

# Summary – CAG<sup>#24</sup> / PDT<sup>#23</sup>

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

*December 18, 2009 - 10 a.m. to 1 p.m.*

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

---

### ATTENDANCE

#### CAG Members

- Rich Hazel – Laurel Hill Valley Citizens Association
- Greg Hyde – Willamalane Park & Recreation District
- Bob Kline – Harlow Neighbors
- David Sonnichsen – Fairmount Neighbors
- Lauri Holts – Eugene Parks and Open Space Division
- Charlotte Behm – Springfield Neighborhood, CPC for Whilamut Natural Area
- Vicky Mello – CPC for Whilamut Natural Area
- Scott Wylie – Springfield Resident
- Dave Carvo – Glenwood Neighborhood Group
- Charles Biggs – CPC for Whilamut Natural Area (CAG Alternate)

#### PDT Members

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

- Carl Deaton – ODOT Region 2

#### Guests

- Charlene Larison – CPC for Whilamut Natural Area
- Drake McKee – ODOT District 5

#### Resource Team

- Megan Banks – LCOG
- Liz Cawood – CAWOOD
- Jamie Damon – Portland State University
- Larry Fox – OBEC
- Don Kahle – ADT facilitator
- Justin Lanphear – CMGS
- John Lively – CAWOOD
- Nichole Hayward – CAWOOD
- Kevin Parrish – Hamilton
- Suzanne Roberts – OBDP
- Jyll Smith – ODOT Major Projects Branch
- Dick Upton – ODOT Project Manager, Major Projects Unit Manager
- Douglas Beauchamp – Arts Consultant

#### Handouts (available at meeting)

- Agenda
- DRAFT CAG<sup>#23</sup> + PDT<sup>#22</sup> Summary
- FINAL CAG<sup>#22</sup> + PDT<sup>#21</sup> Summary

## WELCOME AND AGENDA REVIEW

Dick Upton greeted the group and initiated the meeting by announcing that he planned to present an award to Jamie Damon in recognition for her continued efforts and good work. Dick recapped the agenda and noted that the meeting would be slightly different in order to hear presentations on the Art and Design Teams progress. Dick then introduced Nichole Hayward as the new support contact for the CAG/PDT meetings.

## PROJECT STATUS REPORT

*Schedule and budget* – Dick Upton noted that work on the ground and in the water was delayed by two months, which has continued to delay the entire project. Project completion of Dec. 2012 is no longer realistic. Projected completion is now the summer of 2013, while the team continually seeks ways to speed up the project. In-park design enhancements will be finished after bridge construction is complete in the fall 2013. A meeting will be held mid-January to revisit budget and schedule, but Dick does not foresee the design enhancement funds being cut. Construction activity will cease over the holiday and start back up January 4, 2010.

## COMMITTEE BUSINESS

*CAG<sup>#23</sup> + PDT<sup>#22</sup> Summary* – Jamie Damon confirmed the meeting notes as final after getting a group consensus.

*Bridge name* – Jamie inquired about the progress of naming the bridge “Whilamut Passage Bridge”, which was discussed at length during the last meeting.

David Sonnichsen provided a brief update that the CPC is in the process of contacting the various local governing bodies for support to keep the forward motion.

Jamie Damon inquired about Esther Stutzman’s progress providing meeting information to the Cultural Department of the Grand Ronde. Esther was not present to provide feedback.

## CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES

Kevin Parrish presented a brief history of the milestones since the Notice to Proceed with construction on the project on July 3, 2009. The most recent activities focused on demolition of the decommissioned bridge.

