

# Summary – CAG<sup>#21</sup> / PDT<sup>#20</sup>

## Community Advisory Group / Project Development Team I-5 Willamette River Bridge Project

*June 17, 2009 - 10 a.m. to 1 p.m.*

*McLane Conference Room, Springfield ODOT Offices (644 A Street)*

---

### ATTENDANCE

#### CAG Members

- Charlotte Behm – Springfield Neighborhood and CPC for Whilamut Natural Area
- Dave Carvo – Glenwood Neighborhood Group
- Eric Gunderson – American Institute of Architects SWO Chapter
- Greg Hyde – Willamalane Park & Recreation District
- Lauri Holts – Eugene Parks and Open Space Division
- Bob Kline – Harlow Neighbors
- Vicky Mello – CPC for Whilamut Natural Area
- David Sonnichsen – Fairmount Neighbors
- Scott Wylie – Springfield Resident

#### PDT Members

- Don Angermayer – ODOT District 5
- Molly Cary – ODOT Region 2
- Chris Henry – City of Eugene
- Brad Henry – ODOT District 5
- Al Heyn – ODOT Region 2
- Kent Howe – Lane County
- Greg Mott – City of Springfield
- Ann Sanders – ODOT

#### Resource Team

- Megan Banks – LCOG
- Douglas Beauchamp – Lane Arts Council
- Jamie Damon – JLA
- John Ferguson – T.Y. Lin
- Larry Fox – OBEC
- John Horn – OBDP
- Justin Lanphear – CMGS
- Kevin Parrish – Hamilton
- Suzanne Roberts – OBDP
- Kalin Schmoldt – JLA
- Jyll Smith – ODOT
- Dick Upton – ODOT Project Manager, Bridge Delivery Unit

#### Other Attendees

- Bob McGilligan
- John Porter
- John Rose

#### Handouts (available at meeting)

- Agenda
- *DRAFT CAG Meeting Summary #20*
- *FINAL CAG Meeting Summary #19*
- *DRAFT PDT Meeting Summary #19*
- *FINAL PDT Meeting Summary #18*

### WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

*Meeting purpose: project update, focused discussion on design process.*

### PUBLIC COMMENT

*John Porter is a resident of Quail Run and a bike trail user. He expressed interest in the final design of the bridge arch and the bike trail on the north side of the river.*

*Bob McGilligan* rides by bike from east Springfield. Mr. McGilligan observed that the Clearwater boat landing has long had a posted notice about bridge construction on the McKenzie River. There has been no such notice for the I-5 bridge replacement. Jyll Smith said that notices would be posted soon.

Jamie Damon introduced Lauri Holts, the Natural Resource Coordinator for the City of Eugene who will be replacing Trevor Taylor on the CAG.

#### **COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

***CAG Summary #20***—There were no changes to the CAG Summary.

***PDT Summary #19***— There were no changes to the PDT Summary.

#### **PROJECT UPDATE**

Dick thanked Scott Wylie for prompting the team for an update after the last meeting. Moving forward, the team will commit to providing an update to the groups roughly halfway between meetings. Subsequent meetings may include both the CAG and PDT and may occur every two months with a communiqué in the off-months.

***Schedule and budget***— A contracting issue has delayed the start of construction. This is the first time that ODOT has attempted to use the CMGC process and the contract will need to be revised before payment for the work is authorized. The current plan is to divide the contract into smaller pieces for the sake of easier management. The revised contract is expected by the end of the month. The contractor should be onsite by mid-July and will start pile-driving and construction of the work bridge by the end of the month. Construction of the work bridge is vital to the rest of the schedule. The possibility of continuing work into the winter will be assessed in September.

Dave Carvo asked whether using multiple contracts would change the cost per contract and the Davis-Bacon and BOLI rates. Dick said that the primary issue is whether the construction phase of the Hamilton scope is a contract amendment or a construction change order. The contract rates themselves are already established and will last through the project term.

***Upcoming work***— John Ferguson explained that the team is working to complete Early Work Package 3 which includes the retaining wall, southbound onramp, onramp roadway reconstruction, Willamette River Bridge, and the Patterson Slough (Canoe Canal) Bridge work. The goal is to allow adequate time to procure materials. The design is going through internal quality control and will then go to ODOT and OBDP for external review. The design will go to pricing and negotiation by the end of July. The Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) package will follow Early Work Package 3. GMP includes the rest of southbound work and is scheduled to be completed by the end of the year. The Post-GMP package will involve all northbound construction and is expected in April next year.

