

# Summary – CAG<sup>#22</sup> / PDT<sup>#21</sup>

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

*August 14, 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
- Rich Hazel – Laurel Hill Valley Citizens Association
- Lauri Holts – Eugene Parks and Open Space Division
- Greg Hyde – Willamalane Park & Recreation District
- 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
- Chris Henry – City of Eugene
- Al Heyn – ODOT Region 2
- Greg Mott – City of Springfield
- Ann Sanders – ODOT Region 2

#### Resource Team

- Megan Banks – LCOG
- Jamie Damon – JLA
- John Ferguson – T.Y. Lin
- Don Kahle – AIA
- Justin Lanphear – CMGS
- Rick Little – ODOT Region 2
- Kevin Parrish – Hamilton
- Suzanne Roberts – OBDP
- Kalin Schmoltdt – JLA
- Jyll Smith – ODOT Major Projects Branch
- Dick Upton – ODOT Project Manager, Major Projects Unit Manager

#### Other Attendees

- Liz Cawood
- John Lively

#### Handouts (available at meeting)

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

## WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Jyll Smith introduced Liz Cawood and John Lively who will serve as the new Public Involvement contractors during construction. Rick Little introduced himself as the new Oregon Department of Transportation Region 2-South Public Information Officer who has replaced Joe Harwood.

## COMMITTEE BUSINESS

**CAG<sup>#21</sup> + PDT<sup>#20</sup> Summary** – Greg Hyde noted that “park” is singular in the name *Willamalane Park and Recreation District*.

David Sonnichsen and Dave Carvo noted two date errors on recent correspondence with the group.

## PROJECT UPDATE

**Schedule and budget** – Dick Upton noted that work has been ongoing on the south bank since mid July. Work has begun on the work bridges and piles are being driven in the water. There is now full authorization to begin work within the park, hopefully beginning next week. Initial work in the park will involve paths and establishing the work areas.

The latest cost estimates show the project as within but approaching the budget. The team may look for ways to restrain costs moving forward.

Vicky Mello noted that the *Register Guard* had quoted the project price as \$147 million and asked whether this reflects a budget change. Dick explained that the overall project price is stable and that the \$147 million figure is for construction. The rest of the budget will cover design, inspections, public involvement, and other details. Jamie suggested clarifying the costs in the next newsletter.

**Community presentations** – Megan Banks noted presentations made to the Eugene Metropolitan Rotary Club, the Eugene Bethel Lions, Springfield Rotary, and the Eugene Pedestrian and Bike Advisory Committee. A meeting is pending with the Eugene City Council.

David Sonnichsen noted that Chris Henry had requested a briefing for the Eugene City Council. Chris said that he had discussed the briefing with Megan and scheduled a work session with the council for September 14 at 5:30 pm. David asked about the availability of a briefing document in advance of the meeting. Dick offered to let David present at the meeting. Jamie suggested a briefing memo might be helpful for other elected officials and as a resource for committee members.

**Public involvement** – Megan Banks noted that a project newsletter is planned for after Labor Day. She requested that ideas for possible newsletter content be submitted to her by Aug. 21. The newsletter is expected to include information on the groundbreaking, the DEP, the design workshops, and possibly a description of the activities of the millrace historian.

Volume 2 of the Design Workshop Summary is now available and includes a full explanation of the workshop process, copies of the presentations, and verbatim text that was recorded at the event. CDs of the document are available upon request.

Jyll Smith noted that Cawood will be taking on the role of Public Involvement and Information during construction just as LCOG served as the PI during design. Cawood is currently ramping up their level of involvement. Liz Cawood said that they are looking forward to working on this project.

Chris Henry asked for clarification on the roles of the PI firms involved in the process. Jyll explained that LCOG would continue PI for the design phase and Jamie will continue facilitation of the committee meetings although Cawood will be providing committee support instead of JLA.

Charlotte Behm asked whether Cawood is primarily a public relations or community involvement firm. Liz Cawood said that the firm has done both during its 32 year history.

Suzanne Roberts explained that they have begun issuing weekly updates to the media that are also posted on the project Web site. New signs have been placed in the park kiosks and information about path detours will be sent by e-mail to the stakeholder list. An event in the park is being considered to help get the word out. The team has been working through the City of Eugene to use their InMotion newsletter and the City has helped get the word out through other events this summer. A new Web cast available on the project Web site describes project background and includes an interview with David Sonnichsen. Postcards have been sent to targeted groups who may be affected by the pile driving. The ODOT Twitter feed (@OregonDOT) is also being used to get word out about the project.