*Demolition* - Kevin illustrated the demolition process using photographs of the actual demolition and “munching” of the decommissioned bridge and the containment platform catching debris. Kevin noted the most recent form of demolition for the in-water work is the wire saw. After passing around a sample of the wire, Kevin proceeded to show photographs and explain exactly how the saw works to cut the remaining piers just below the bedrock. The wire saw was set up last week and Kevin estimated that all in-water work would be complete by the evening of Dec. 19. Kevin emphasized how much more efficient the wire saw technique is, as he mentioned that they would have needed six cofferdams to remove the piers without the wire saw. Kevin emphasized that planning and preparation is what has allowed the demolition to move so quickly. Safety measures taken during demolition include laying sand to act as a cushion, hanging demolition curtains to minimize debris, and installing

barrier rails. A high reach excavator has been used to demo the top deck of the bridge. Dennis McGee of McGee Engineering, Inc., designed the demolition plan and has maintained an engineer on the site to monitor the demolition process and to ensure that the actual state of each section being demolished is the same as expected. Kevin mentioned one 'hiccup' in the demolition plan, where a huge piece of cement fell rather than sagging as intended. Kevin used this situation as a prime example for how the containment platform caught the debris, the demolition team modified their process and demolition continued. All of the debris is being separated with rebar being sent to Schnitzer Steel to be recycled. Rubbelized concrete will be reused for embankment, road or other similar fill. Staton Companies devoted their entire fleet to this project to help make up for the delay, which has sped things up significantly. The water level is expected to rise, which is creating more urgency to get the in-water work done.

Vicky Mello questioned what exactly happens to the concrete debris, especially any from in-water work, and wondered if any water testing was necessary.

Kevin explained that the containment platform catches almost everything with very few particles going into the river. Cement particles entering the water from this demolition are hydrated, therefore the pH level of the water will go unchanged and will not impact the oxygen level for fish. It's a fairly minute amount entering the water when compared to the volume of water.

Dick Upton commented that the Agency is very happy with the water saw technique.

Kevin reiterated that the water saw is the demolition method with the least impact to the environment.

Bob Kline asked how the remaining pieces of piers are stabilized when using the water saw.

Kevin explained that a 140-ton crane holds the remaining pier while it is being sawed.

Scott Wylie questioned how close the sawing gets to the riverbed.

Kevin stated that the wire saw rides flush with the top of the footing, therefore cutting the pier one to two feet below the riverbed. Kevin showed pictures of column stumps left in place on the south bank at the request of the ADTs.

A guest asked about the quality of the embankment material that will be re-used. Kevin responded that it is good quality.

Scott Wylie asked if all of the concrete that is being turned to rubble, chunks and dust, will be used for fill, and if so whether it needs to be cleaned. He also asked what state the rubble needs to be in to be used for filler.

Kevin informed the group that the rubble would be a well-graded mix to make use of all particles. If additional filler material is needed to fill voids, it will be brought in at that point.

Bob Kline mentioned that the ADTs have proposed a use for rubble, and inquired as to when they would need to inform the construction team that they'd like to save/use some of the rubble.

Kevin mentioned that plenty of material would be available from the demolition of the detour bridge for use with recommended design enhancements. Currently they need to get the mass of cement out of the construction zone. Once the demolition of the detour bridge starts, it will only be an issue of how much rubble is desired and locating a place for storage.

Bob then asked for the projected detour bridge dismantling date, at which point Kevin estimated summer of 2011. Bob suspects the ADT to need rubble in 2012 and asked if the ADTs could talk with Kevin to coordinate. Kevin suggested that the coordination go through the design team.

Dave Carvo asked if the rubble is being stored off-site. Kevin replied that the demolition, including removal and re-use of rubble, is Staton's responsibility, and they do store it until they find a re-use for it which may include selling it.

Bob Kline inquired if Staton will charge ODOT, and Kevin confirmed that they would. Bob asked if there is any chance at getting the numbers next year. Dick Upton ensured that when plans are made for the demolition of the detour bridge, the numbers would be negotiated.

Kevin reiterated that there are a couple of years to sort out the re-use of rubble.

*Next steps –*

- Installation of shoring.
- Installation of drilled shafts — one north and one south.
- Construction of west sign bridge foundation and support.
- Open Franklin Boulevard south (FS1) ramp; close Franklin Boulevard north (FN1) ramp.
- Construction of east sign bridge foundation and support.
- Temporary widening of ramps where needed.

*Construction questions* - David Sonnichsen brought up the previously discussed danger of exposure to silica in the concrete. He mentioned that as he passed by it did not appear that any workers were wearing respirators, and inquired about the testing results.

