scott Wylie noted that the density of design decisions will be increasing soon and the CAG will continue to be surprised by the number of decisions that need to be made between their monthly meetings. Under ideal circumstances the CAG and PDT would be able to meet more often to address these issues during periods of need. What is needed now is a way to move forward with a sense of trust so that the intermediate time-cycles of the necessary design decisions can be addressed quickly. Larry explained that the team is trying to create a mechanism to achieve the end goal and the team feels it is important to continue to engage design professionals as guides.

David Lewis suggested that if the CAG was interested in providing feedback at each step, then the group could nominate someone to serve on the panel. He asked whether the DRP would seek approval from the CAG. Larry clarified that the DRP would make recommendations to the CAG. The process structure in the report would likely change.

Bob Kline agreed with involving the CAG members in the process and keeping the group informed on a more regular basis in order to better prepare the group for full meetings. Larry noted that participation on the DRP could be demanding and could involve 2-3 meetings in a week as needed.

Ann Sanders noted that she felt that the three suggested members of the CAG on the Panel would represent the process well.

Charlotte suggested including Esther Stutzman on the Panel to serve as a woman and a member of the Kalapuya.

Bob Kline said that he respected the professionals but was concerned about getting important information. He requested that the CAG should receive copies of minutes from the meetings. Larry Fox noted that the schedule can make it difficult to get information to the group in advance. He suggested that the team would do its best to share information ahead of time as possible.

Rich Hazel acknowledged the process limitations and agreed that the DRP structure and the use of professionals is a good response. He noted that arbitrary representation is not appropriate. He expressed concern that the group could end up advancing a concept too far and then confront the CAG with a false choice that must be accepted because there isn't time to make changes. He noted that information along the way could help the process.

Greg Hyde suggested that it may be a good idea to have a member of the CAG, the CPC, or parks serve on the DRP. He suggested adding an additional check-in with the Committees to the schedule graphic.

Scott Wylie noted that the use of design professionals on the panel does not mean uniformity of viewpoint. He suggested that the DRP would need to work with divergent ideas and be prepared to change their minds. He agreed that including one or two representatives from outside the design community and communicating the events of the meetings would be appropriate.

David Sonnichsen agreed with the need for meeting minutes and increased involvement with the CAG. He noted that his objections to the "master plan" document were also largely because of a lack of consultation. David said that he couldn't accept a DRP that only included men. Don Kahle offered to try and recruit one or two more women who participated at the workshops.

Eric Gunderson suggested including a CAG representative, posting regular meeting minutes, and adding more gender balance.

Charlotte Behm suggested that the artists and architects should involve outside opinions. She acknowledged the professional skills but said that the perspective of a single community is insufficient. She suggested that building in better representation now will lead to fewer issues when the full group convenes and could ultimately expedite the process. She agreed that Parks and the

Kalapuya should be represented. Eran Schlesinger noted that the designers would not be working in a vacuum, and that the DRP would be communicating with stakeholders.

Bob Kline requested a standing invitation for CAG members to attend the meetings so they can listen and remain informed. Dave Carvo said that he would support the process as long as he is kept informed of events on the south side of the river.

Ann Sanders asked about decisions regarding the Laurel Hill Valley Neighborhood retaining wall. Larry said that a decision about adding stepped terraces would need to be reached very soon. The group will need to start work soon to address the Phase 1 elements of the matrix.

Don Kahle noted that the DRP was apparently being perceived as both a representative body (like a mini-CAG) as well as a panel of design professionals. Jamie offered to address the issue at a later time.

Jamie summarized the group's ideas and concerns:

- *CAG could meet more often;*
- *CAG nominates a liaison to the design panel - more representation needed for Kalapuya, women, CPC, parks, (Esther Stutzman or Vicky Mello were recommended as possibilities);*
- *Regular, timely communication needed with the CAG;*
- *Notice needs to be sent to the CAG for all meetings;*
- *Notes from the DRP should be provided to the CAG to keep them up-to-speed;*
- *A runaway group should be avoided;*
- *How will CAG members and design professionals work together in DRP meetings?*

NEXT STEPS

Jamie noted May 6 or 13 as possible meeting dates. Larry Gescher and Kevin Parrish will provide construction details at the next meeting. An implementation plan may also be available for review in advance of the next CAG meeting. In the interim, the team will refine the configuration of the DRP.