**Groundbreaking information** – Suzanne said that the groundbreaking event was successful. Senator Wyden, Representative DeFazio, ODOT Director Matt Garrett, and Esther Stutzman gave speeches as part of the event. Jamie commented on the statewide interest in the project, noting that she had heard about the project while in Malheur County.

Kevin Parrish asked why the *Register Guard* did not write an article on the groundbreaking. David Sonnichsen noted that the paper probably made a conscious decision to cover the Springfield Willamalane event afterward since they had already written about the bridge in an advance story. The *Register Guard* did publish an article prior to the event.

#### **CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES UPDATE**

Kevin Parrish noted that work has finally begun in the river. Cranes are being used at various locations throughout the work site. The work bridge will need to be completed by Oct. 31.

Work on the north bank should begin shortly and will involve setting up signs, implementing erosion control measures, removing noxious weeds, creating the temporary path to the west of the staging area and clearing operations for the path under Canoe Canal. Flaggers will be used during the path work and detours will be in place while Canoe Canal is closed. Temporary improvements at Canoe Canal will require pile driving at the end of the month. This work will be from above and not on the path itself. Hopefully the paths will be paved after Labor Day, with the long term detour alignment in place after Sept. 10.

In response to Charlotte's question about tree removal, Kevin said that cottonwoods on the north bank would need to be cut at some point to widen the embankment. If the embankment cannot be widened this fall, the removal will likely be delayed. Removal of smaller trees will begin next week in the construction area.

Charlotte Behm asked whether water access at Canoe Canal would be blocked. Kevin said that the work would not affect the canal until demolition begins on the old bridge.

Greg Hyde confirmed that it was appropriate to warn people of significant work beginning in the park. Kevin noted that the construction presence and work should be obvious in the coming weeks.

Kevin said that the DEP had discussed the possibility of making trips to the work site. He noted that he had brought hardhats and safety vests for the committee members. The group will need to undergo a safety orientation after which they will be able to check in at the worksite when they wish to visit. Kevin said that he would need to confirm how long the safety training will last. Jamie suggested that Kevin coordinate the safety trainings with Suzanne over the next month.

Kevin noted that the construction office is at 3001 Franklin Blvd. Parking is available nearby and they will be getting a bike rack on site for visitors and construction bikes. Megan suggested using the railing behind the office until a bike rack is in place. Kevin explained that they would have eight bikes for staff to use to get around the site. David Sonnichsen suggested that the use of bikes on the worksite would make a good story. Kevin said that they are trying to figure out a way to keep bikes secure. The bikes will ideally have large baskets with space for radios and coaster brakes for convenience and safety. Kevin said he would be getting a trailer to haul survey equipment. Several committee members complimented Kevin for his efforts.

The intent is to finish the road work before it rains, so it may be necessary to postpone roadway work this fall that would otherwise impact traffic. The current schedule is very compressed and work is proceeding as quickly as possible. Pile driving will continue six days per week in order to catch up to the schedule. Six day work weeks will be avoided for other work items when possible.

Bridge demolition will likely begin at the end of October when the containment system is complete. The demolition should take three to four weeks. A maintenance agreement is needed with Union Pacific Railroad before work can proceed above the tracks. In general, the process is fairly linear though restrained by the limitations of the in-water work windows.

Megan noted that updated construction information and other information would be included in the newsletter. Jamie said that it would be important to keep reminding people why the project is needed. Charlotte Behm noted that she had overheard skepticism about why the temporary bridge must be replaced. Dave Carvo also noted lingering questions about why a temporary bridge was ever built.

#### **DESIGN ACTIVITIES UPDATE**

***Schedule and upcoming work*** – John Ferguson noted that Hamilton has accomplished a lot in a short amount of time. The design team is currently in the process of finalizing the southbound plans. Final documents regarding the southbound elements are expected to be submitted on Aug. 26. Draft northbound documents are expected to be submitted for review on Oct. 28, with final submittal on Dec. 21. The next package will include non-highway elements such as the bike paths, Canoe Canal, and aesthetic treatments. Preliminary designs are scheduled for review in April with the final package due in June 2010. This package will include the Millrace viaduct that will connect the path under Franklin Boulevard as well as the trail system near the interpretive center. The design of the area between I-5 and Franklin will be managed by the City of Springfield with a separate environmental firm, though it will be designed by the WRB team. Work on that section has not been scheduled yet.