Kevin Parrish summarized the silica testing — the amount found after monitoring the air quality was very low and is not presenting a risk. There are monitoring stations on the Knickerbocker Bridge and North Bank Path, which found exposure level is 1000 times less than the maximum amount allowed. Kevin reiterated that it looked worse than it actually was, which is why they did not require the use of respirators.

Dave Carvo agreed and commented that local cement has very minute amount of silica.

Kevin added that most severe cases of exposure to high levels of silica are historically found in miners and farmers.

Molly Cary asked about quantity of rubble collected. Kevin approximated there will be 10,000 cubic yards when complete.

Jamie Damon asked the group and Kevin how they felt about continuing the construction presentations, and confirmed that Kevin will continue to present construction updates and progress at future meetings.

Scott Wylie noted that current public relations indicate the project is reaching a 90 percent level of recycling. He wondered if the repurposing of rubble is still considered recycling. Scott also asked what is going to end up in the landfill.

Kevin reminded the group that Staton is responsible for the removal and disposal of rubble, and that it all depends on how the project is bid out. Kevin stated that none of the bridge is going to the landfill because Staton will not let it. They understand that re-use is ideal and will not let anything go to waste.

Bob Kline asked how much material would be repurposed for this specific project. Kevin was unable to give a specific answer but said that, right now, there is no place to store the rubble for re-use.

Vicky Mello asked Kevin if the pictures of construction from his presentation could be posted on the Web site. Kevin confirmed that he would get the photographs to Suzanne.

Ann Sanders commented that Kevin's photographs would lose a lot without being paired with his informative verbal presentation. David Sonnichsen suggested titling Kevin's presentation "Parrish the thought."

#### **PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES**

*Open house and Millrace history* - Suzanne Roberts briefly re-capped the December 15 open house, mentioning that most attendees came to view the work of the ADTs. A lot of good feedback was given regarding the concepts presented. One attendee, Bob Park, turned out to be another resource for the history of the Millrace.

Bob Kline asked if the history on the Millrace would be published.

Suzanne confirmed the publication of the history but was unable to provide an exact publication date. Suzanne added that creating a brochure as well as informative panels is a part of project plans.

*Recent activity* - John Lively provided a synopsis of public involvement activity. John visited many businesses on Franklin Boulevard to hand out flyers and answer questions regarding the on ramp closure. He found many businesses were misinformed, and he was able to provide clarification. John also encouraged the businesses to copy the flyer and hand out as needed. He has prepared a list of Franklin Boulevard businesses to be added to the interested parties list. John noted that the new kiosk signs have been installed and have been well received.

#### *Next steps* –

- Revisit outreach to river users; post information at input areas.
- Continue to provide Web updates.
- Formally start providing site tours that will be coordinated with Kevin, through John Lively. They will be held on the second Wednesday of each month. John plans to contact various groups including schools, and encouraged the committee to contact him if interested in a tour.

*Public involvement questions* – Bob Kline asked when to expect the next open house.

John Lively commented that it isn't scheduled and reiterated that timing for the open houses would depend on the information available to present and the identified audience.

Charlotte Behm commented that the new kiosk signs are fabulous.

Jyll Smith informed the committee that more videos and pictures will be added to the Web site as well as highlights from the original bridge surveyor.

## **DESIGN ACTIVITIES**

### *Art and Design Teams*

Don Kahle provided DEP updates:

- Voted on theme “Whilamut Passage” last fall.
- Held two workshops in February.
- The Design Enhancement Panel was created.
- The DEP worked through the summer and hired three ADT's specifically for this project. Don made a point to recognize how quickly they've worked.

Scott Wylie said that looking at the bridge and the two banks, some design elements seem very abstract where others are very literal. There has been a lot of thought surrounding how well suited the ADT teams are, as well as how to apply design elements in different applications.

*ADT #1 – above deck and roadway* – Scott reminded the committee this application is a high-speed environment, which significantly affects the design, contributing to the abstract elements.

*Set #1* - The approach is based upon movement and the transition from mountains and hills to plains and rippling water. The designs are based on an idea that the railings signify different passages, providing a sense of progression from the mountains to the valley and river.

*Set #2* – Scott described the design inspiration of the weaving traditions of our area. This design focuses on the progression from natural to man made, and the interweaving of the two.