Ann Sanders asked whether the plans would need to be completed and signed prior to work. Larry said that pricing plans and specs that have not been fully quality checked could result in needing to revisit the figures. He noted that the prices for EWP 2 had to be updated for this reason.

Scott Wylie encouraged the team to be conscientious of explaining acronyms when they are used.

**Public involvement** – Megan Banks noted outreach to the Springfield Mohawk Lions, Harlow Neighbors, the Board of County Commissioners, and the Springfield City Council. The team also conducted outreach in Alton Baker Park to inform users about detours. The next project newsletter is anticipated in late summer.

Suzanne Roberts noted that a project construction update had been mailed in May. A news release anticipating the start of construction was issued in May followed by a release noting that construction had been delayed. Maps of the trail detours are available on the website and will be posted at kiosks in the park. A groundbreaking event is being planned for early August and will hopefully include the Governor and other high-profile figures. Charlotte Behm requested the opportunity to comment on the list of invitees. Suzanne offered to get in touch.

Chris Henry said that he was still awaiting a project memo for the Eugene City Council. He requested that the memo be issued as soon as possible since the other jurisdictions had already been contacted. Megan offered to connect after the meeting.

Larry Fox noted that a survey had been mailed to appropriate residents of the Laurel Hill Valley Neighborhood to determine whether a soundwall is wanted. The survey had a good response rate and there was overwhelming support for a soundwall. The residents will now be surveyed regarding possible aesthetic enhancements for the wall.

Vicky Mello requested a target date for when work is expected to begin. Dick said that approval from National Parks is anticipated by July 1. Kevin said that signs will be posted, erosion control devices will be installed, and flaggers would appear in the park pending that approval. Work would likely start after July 4. Vicky requested posting a “for more information” contact phone number on the detour signs along with a target start date.

Chris Henry noted concerns about how the park detours would be communicated once a final start date is known. He noted the Eugene City Council newsletter as a resource. Suzanne noted that there would be continued coordination with park user groups and park event organizers. The public will be kept informed through display ads, press releases, and mailings. Megan noted previous use of the InMotion newsletter. Bob Kline suggested also using Travel Lane County resources. He volunteered his connection to a list of bicycle and pedestrian groups and individuals. Ann Sanders requested preparing more thorough details on the plan to publicize the detours.

David Sonnichsen clarified that the contractual delays were separate from the 6(f) issues with National Parks. Dick said that the 6(f) issues needed to be resolved, but they were not preventing any critical work on the work bridge and were not a cause for delay. Construction of the work bridge will still proceed from the south bank, in part to minimize impacts to the salmon runs which are more active along the north bank.

#### **“WHAT TO EXPECT DURING CONTRUCTION”**

Kevin Parrish noted the divided construction focus between the south and north banks. Timber decking and other work bridge components are being staged near the site to expedite the process once construction begins. An area with trailers is up and running and a nearby rental house will serve as additional office space.

Initial work will include creating a 30-foot wide construction access road. The first notable impact to users will be the presence of flaggers who will direct bikes and pedestrians through the work site. Culverts will allow the road to be built on top of the concrete ditch. The waterway will be naturalized after the project finishes. The access road will provide a connection to the south end of the bridge from which the work bridge and a 120-foot wide containment platform will be built.

Slayden will also start work on a coffer dam in the middle of the river to keep water out of the work zone and allow for pier construction. The coffer dams will be part of a Minority, Woman, Disadvantaged and/or Small Business Enterprise (MWDSBE) contract managed by Slayden to help achieve diversity goals.

Parks work will start with the creation of a detour path and the staging area. The path at Canoe Canal will require soldier piles to facilitate widening the bridge and removing fill. This will result in a temporary retaining wall made from steel piles and timbers on the south side of Canoe Canal. Part of the existing concrete retaining wall will be removed. That work is expected in mid-July. Charlotte asked whether the Canoe Canal work will require removing trees. Kevin said that options for saving trees had been explored but some of the work will require tree removal. Salvaged trees will be used in the park as barricades for closed paths.

A flagger will likely be placed at N. Walnut drive and signs will be posted noting closures due to construction traffic. Users will not be physically prevented from using the road on weekends. A flagger will also be located at Canoe Canal and a detour to the south will be in place while the Canoe Canal retaining wall is being built. Kevin emphasized that there will always be access, though riders may be asked to dismount before passing through.

