

**I-5 WRB Art & Design Teams Meeting #3—Constraints Parade**  
**Thursday, November 5, 2009**  
**ODOT McLane Conference Room, Springfield**  
**10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.**

**Attendees:** Peg Butler, Robin Craig, Tulsi Wallace, Bill Willingham, Chris Henry, Con O'Connor, Joel Miller, Trevor Taylor, Kristi Krueger [partial]

**Staff:** Don Kahle, Facilitator; Megan Banks; Douglas Beauchamp; Larry Fox, Justin Lanphear

### **Introductions**

Those present introduced themselves.

### **Meeting Goals**

Don stated that he is not afraid of limitations because we have great teams. We purposely didn't start with constraints but need to address them. He said the group turned a corner when we made the distinction between stakeholders and caretakers, and explained that stakeholders really care about aspects of something but they don't have responsibilities attached to that. Caretakers have staffing, equipment, budgets, etc. Larry added that most caretakers have veto power.

Don added that this was the first of a couplet of meetings. Today would be voices going past you—information and presentations. The second meeting would be specific to the bundles and they would be more collaborative and problem solving; more system thinking.

### **Rhythm of Meeting**

Don stated that today's structure would be about 20 minutes of presentation followed by 10 minutes or so of questions. The presenter is welcome to leave after that.

The tentative schedule for next week was:

Monday, 12:30-3:30: Bundle 3 (tentative)

Thursday, 10-1 pm, Bundle 1; 1-2: tentative teleconference with OBEC's stormwater designer; 2-5: Bundle 2.

Don let the group know we are still working on the family tree and hope to have something next week.

### **Ownership, Maintenance, Jurisdictions**

Larry reviewed a wall-sized project aerial map—he noted the centerline of I-5 was the boundary between Eugene and Springfield. Both cities require land use permitting. On the north side, those involve include Eugene Parks and Open Space on the Eugene side and Willamalane Parks and Recreation District on the Springfield side. The Citizen Planning Committee is an entity that, with EPOS and Willamalane, manages the Whilamut Natural Area. The CPC is an active protector of the naturalness of the park.

On the south side, the paths are under the jurisdiction of public works transportation. On the west side, Eugene has jurisdiction and on the east side, Springfield does. Within the freeway right-of-way, ODOT has jurisdiction. ODOT maintenance has jurisdiction on the south side and ODOT owns Franklin Boulevard. ODOT and the cities are working towards completing Intergovernmental Agreements that delineate ownership and maintenance responsibilities. Two IGAs are being developed for the canoe canal (one each for Eugene and Springfield) and two IGAs are being developed for under the Willamette River Bridge (one each).

Larry said that the wall map didn't show the new bridge connecting the mill race viaduct. An IGA will delineate ODOT's and Springfield's responsibilities for that too.

Larry discussed the nuance of lighting on the south side. Lighting is needed on Springfield side but it is likely that Eugene will own and provide the maintenance. This relates to Springfield Utility Board requirements and is still under discussion. IGAs with the respective cities are still being negotiated. He added that art is not included in the IGAs but he will ask if this is coming. He added that facilities underneath the east side are Springfield's; on the west, Eugene's, which is similar to the canoe canal.

Larry said that the maintenance within the Whilamut Natural Area is somewhat nebulous. The City of Eugene has and will continue to maintain paths. Chris Henry added that all divisions—Parks and Transportation—are all part of Eugene Public Works and the standards are the same. Larry added that this is a good point. For example, CPC is somewhat pavement adverse and have pushed for smaller than standard radii for paths. The groups worked this out and reached a compromise.

Don asked about the boundaries of the project area. Larry responded that they are obligated to restore areas that are disturbed as a result of this project, and they may only touch ground in areas where they have received environment clearance and permits. Larry said that since the bridges and spans are built on and from false work; we will see the staging areas filling up with those materials soon. The contractor will be using North Walnut a lot more now and it will be repaved at end of project.

Tulsi asked if the temporary path will be removed at the end and Larry replied yes. The intersection north of the canoe canal, along with the path and alignment, will be rebuilt and improved.

Larry said that the area shown in the green on the map on the east side includes some ODOT right-of-way; right now the contractor is leasing it for job trailers. He added that ODOT has access rights to Jenkins Road, which is located in the same vicinity. ODOT maintenance has used this road area, and will continue. Larry said that the project limits were shown in blue.

Regarding the sign bridge, he added that it has to be replaced early due to temporary widening of the freeway and because the contractor is closing the southbound ramp for a couple of months. At the design workshop, an OBEC engineer suggested that the new, standard sign bridge be removed and used somewhere else, at which time it would be replaced with an artistic one. ODOT is concerned about graffiti on the back side of the sign bridge. They are not opposed to something being added to sign bridge posts.