*Set #3* – Scott referred to the construction of arches and identified this design as a way of exploring the idea of points of crossing. The end points may become sculptural, although that has not been determined at this stage. The inverted arch paired with the arch of the bridge embraces the dichotomy of residents and freeway travelers.

*Set #4* – Scott compared this design to traditional markers that move in the wind and also noted the focus of the progression of visual design.

*Set #5* – Scott introduced this design mentioning the power of the sign bridge. Based on the concept of big ideas moving through landscapes joined with the visual

aesthetic of the camas flower, this design creates a sense of motion in the railing or with the blades of the propeller.

*Sound walls* – Justin Lanphear introduced the sound wall design as an attempt to sculpturally represent the local geology. The Laurel Hill Valley neighborhood has endorsed the design concepts. He recognized that sculptural elements still provide aesthetic value to the highway side of the wall. The team performed a view-shed study to identify the locations that are best suited for sculptural and visible elements of the walls. The study essentially identified where the sound wall aesthetic will get the ‘best bang for your buck’.

Justin noted that as you move toward the south sound wall, the landscape is much more wooded, which leads to a much less visible wall. Maintaining the overall concept of the Whilamut Passage, it was decided that two tones of CMU block would be used. The treatment of the CMU blocks will look like a sound wave that becomes denser as you are closer. The two-toned CMU block is also intended to help blend the sound wall with the landscape, providing a more pixilated visual. Moving forward, final concepts addressing both sides of the sound walls are being sought after and the team intends to finalize the design concepts in a more formal engineering and construction format. Justin also reiterated the universal desire for quick completion of the sound wall project.

*ADT #2 - south bank* – Scott Wylie briefly identified these design efforts as the most varied. Affected by landscape, these designs involve ruins, overgrowth, restoration, and reconstruction. The team has focused on bringing all elements to light and providing a narrative for interpretation. Hoping to incorporate the history of the Millrace, the team envisions the channel becoming a learning environment in addition to being aesthetically pleasing. The bank designs incorporate artistic interpretations of ideas, including the broken columns used to represent the old bridge.

*ADT #3 – Whilamut Natural Area* – Vicky Mello described this team’s work as an attempt to embody the environment. They intend to do this by re-using materials for singing perches and other elements. They’ve also incorporated a canoe design to feature at the Canoe Canal. The team has high hopes of community involvement to be incorporated to help carry out the final enhancement and restoration plans. It was mentioned that this team has paid close attention to stakeholder concerns throughout their design process, and CPC members have been allowed to provide input. Budget constraints may be the primary limiting factor for design. Vicky pointed out how the landscaping restoration plan is very comprehensive.

*ADT next steps* – Bob Kline complimented the design teams for working so well together.

- The ADTs will take input and narrow down the design concepts, incorporate changes, and re-present to the DEP and other groups.
- A meeting is scheduled for January 5 to revisit the designs.
- Another meeting will be held in mid-January to narrow down the design concepts further, at which point the teams will need to ‘sell’ their ideas to the DEP.
- A major effort will be put towards marrying the design concepts and budget once concepts have been narrowed down.

- Phase 2 Design will start late February 2010 when concepts will be finalized.

*Review and discussion of design enhancement concepts* – CAG and PDT members were provided worksheets to make note of elements they found to be good, bad, intriguing, or questionable. Don Kahle encouraged the group to capture their first impressions.

Jamie Damon instructed the group to mill around, fill out worksheets, and grab lunch.

After the group reconvened, Jamie asked members to ask any questions they had and to identify anything the DEP may have missed.

Vicky Mello noted the Laurel Hill Valley neighborhood has provided input regarding the south sound wall design concepts, and wondered if the Springfield neighbors near the northbound sound wall will be given a chance to give input.

Dick Upton assured her that there has been a dialogue.

Suzanne Roberts noted her work with Megan Banks to obtain input from the northbound sound wall neighbors. The impacted area is much smaller than the sound wall in Laurel Hill Valley. Suzanne confirmed the Springfield neighborhood has been notified that they will get a sound wall, and design concepts will be provided for them to review. She intends to ask for input from those in the surrounding neighborhood through a mailing to those visually impacted.