Vicky Mello asked whether it was feasible to estimate and post when the different detours would be used. Kevin noted that the construction schedule must remain somewhat fluid because it is largely weather dependent and it is difficult to predict schedule changes far in advance. He noted that the kiosks would be updated and detours would be posted in the Register Guard. Dave Carvo suggested the Eugene Weekly as a way to reach cyclists. Larry noted that they would try to post schedule changes 1-2 weeks in advance. He suggested that trying to post a complete schedule might confuse more than inform. Scott Wylie suggested that the most imminent information would be the most useful and allow for flexibility and a changing schedule.

Kevin noted work on the southbound onramp this fall. As the new bridges are higher, there will be a need for 4-5 feet of embankment fill. The onramp is expected to be closed during the construction of the retaining wall for 10 weeks or more. The goal is to finish the work before the fall rains. A detour will be established through Glenwood. There will also be some activity on Franklin Blvd for the demolition of the old bridge, though that demolition won't begin until the end of October when the work bridges are complete. There will not be closures on Franklin Blvd and the onramps at the same time.

Dave Carvo noted the importance of maintaining the bike path under the south end of the bridge for regular commuters. Kevin said that the new path alignment will be permanent and although travelers may encounter flaggers, they should always be able to get through the site.

Scott Wylie noted previous suggestions about reusing parts of old bridge and asked how such recycling and reuse could be addressed and implemented by the demolition company as part of their

contract. Kevin said that concrete from the old bridge would likely be used for fill and any aesthetic applications would need to be considered by the Design Enhancement Panel. Scott encouraged revisiting the possible opportunities associated with reuse.

Charlotte Behm emphasized the importance of communicating to through travelers whether there will be the need to stop or wait on the paths.

Dave Carvo asked how the pylons would be removed under water. Kevin said that a diamond impregnated wire saw would be used and the pylons would be lifted out in pieces. The wire saw is useful underwater because it operates relatively cleanly compared to a hoe-ram.

Jamie noted highlights from the conversation:

- Detours will be provided within 1-2 weeks notice.
- Regular updates are needed in a consistent format, including:
  - E-mail;
  - Park kiosks (with the addition of a phone number);
  - Eugene Weekly;
  - InMotion Newsletter;
  - Register Guard;
  - Springfield Times;
  - The project Web site;
  - Project Newsletter.
- A plan is needed for detour outreach.
- Easy to follow, graphic representations of the detours are needed with fewer words.
- An overall “detour phasing” schedule with estimated timelines is needed.
- Potential delays from the detours need to be well communicated.

Greg Hyde noted that the outreach items need to be updated regularly. He suggested taking a modular approach to the kiosks so that different sections can be updated easily. Jamie noted the importance of getting people used to the kiosk content.

#### **DESIGN PROCESS UPDATE**

Jamie noted highlights from the previous meeting and the discussion of the design panel. The committee had expressed concern about maintaining communication, assigning a liaison, issuing notices about activities, and trying to avoid a runaway group. The challenge to the team has been how to integrate the CAG and design professionals together.

***Design Workshop Summary*** – The PDT characterized the document as a report instead of a master plan. The report will be used by the Design Enhancement Panel as a reminder of the workshop outcome. Megan has incorporated suggestions from the group into the final version.

Larry noted that the document is a two volume report. The first volume is an executive summary intended to capture the larger ideas while the second captures everything from the workshops, including images and notes. Both documents will be used for reference. The second volume is currently being reviewed and will be available soon. Hardcopies will be available through Megan.

**Schedule** – The design team is wrapping up Early Work Package 3 which includes elements for most of the southbound alignment. The LHV soundwall design will need to be finalized by October. Because of the tight schedule, CMGS (who is on the team already,) will lead the soundwall design. Larry noted several concepts that emerged from the design workshops. A mailing has been sent to the LHV neighborhood in order to collect feedback on the concepts. The goal is to get approval from the neighborhood before the next committee meeting. Larry noted that each area of the project will involve certain key stakeholders who have a particular interest in that design element. The designers will bring their ideas to those stakeholders in order to gather a sense of the design constraints. In this case, the team will vet the designs with the LHV Neighborhood so that the committees don't spend time entertaining ideas that the neighborhood doesn't like.

**Design Enhancement Panel** – Larry explained that Jamie had created a new proposal for a design panel based on consultation with David, Charlotte and Esther Stutzman about tribal interests. The CAG and PDT had both expressed interest in more participation from the CAG while also benefiting from the participation of design professionals. The team had also discussed the idea of using a core group that would facilitate consistent interpretation of the theme between the design bundles. Under the revised proposal, the core panel would include an artist, architect, landscape architect, and a CAG member. The team also felt that it would be important for the panelists to have been involved in the design workshops.