Phase 2 land use permits are nearly ready for submittal. Federal and state permit activities are mostly done. Work is being done to ensure that fieldwork is within the permit guidelines. There had been some concern about the adverse hydro acoustic effects of pile driving, though the actual noise levels appear to be lower than expected. Kevin explained that they had tested pile driving with and without a “bubble-curtain” designed to reduce acoustic impacts to fish. Even without the curtain, decibel levels were below the maximum 286 db. The curtain effectively reduces sound levels by 5 db. Exceeding the limit may have held the project back, and hopefully future tests will also not be a concern. Dave Carvo noted that the pile driving work seems less noticeable than for the work on the detour bridge. Jamie noted that the hydro acoustic testing might be an item of public interest.

***Design Enhancement Panel report*** – Vicky Mello explained that the 13 member DEP has met on numerous occasions. The DEP includes five staff and eight volunteers, five of which are CAG members. The DEP agreed that participants would merge and work together on all three design bundles. DEP members were provided with a design matrix that showed areas of possible enhancement as well as prospective budget ranges and lists of stakeholders for each design area. The group has worked to reach consensus on the price allocation for each bundle in the matrix and also suggested edits to a draft Request for Services. The RFS is not intended to direct, but to provide guidance to potential artists. The project is more than just a bridge, and the work should focus on the relationships that the bridge project has catalyzed. Vicky said that the volunteers plan to continue working with the professionals in order to create a special bridge.

Bob Kline noted that there would be a group that will evaluate, score and recommend successful bidders. ODOT and OBEC will make the final selection. The DEP is encouraging selecting a team from Oregon. A team could include one or more people. Once a decision is made, the DEP will continue to work with OBEC and the successful bidder through the design phase. Bob noted that the group dynamics on the DEP have been interesting and that there has been some clash of work styles. Bob thanked staff for their support and input as part of a good process. He said he is looking forward to the next phase and finally seeing ideas become reality.

David Sonnichsen noted the discussion of confidentiality agreements at the last CAG/PDT meeting. Bob confirmed that DEP members were required to sign an agreement before they could attend the meetings. David asked for more clarification on what is governed as “confidential.” Bob noted that DEP members must obey procurement rules: they cannot discuss the content of an RFS, speak with bidders or give advice. OBEC is responsible for responding to questions from all the bidders. Justin Lanphear noted that the Panel is also privy to confidential budget information. David asked whether visiting CAG members would need to sign confidentiality agreements before attending DEP meetings. Bob said that it was his understanding that DEP meetings were not open to all committee members. Dick said that committee members may attend some meetings, but would be required to sign confidentiality agreements if the meetings address the procurement process.

Vicky Mello said that the CPC would like to ensure that there are opportunities for more than one bidder for the potential projects.

Chris Henry noted that RFS’ would be available publicly once published. He asked about the proposed budget for the design enhancements. Dick said the budget is around 1% of the project.

Charlotte Behm said that the CPC has concerns regarding how the DEP process is working for the park bundle. She suggested that a parallel process to the DEP for Bundle 3 may be necessary because the bundle has already progressed farther than the other two bundles. The CPC is also concerned about OBEC and ODOT as the decision-makers regarding what goes into the park. The CPC will need to have more say regarding any work related to the park. Charlotte also noted that the CPC is a publicly accountable body appointed by the Eugene City Council, and the confidentiality agreements have limited the CPC members' ability to discuss issues relevant to the park. Charlotte suggested that the Friday meetings between park representatives and the designers have been a very successful venue for addressing issues, and that this advance work puts Bundle 3 in a different position than the other bundles. She added that the park already has a preferred process for art that is governing the installation of four more Talking Stones. The park would prefer to use a similar process for adding other art elements in the park and may be able to more efficiently allocate funds than could an outside design consultant.

Bob Kline asked for more clarity on why a separate process is needed for Bundle 3. Vicky Mello said that the process has been rushed and that there are still points that need to be discussed. Chris Henry asked if the entire CPC is taking issue with the DEP process. Charlotte said it was. Bob requested documentation of the CPC's concerns and position. David Sonnichsen said that it is hard to document specific concerns because information is limited due to the non-disclosure agreement. Chris observed that while the non-disclosure agreement governs issues surrounding budget, other elements seem like they should be open to discussion as part of a community process. Charlotte reiterated that it has been challenging to make decisions when some information is confidential. She again noted her concern that with only two votes, the CPC representation on the DEP is not adequate to represent the interests of the park in a situation where the group may be voting on park related issues. Previous CPC agreements and restrictions must be considered.