Douglas confirmed that the IGA with Eugene includes the area under the Willamette River Bridge. Justin said that the IGAs also included post-construction maintenance shifts, such as the west-facing slope along north side where a retaining wall is being built to save trees.

Bill asked what happens to the berm on the east side and it was determined that when the new bridge is built, the area will be inside ODOT's right-of-way.

Don suggested the ADTs take notes and capture their thoughts for the next week. Don said constraints will affect ADTs in terms of schedule, storage, reuse, etc.

Con O'Connor, project manager for Hamilton Construction, said that the work bridge may have some leftover materials that would be available but much of it will be used again for another bridge job. He explained that much of the bridge and columns have concrete that gets ground up and the rebar gets recycled. The columns will become the state's property. Moving columns from the decommissioned bridge is problematic because they are so heavy. For the detour bridge, the columns weigh about 8,400 pounds per 10' section. In terms of taking them down, it takes about one day to set up for removal and four hours to cut at \$5,000 per cut. The divers they use cost about \$3,000 per day.

Betsy asked if the columns would be cut anyway, regardless of the ADTs' interest. Con responded yes. Con added that below the work bridge, there are environmentally sensitive areas and techniques for removing columns. Con added that about five feet of the column is in the river. Larry added that none of the columns may be left in the river but asked if any of the columns could be left on land? Con said possibly. Hamilton is building access up to where the cutting work will occur. He hadn't anticipated saw cutting any of the columns on land. He noted that removing the decommissioned columns is trickier than the detour.

Chris asked is permitting would be an issue if something originally proposed to be removed wouldn't be. Justin said it would need to be addressed in a land use finding. Since land use permits have already been submitted, might be a supplemental. He added that things are likely to be scrutinized in more detail in resource areas.

Tulsi asked if grading changes on the east side north of the river would affect the columns that may be saved. Larry responded that the detour columns would be on a slope.

Con said that while the decommissioned bridge spans are wide and that is great, it also makes the bridge difficult to take down. He said the detour box beams are 113' square feet and 1,000 pounds per square foot. He said that one reason to leave the columns where they are is that they are so heavy that a new foundation would have to be engineered if they are moved. He said there are two columns per span that could be potentially saved. He said that the columns have a 4.5' diameter for a total of a 6' diameter within the shafts.

Larry stated that the ADTs should be aware that the detour bridge was not built to seismic standards. He added that ODOT is selling the box beams but it is likely that not all of them are sold. The pedestrian bridges and viaduct are also using the recycled box beams.

Tulsi asked about dimensions of the salvage work bridge wood. Con responded they were 12x12x24 length. There were some existing 4' segments, probably about 100 of them. Don asked where they were located and Con responded that they were in random locations. Typically, wood and steel recycling would be staged in the area along North Walnut. He could take photos and send them out if the ADTs would like.

Robin confirmed that the form work and rubble could be reused. Con added that much of it would be used on the south side where the road was coming up six feet.

Betsy asked if there would be dumpster of rubble and Con said yes. Larry asked if there was somewhere rubble could be stored on the site, recognizing that there was a cost to Hamilton to do so. Con said there is not a lot of access but the group could go to Staton's site in Goshen and see the concrete pre- and post-crushing. Douglas confirmed that it could be hauled back to the site.

Don suggested a trip to Goshen could be added to Thursday's agenda and asked Megan to look into it.

Peg asked Justin if he needed any help on the sound walls. He responded that schedule was an issue, particularly with the southbound sound wall because of the on-ramp. He described the design and functional aspects of the wall. Larry added that neighborhood expectations for the design of the wall have been set and we would need to be careful if there were changes.

### **Land Use Constraints**

Justin presented a Powerpoint on land use. As background for land use permitting, he said there are different jurisdictions—the cities, state and railroad; and there are different local land use Codes. He said there are two phases for land use and both require a long timeframe for approvals. The longest is the Willamette River Greenway permit, which may take up to 150 days. He added that land use approvals are needed before construction permits and subsequent approvals may be issued.

Justin said that the types of permits are different for Eugene (two permits) and Springfield (four permits). Both cities have a strong interest in the visual elements and both have quasi-shared jurisdictional responsibilities for “resources.” The basic constraints for land use address mass, scale and location. It is possible that there is more flexibility within the ODOT right-of-way—for example, the sign bridge.

Justin noted that design enhancements placeholders are included with the narrative and drawings because he needed to provide a range of what might happen at the time of submittal. Will need to go back and inform the cities if go beyond what is shown. Beyond the placeholders, depending on timing for ADTs work, may need a Plan Modification (major or minor) if design work goes beyond when approvals are issued. A third and separate Willamette Greenway permit approval is not an option.