Jamie noted that in addition to a CAG nomination to the core group, the proposal also provided an opportunity for the CAG to select liaisons to the different design bundles who would serve as a link to the constituencies of each area. This would result in four CAG members being connected to the design conversation. The Panel would serve as an advisory body to the designers, who would then bring recommendations back to the CAG and PDT for review and direction.

Vicky Mello asked how the DEP would be used and how that process relates to the LHV soundwall. Jamie explained that it was necessary to move the soundwall forward without the DEP because of the tight schedule. Larry added that if the Panel is approved, they would be engaged before the details are finalized. Larry suggested thinking of the DEP as an advisory group coming out of the workshops who will advise the design team in the selection of enhancements that fit with the design theme. He noted that the DEP will not be performing design work, and that the members are volunteering their time.

Ann Sanders asked who is on the Panel. Larry noted architect Randy Nishimura, artist John Rose and landscape architect Annie Loe. The CAG representatives will need to be identified.

Charlotte Behm asked who would ultimately be responsible for selecting the designers and the proposals. Larry said that ODOT and OBEC would have the final say on selecting the designers, though the DEP will hear the proposals and will help make the selection process more engaging by representing the interests of those on the panel. Whoever is selected will then work closely with the team to refine the designs. Dick said that any recommendations from the DEP will need to be consistent with what is affordable and can be contracted for. Larry noted that the designers will need to continue to engage the involved stakeholders. Charlotte noted that there were challenges surrounding working through some issues in the past. Larry noted that the land use permits have imposed a number of constraints on design, but reiterated that prospective design teams will need to demonstrate understanding of the collaborative nature of this process in order to be selected.

Bob Kline questioned what would happen if the DEP made a recommendation that was objectionable to ODOT or OBEC. Dick said that the DEP would be reengaged to resolve the issue. Their recommendations won't be overridden or replaced by new ideas. Bob requested an open invitation for the bundle representatives to sit in and listen to all the meetings in order to convey ideas between the groups. Jamie noted that the core group is intended for that purpose and that it was important to keep the group small and agile. Larry said that although the meetings will be documented, they are not necessarily public. Discussions of RFPs, for instance, will require a degree of secrecy and representatives will likely be required to sign a confidentiality agreement.

Greg Hyde noted the issue of governance and asked for clarification on whether the DEP is making decisions or recommendations. He reiterated Charlotte's concern about getting approval for any decisions that affect areas outside of the project right of way, particularly those that will require maintenance commitments. Larry clarified that the DEP is advisory to the design team and ODOT. The design team and ODOT will create the designs.

Eric Gunderson complimented the ideas that emerged from the design workshop and noted the challenge of exploring those ideas while respecting all stakeholders involved. He noted that it will be the duty of the DEP to pass ideas back to the CAG and PDT for review. Chris Henry suggested that the DEP would be more akin to a talent scout than a judge as they won't decide who wins. Chris also affirmed Greg Hyde's point about reconciling ideas with the stakeholder groups. Dick noted that they would not be advancing ideas that the stakeholder groups reject.

Charlotte Behm asked for clarification on the involvement of the Kalapuya. She noted that the Tribe was not consulted on the design for the soundwalls. Dick said that the walls required the team to move faster because of the schedule, but he offered to revisit the idea of bringing a Tribal representative into the DEP. Charlotte said that she felt the solution with Esther is fine, though she wanted to make sure that the Tribe gets input before decisions need to be made. Jamie said that they also did not want to burden the Tribe. Larry suggested that the DEP would be engaged on the soundwall design as soon as the group is approved. Jamie added that each bundle would have its own process chart that explains which jurisdictions need to be engaged. Charlotte noted that the Friday Parks meetings at OBEC have worked very well. Larry said that attending the Friday meetings with all three parks groups would be a requirement for designers.

Ann Sanders noted that the theme involved more than just the Kalapuya. She did not share Charlotte's concern that the tribe needed to be involved in everything. Larry described the theme as a global history of the area. While not every enhancement will have a Kalapuya related theme, there will need to be a robust engagement with the tribe on the elements that do. Jamie suggested continuing the conversation with the tribe on the subject of how they want to be engaged. Scott Wylie suggested that it would be difficult for non-Kalapuya people with different cultural attitudes to recognize all of the elements that were formative of the place. He urged listening and enriching our thoughts by considering multiple perspectives and understandings.