Eric Gunderson said he was surprised at the concerns. He noted that all three bundles were constrained and that the goal is to work with whoever is hired as the process moves forward. He also asked for clarification on why the park should be separated from the other bundles. Bob Kline noted that the RFS clearly requires the winning bidders to work with the relevant stakeholder groups. Greg Hyde noted that the difference is that Bundle 3 is within the park, not ODOT right of way. He also questioned the level of secrecy required of DEP members.

Justin Lanphear noted that there has always been the intent to work with the CPC and the park as stakeholders on Bundle 3. Designs and enhancements proposed by the OBEC design team would need to be blessed by the park and the CPC. The design team is expecting to work directly with the CPC and park to identify concerns during the stakeholder involvement phase. Jamie noted that similar decisions will need to be made by ODOT maintenance for Bundles 1 and 2.

Justin Lanphear asked for clarification on whether Charlotte was suggesting separating the Bundle 3 budget from the other bundles and allowing the park to make all of the decisions. Charlotte said that the process didn't need to be completely separated because of the common theme and the need for coordination between the bundles. She reiterated that it might make sense to separate the money from the process because much work has already been done in the park and it might be easier to use the existing park process. She also noted that the CPC would need to be more involved in the selection of an artist and that the secrecy elements would make that difficult.

Scott Wylie noted that the identified stakeholder groups represent specific interests related to the site but that there is a clear need for interplay among groups to address issues that affect multiple areas. He encouraged the group to consider the lateral dynamics of communication between stakeholders.

Bob Kline explained that the conceptual phase of the contract will involve meeting with the successful bidder at which point some of the design work will be allocated to the construction contractor, some to the artist, and some to the CPC. The CPC will have input into that process.

Dick noted that the confidentiality agreements are intended to prevent anyone from giving potential proposers more information than their competitors or from sharing propriety information between proposing groups. He said that it may be necessary to revisit the restrictions and provide clarification. Dick explained that ODOT is a final decision maker only so far as to ensure that what goes through the process is consistent with ODOT policies and can be funded. The constraints are generally not about content or aesthetic preferences. Dick acknowledged the unique decisions that the park must make and he said that there was no intention of pushing a decision that the park doesn't want. He suggested working on the concerns with the DEP and then working with the CPC surrounding that process.

David Sonnichsen reiterated how he is unable to get sufficient information from Vicky or Charlotte because of the confidentiality agreement. He noted that the restrictions are not compatible with the CPC as a publicly accountable organization.

Jamie summarized the issues at hand: the allocation of funding for the bundles is in question and a matter for the DEP to discuss. Charlotte and Vicky have concerns that the CPC only has two votes on the DEP and is not sufficiently involved in decisions related to the park. The park will have a similar decision role as ODOT maintenance and this issue should be addressed by the CPC and ODOT. The issue of secrecy and the ability to share information is also an issue. ODOT should try to get more clarity on what can and cannot be shared. Jamie also noted Charlotte's example of the Talking Stones process as potentially a good model for moving forward.

Bob Kline clarified that the group has called for a vote just once. Bob denied that there was ever any intention by other members to overwhelm the CPC vote.

Dave Carvo said that he was unclear on Charlotte's specific concerns and asked whether Charlotte had a specific artist in mind for work in the park. Charlotte said that the park did not have a specific artist in mind.

Ann Sanders said that ODOT decisions would not override any concerns of the park. The park should still be able to say no to any particular plan. Ann questioned whether it would even be possible to hand over funds to the park to allocate. Dick said he was not sure.

Chris Henry observed that the CPC appears to have specific plans for what they want to see in the park. He suggested that any such plans would need to be incorporated into the procurement process. Charlotte explained that while there is no specific master plan, the issue is how to address decisions regarding art structures that aren't on ODOT right of way.

Greg Hyde suggested that the DEP should work to build clarity on the issues at hand. Dave Carvo suggested that it might help if the CPC made a presentation to the DEP.

Justin Lanphear noted that the RFS will be sent out soon with a pre-proposal meeting to be held on Aug. 25. There will be a meeting of the DEP within the next few days in order to incorporate changes to the RFS. Jamie requested a meeting with the DEP members after today's meeting.