Tulsi asked about how Justin could communicate what would be easier for him—for example, striving for a minor rather than major Plan Modification. Justin said that it would be helpful to describe the structure as well as the placement within the Willamette Greenway if there is a structure. Anything in the ODOT right-of-way is helpful for local land use permitting. It would also be helpful to describe the visual aspects—for example, the canoe canal. If can isolate areas where design work will occur and placeholders now exist, it would be helpful in case the cities ask for more information. He added that increasing impervious surfaces is a trigger for plan modification, although it may vary by city as to how much.

Douglas complimented Justin's sensitivity to potential openings for artists and the creative and gracious “permeable membrane.”

Bill asked if the slope paving was an enhancement in the project currently. Larry and Justin responded that yes and was designed per ODOT's standard drawings. Tulsi asked about finding out the baseline budget for this enhancement and Larry said he could do that. She noted that

40% of their budget was for restoration. Larry responded that she should be sure all the parties agreed with that focus. It was observed that the breakdown of the bundle 3 budget was somewhat political.

## **Parks Maintenance**

Trevor Taylor, City of Eugene Parks and Open Space Division, said that vandalism and graffiti are parks maintenance issues for the city. He said they also need to have access to fix something if damaged. Camping and "hanging out" are discouraged. He would like to see people passing through have a positive experience but not make it a place to hang out. He said that if something is not durable, the city will likely remove it.

Joel Miller, Parks Maintenance Supervisor with Willamalane Parks and Recreation District, concurs and added that this location is not typical of other public art locations. Willamalane doesn't do much maintenance in this area now. If people use it wisely, great; want people to be able to use it. The more durable the better. Enforcement is difficult for Eugene and Springfield Police Departments. Willamalane typically removes graffiti within 24 hours of being notified. Larry asked how that was working and Trevor said it definitely helps to remove it quickly. Joel said they are part of a graffiti database. Betsy asked about anti-graffiti paint. Trevor responded that Eugene uses a variety of techniques.

Robin asked whose jurisdiction the columns would be. Joel said he wasn't sure but that Willamalane did not want to take on any infrastructure. Trevor noted that access and visibility are important for taggers. Joel said that difficult access with lots of exposure can be attractive to taggers. Joel said that webcams can reduce graffiti. Trevor added that taggers are less likely to tag complex art work.

Robin asked about giving graffiti artists a canvas. Trevor asked how that would be managed and Robin said they hadn't gotten there yet. Douglas said that sometimes they can be an attractive nuisance. This is a difficult place because there is the potential risk of conflict between users, although he said that doesn't mean the idea shouldn't be explored.

Larry noted that the designers were doing their best to discourage climbing on the bridge arch, etc.

Douglas asked who was maintaining the infrastructure. Larry said that Eugene will be maintaining the slope paving and ODOT will be maintaining the arches, bridges, etc. Douglas asked about proactive maintenance and suggested that elements be designed for durability.

Don said that the ODOT maintenance person was sick but he had suggested making extra, "spare parts," so that if something has to be taken care of or replaced, they can do.

Tulsi asked about sweeps through the park. Trevor said after UO football games, there is garbage pick-up, otherwise only as needed. For example, the city has a contract with the Sheriff's work crew and could use them on the vegetated slope up to the wall. Joel said there is tons of activity and clean-up that his staff has to do in that area. Douglas reiterated that we are working in the "borderlands" of both jurisdictions.

Tulsi asked if there was the possibility for an IGA between Eugene Parks and Willamalane. Joel and Trevor said perhaps but it may not get formalized. Trevor said that there was good communication between Eugene and Willamalane as well as good informal coordination. Trevor

highlighted that there was a big difference between camping and sleeping; camping is long-term and a very expensive nuisance.

Joel said it is better to try and figure it out on the front end because it is much more expensive to go back in and fix something.

Tulsi said there was a contradiction between “fancying up” the bridges and keeping people out of there. She added that a pleasant, passing through experience is very different than a destination. It was acknowledged that the mill race interpretative area will be a destination under Eugene’s jurisdiction.

Vicky noted that kayakers congregate at the canoe canal.

Betsy asked about the budget for landscaping under the bridge and Justin responded that it was designed to be rip rap boulders.

Robin asked about new stair access on the Springfield viaduct area on the south side—wouldn’t that be a location for potential camping? Justin responded that the design enhancements wanted to include possible access but were not necessarily ADA accessible since they were designed as stairs. The group discussed the potential design and access for this area, such as the legality of stairs.

Tulsi suggested that the restoration concept baseline could be discussed off-line.

Robin asked if there would be a camping follow-up. Joel responded that there is not a lot of tolerance for camping, although some depends on whether it is the first time or someone has been there a while.