***Proposed design bundles*** - Larry explained that the design team has tried to consolidate areas of design in order to engage the local designers. Treating the bundles as quasi-geographic regions also seemed to be the most logical and the best way to engage specific stakeholder groups. The three bundles included:

- **Bundle 1, above deck features:** Includes elements within ODOT's right of way, landscaping, screening, soundwalls, and potential elements such as a sign bridge and median sculptures.
- **Bundle 2, south bank interpretive area:** Described as an "interpretive area" because of the required display for the millrace ruins. There are also opportunities to naturalize the channel within this bundle.
- **Bundle 3, Whilamut bundle:** Includes areas on the ground on the north side of the river, including ODOT's right of way under the bridge and areas outside of ODOT's right of way including final path configurations.

Larry addressed the matrix handout. The matrix explains, for example, how any median sculpture would need to be identified in terms of mass, scale and location to be included in a land use permit. The matrix also lists key stakeholders that will need to be engaged for each element. The list is still evolving. If groupings are appropriate, then the DEP will be able to meet and begin their work.

Charlotte Behm noted that the Whilamut bundle should extend into Springfield and should include the potential use of a camas meadow to the northeast of the project area as proposed by Pat French. The rest of the committee agreed with the proposed extension.

Larry noted that there will be the need to prioritize the elements because of budget. There will also be the need to maintain whatever is created, and some enhancements may only be acceptable if annuities are set aside for future maintenance.

Scott Wylie noted that there is a bang-for-the-buck element to the enhancements, but also issues of scale to consider. He noted the need to be careful about what level of detail is used where, understanding that elements on a contemplative scale will be more labor intensive and have a higher cost per square foot. This understanding can help make the budget go the farthest.

Jamie asked whether there were any objections to moving forward with DEP approach as described. The committee had no comments.

Vicky Mello noted that the Whilamut Passage theme does use a Kalapuya word and the connection with the Kalapuya would be necessary to be consistent throughout the design. She also felt that there would be a benefit to having each group share with the other groups what they have learned as they move through the process in order to minimize surprises.

***CAG nominations to the Panel*** – Jamie noted that one CAG member was needed as a representative on the Core DEP along with a CAG liaison to each bundle. The time commitment will be from now until April of 2010.

Eric Gunderson and Bob Kline volunteered to serve as the Core DEP representative. Scott Wylie was nominated by Charlotte Behm, though he said he would be more comfortable as the Bundle 2 liaison. Dave Carvo had also noted that he was willing to serve as Bundle 2 liaison if asked. The CAG agreed that Scott made sense as a Bundle 2 liaison and that Bob should serve as an alternate to Eric on the Core DEP. Both will attend the meetings. Vicky Mello volunteered herself as Bundle 3 liaison and Charlotte Behm volunteered herself as Bundle 1 liaison. The CAG confirmed each

appointment. Bob Kline offered to serve as an alternate for any of the liaisons if needed. Larry said that the meetings would likely be held in downtown Eugene, though a location has not been set.

### **SOUNDWALL DESIGN**

Justin Lanphear is with the firm CMGS who is working with OBEC on the landscape elements of the project. Justin reminded the group that the February design workshops were aimed at identifying opportunities for aesthetic enhancements and coming up with preliminary ideas for what those enhancements might look like. Because of the compressed schedule, CMGS is helping to advance some of the soundwall ideas seeded at the workshops. Those ideas have been refined into four concepts with different material approaches:

1. The first concept uses sculpted concrete to gesture towards the basalt geology of the area.
2. The second approach uses weathered steel instead of concrete to reflect the basalt geology. The concept is intended to be simple and graceful with attention to price. The design does not try to imitate nature, but rather make an emblematic gesture towards the natural forms. The concept drew some inspiration from steel fountain work found in Portland.
3. The third approach also gestures to geological formations but uses a metal lattice and various types of non-invasive trailing vines to add texture.
4. The fourth approach is a gesture towards the native camas flower. The design would depict different stages in the life of the flower in materials like weathered steel. The concept was proposed as part of the "movie" concept during the workshops.

Some of these ideas have already been shared with the LHV community. Their feedback directed the design of the floral pattern to be less contrived or like wallpaper. The LHV neighborhood has already voted on having a soundwall, and now more feedback will be sought on what design enhancements to use. Moving forward, the DEP will look at the ideas that have been vetted with the neighborhood and determine whether they fit with the overall theme. They will then help guide the design team as they prepare concepts to bring to the CAG and PDT.