***Laurel Hill Valley soundwall update*** – Justin Lanphear provided an update on the aesthetic treatments for the southbound soundwall. Three design options had been presented at the last CAG/PDT meeting and those options were then presented to the neighborhood through mailings and e-mail. The neighborhood overwhelmingly preferred the sculpted concrete forms. During the voting period, the retaining wall was changed into a reinforced soil slope up to the foundation of the soundwall that uses layers of soil wrapped in an erosion control netting. This change was due to time constraints. Vegetation on the slope will be irrigated. Justin also noted that they had clarified how the design elements along the soundwall would be intermittent. The northbound soundwalls will be addressed in the future by the DEP.

Scott Wylie asked whether there had been a process to determine how many people can see the aesthetic treatments in each location. Justin explained that the next steps will involve determining high priority treatment areas and how to get the best value. The placement locations will be reviewed by the LHV neighborhood and the DEP. More information on the installation process should be available at the next meeting. Rich Hazel noted four primary focal points for viewing the wall. Concerns have focused on the limited budget and spreading the benefits of the wall treatments evenly. Large expanses will be addressed first. Scott noted that even small elements could have an impact as part of a larger composition.

Eric Gunderson asked whether it is possible to vary the top edge of the wall instead of using the colored band as depicted in the rendering. Justin said that varying the top of the wall was discussed as a way to create shapes without increasing costs. Different shades and colors may also be used to create patterns or textures. Maintenance is an important consideration and the design should avoid creating spaces where organic material can collect. The designs will be shared with ODOT maintenance. Accent features will be feasible so long as a minimum height is maintained. Rich Hazel complimented Eric's idea. He noted concerns about how the details should contrast with the wall, and not appear plastered on. Scott Wylie suggested that it may be possible to use the features on top of the wall to compliment the views from both sides.

Bob Kline noted that the DEP had discussed opportunities for adding to soundwalls without spending a lot of money on them. He expressed the hope that treatments would not add much cost, particularly on the roadway side where people drive by quickly. Justin agreed that the design would need to be considered from both sides. Kevin Parrish confirmed that nothing would be used on the highway side that would create a distraction.

Megan noted that the northbound soundwall would be shorter and adjacent to unincorporated Lane County and the old East Alton Baker Neighborhood. Megan explained that only the property owners in the noise impact area will be able to vote on whether to have a soundwall. This includes fewer than 10 properties. Megan asked for ideas on how to reach out to this relatively unorganized group of neighborhood stakeholders. Jamie said that the team was considering knocking on doors. Dave Carvo suggested using mail to approach those directly affected and not to try and target a broader group. Scott Wylie suggested noting that it may be possible to add to the wall at a future date. Ann Sanders noted that the question for the neighbors is whether a wall is wanted, and then it



will be up to the CAG to address treatments. Jamie suggested using an initial mailing followed up by site visits if needed. David Sonnichsen noted that he had observed an increase in noise in that area after the wall was installed at Quail Run and he suggested that others may be interested in a wall. David asked how the affected areas were determined. Megan explained that the impacted area is defined by the Environmental Assessment.

Rich Hazel noted that the LHV discussions about the wall primarily focused on scale. The bulk and scale is quite different for the northbound soundwall.

David Sonnichsen said that he felt it could be helpful to get input from those not identified as impacted. Rich Hazel said that it could support the findings if other neighbors are also involved.

### **CAG ROLE DURING CONSTRUCTION**

Jamie said that the team would be charged with keeping the committee informed so they can respond to their constituencies. The committee will also serve as a resource for the team if there is a question of how to interface with the community. Kevin noted that it will be difficult to make major changes once construction begins and the CAG will be important for spreading information.

Bob Kline requested that design updates be sent to the CAG. Dave Carvo requested absolute drawings – if available – as a courtesy. Jamie also requested that schedule changes be sent to the CAG and PDT.

Jamie requested feedback on the interim update to the committees. Scott Wylie said that the communications were a step forward and that more frequent communications should be a goal. David Sonnichsen requested that contacts be listed along with the updates so that there is a clear way to provide feedback or ask questions about specific items.

### **NEXT STEPS / NEXT MEETING**

The newsletter will go out after Labor Day and content ideas should go to Megan Banks by Aug. 21. Dick and Jamie will meet to try and resolve the outstanding issues with the DEP. Suzanne and Kevin will coordinate regarding setting up the safety trainings. The next interim update should be expected in mid-September with the next CAG/PDT meeting in October.

Jamie noted that some committee members felt that the combined CAG/PDT meetings tend to flatten out decision making by having both the advisory and decision making bodies at the same table. Jamie suggested that the committees may return to meeting separately at future decision points.