Don noted that Eugene has an art maintenance endowment fund. ODOT has said they are intrigued with this concept but doesn’t have anything in place as of now. Joel said there is the potential to do something similar through the Friends of Willamalane and they would be interested in more information.

## **Transportation**

Chris Henry of the City of Eugene Transportation Planning reminded the group that City of Eugene standards for paths should be followed, which typically include a 12’ wide path with 3’ of clear on the sides. The standard paving material is concrete. It can be colored but that is extremely expensive. He was informed that the CPC has discussed other paving materials. Larry said that on the south side, all the paths will be asphalt. Chris said he was unclear why but would check in with Lee Shoemaker about this.

Larry noted that it will be written into the specs that the concrete curing compound will not be white.

Bill asked and Larry confirmed that the path under the WRB Bridge was to be redone.

Vicky asked for clarification where the paths were to be asphalt and where they were to be concrete. Larry and Justin responded that on the north side, the concrete would be taken to where there was existing paving.

Tulsi asked about sand blasting and asked if that was in the specs. She also asked about silica carbide. Chris responded that as long as it meets ADA, it would likely be okay. He has looked into it for other projects and hasn't gotten very clear answers about what smoothness is acceptable. Justin and Megan noted that exposed aggregate, which is already in Alton Baker Park, is not desirable for cyclists and runners. Kristi added that it is a maintenance issue.

Don asked about the different paces and ways they intersect with each other. For example, the Franklin corridor impacts bundle 2 and maybe bundle 1. Peg asked about the underside of the bridge, as well as rails and fencing. Don and Larry added that they hoped ODOT would be part of the discussion next week.

## **Mill Race**

Bill Willingham said that he had been hired by ODOT to do a mill race context statement, looking at the intake in particular. He said that sources have been elusive. He said that in 1851, the mill race began and it was decoupled in 1928 with the advent of electricity for industries. The intake remained in place until the 1940s when it was damaged by flooding and not repaired. He described it as an "orphan" fought over by the UO and Eugene. Eventually it was used as a recreational element.

Historically, in 1851, the mill race was developed by Shaw and changed hands over the years. In 1858, Chambers and Midgley bought it and in 1910, they tried to make improvements but nearby and downstream homeowners fought those improvements. In the end, the Oregon Supreme Court okayed the expansion but within a 50' "prism." In 1928, it stopped functioning.

Bill said he was focusing on the different construction phases. Unfortunately, there are no records or drawings, only brief descriptions in the newspaper. He may try to get information from the Seattle archives of the Army Corps of Engineers since the owners had applied for a permit in 1910.

Don asked if Bill could share newspaper dates with the ADTs and he responded yes.

Douglas asked how distinctive a feature or artifact the mill race was for this area and how much impact it had on the communities' growth. Bill responded that it drove economic and industry growth in Eugene between the 1860s and 1920s. It was not terribly unusual since many other cities had mill races.

Douglas asked what was required of Bill. He responded that he would be preparing a context statement. He added that ODOT was required to do interpretive signage as well as increase and maintain its visibility. He added that his timeframe was completion by December 2009. Bill said it would help him to know which pieces were higher priorities for the ADTs.

Peg asked about mills in the area. Bill responded that there were others near Shaw's mill. He noted that railroads had an advantage because they operated year-round although a 2.5' channel was maintained in the Willamette for steamboats, such as the one that went between Portland and Eugene.

Larry asked about the requirement for a public event to solicit information on the mill race. Bill said yes, that was that requirement but it was vague. Larry suggested this could potentially be part of the December 15 project open house.

Don described next week's meetings and the invitees. Larry added that he wasn't sure how much new information they would be but the ADTs should think about how to "outsmart" those constraints. He encouraged them to come back with what ifs and creative ways to find wiggle room. Don added that next week would be of the ADTs doing the talking.

#### **Next meeting times and place (McLane):**

Bundle 1: Monday, 12:30-3:30 pm (tentative)

Bundle 2: Thursday, 2-5 pm

Bundle 3: Thursday, 10-1 pm

#### **Follow-up and Action Items**

- Larry will ask if art is to be included in any of the IGAs that are being developed.
- Megan will look into a trip to Staton's Goshen yard, preferably on Thursday.
- Larry will investigate the baseline budget for slope paving and convey this to the Bundle 3 ADT.

#### **Handouts:**

- *Agenda (Don)*

INTERNAL

LCOG: T:\TRANS PROJECTS\WILLAMETTE REPLACEMENT BRIDGE PROPOSAL WITH OBEC\CHARRETTES FEB 09\DEPIADTS\MEETING NOTES\ADT\_MEETING #3 SUMMARY110509.DOC  
Last Saved: July 3, 2014