Bob Kline expressed concern about the differences in cost and how other enhancements might be diminished if the most expensive option is selected. Justin noted that the costs are roughly the same, ranging from \$20-25 per square foot. He added that it was unlikely that they would be able to enhance the entire length of the soundwall at this price and the enhancements would likely take the form of spaced outcroppings against the course of the wall. Bob noted that it would be important to make that known. Larry said that the materials that went to the neighborhood had noted the limitations and there will be more work to determine where the enhancements will provide the most bang for the buck. Bob noted that the two sides of the soundwall do not have to be the same.

Scott Wylie noted that the workshops did not specifically investigate a variety of options for the walls and that limiting the design to floral or basalt motifs seem to neglect other possibilities. He noted the presence of rivers, erosion, and other potential influences in the area. Jamie noted that the wall had been discussed at the last PDT meeting and some concepts for planting areas had been explored. Some ideas were taken off the table because of maintenance concerns. Larry reiterated that the time constraints were driving the narrowed options. Larry noted that the neighborhood may not

approve of any of the proposed ideas. Scott said that it was good to be moving forward, but he was concerned about there being adequate research into the opportunities.

Don Angermayer noted that soundwalls are typically flat and require little maintenance. He said he liked the concepts being explored, but he cautioned the group against making a selection that would look bad over time.

Eric Gunderson recalled the notion of thinking about the area as a sequence of events. He recalled the foothills to valley theme and noted that the neighborhood side of the wall was different from highway side.

Bob Kline asked why it was necessary to come to conclusions about the wall designs if the enhancements could be added after the walls are built. Larry noted that while some of the ideas could be applied to the surface, others would need to be integrated into the structure during construction. If the choice is to use an applied treatment, then the timeframe might be extended. At this point the preference is to not add those constraints. Bob asked whether the group could agree to use applied enhancements on the wall in order to buy more time. Dick said that he would want to know the cost implications first. Jamie said that the DEP would be able to discuss the issue.

Charlotte Behm asked about the next steps for the DEP. Larry said that they hoped to have a DEP meeting in the coming week. He noted that the LHV neighborhood will not decide what the freeway side of the wall looks like.

David Sonnichsen commended the team for involving the LHV neighbors. He noted how visible the wall will be and said that seeking input sets a good tone.

#### **NEXT STEPS**

Jamie noted that the DEP will get started. Megan will coordinate with Chris about a memo to Eugene. Suzanne will work on the newsletter and a construction communication plan. The committee is interested in more detailed detour and construction information soon. Jamie will work with the group to establish a more consistent sequence for meetings.

Larry noted that the first DEP meeting will likely include all liaisons. Don Kahle will serve as a paid facilitator for the meetings and Megan will provide documentation. Don Kahle will set up a working group email list and the representatives should hear from Don soon.

#### **Action Items**

- Suzanne Roberts will contact Charlotte Behm regarding the list of invitees to the groundbreaking ceremony.
- Megan Banks will connect with Chris Henry regarding a memo to the Eugene City Council.
- The team will explore options for posting a projected start date and construction hotline number on the park kiosks.
- The team will produce a written plan for publicizing the parks detours.
- The team will provide a way to clearly communicate impending detours with graphics.
- The team will follow up with the Kalapuya about how they want to be engaged in the design process.
- Jamie will connect with the committees to establish a meeting schedule.

## Flipchart Notes

### Construction/Detour information:

- 1-2 weeks notice
- Regular updates; consistent format
  - E-mail
  - Kiosk – add phone number
  - Eugene Weekly
  - InMotion
  - Register Guard
  - Springfield Times
  - Web site
  - Newsletter
- Need “Plan” for detour outreach
- Graphic representations of detour updates (less words)
- Develop overall “detour phasing” schedule with estimated timelines
- Communicate potential delays of the detours

### DEP

- Open invitation for CAG/PDT [*liaisons to other design bundles*] to observe – increase continuity
- Clearly articulate decision-making channels
- Develop “mini process” for each bundle
- Identify jurisdictional authority for each bundle
- Continue conversations with David and Esther regarding ongoing involvement at a high level

### CAG Liaison – Core

- Eric Gunderson (primary)
- Bob Kline (alternate)

### CAG Liaison

- Bundle 1 (roadway/above deck) Charlotte Behm
- Bundle 2 (south bank) Scott Wylie
- Bundle 3 (Whilamut) Vicky Mello
- [*Bob Kline offered to serve as an alternate liaison to all bundles.*]