Charlotte Behm requested that efforts to communicate with the Springfield neighborhood involve her.

Scott suggested the DEP also encourage neighborhood residents to give design input, reiterating the goal of an inclusive design process.

Bob Kline commented that it appears that the northbound sound wall hasn't been given as much attention. Bob feels, in terms of the roadway side, it will be interesting to see what concepts are presented. He questioned if it will just be a sound wall with no design.

Justin Lanphear responded that the concept planned for the south sound wall on the highway could apply.

Bob noted that he likes the flower and evergreen concept.

Larry Fox pointed out that the north sound wall has been on a different schedule and thus has not been as much of a focus. It will be constructed toward the end of the project. Larry also noted that less of the budget was devoted to the north sound wall since it is not as large. The pattern of CMU blocks will be seen on both sides. He pointed out that while performing a view-shed assessment, the team realized the number of people that will be visually impacted is noticeably smaller than on the south end, so each sound wall should be treated as an entirely different situation.

Scott Wylie introduced the notion that the design process of the wall should dovetail with the work of ADT #1 to ensure a collaborative design.

Charlotte Behm reiterated that she went around and talked to hundreds of neighbors about the sound wall and gathered signatures. She asked why the neighborhood residents aren't being talked to, let alone herself as a committee member. Charlotte expressed a sense of frustration in regard to the lack of communication surrounding this topic and region.

Jamie Damon reiterated the scheduling difference, and restated that a meeting needs to be scheduled to touch base with Charlotte and her neighborhood.

Larry suggested that this conversation happen before the team gets back to the stakeholders who are visually impacted.

Suzanne Roberts informed the group that the design concepts would be available and dispersed in January 2010.

Charlene Larison asked how far north the sound wall would stretch.

Larry Fox pointed out on the project map where the location of the north wall will be, noting that the end point was determined in the Environmental Assessment. It has since been determined that a sound wall of this length, in this location, is no longer needed, however the Agency will keep its commitment to the neighborhood.

Scott Wylie reminded the group that drivers on Interstate 5 will be right beside the sound wall, which leaves a very oblique view. Scott encouraged the group to take that perceptual fact into account, while the other wall has a multi directional view of what is going on. Viewership has very different angle, in addition to what the neighborhood wants to see.

Dave Carvo mentioned the priorities listed at the start of the ADT process – maintenance, durability, safety and vandalism – and he doesn't see these addressed within the design concepts. He doesn't see the reality of homeless and adolescent traffic being incorporated or thought of, for an example.

Don Angermayer interjected there was a meeting of all parties to discuss these issues which allowed them to give an idea of what needs to happen, as well as more broad parameters on what could or couldn't happen. Don expressed the need to make sure that the ADTs got the broad idea.

Dick Upton noted that he feels a strong message was shared with the ADTs about these priorities, and noted that it will be an ongoing discussion.

Dave Carvo expressed that he doesn't see the practicality in the design concepts. He feels they lack a big picture, e.g. no mention of long-term maintenance.

Scott Wylie pointed out that not all measures taken in this phase would be obvious. The art won't necessarily say or illustrate its durability or maintenance, but by using select materials and applications, the designs will address these priorities. Scott realizes these issues can be addressed over and over, but reminded the group he has been witness to a great deal of energy and concern regarding those topics specifically being incorporated into each design. Each bundle is different in how it addresses this issue based on area, materials, and environment. Things being made largely of rubble are not hugely appealing to vandalize, etc. Scott appreciated the feedback and the concern was well taken.

Bob Kline agreed that a large amount of conversation addressing these priorities is happening; it just hasn't been as visible or publicized.

David Sonnichsen commented that these topics have been discussed at monthly parks coordination meetings and intense meetings at OBEC. Durability in the park, in particular, has been addressed frequently. David has heard from Willamalane maintenance staff and feels confident the primary goals of the design are being addressed in depth. His concern is lack of synthesis; he doesn't feel the design teams are incorporating as much of the Whilamut Passage idea.

Jamie agreed that more synthesis is desired from the CAG and PDT.

Chris Henry reminded the group that these ideas are early prototypes, and what will actually go into production will go through an inspection and approval process. First we have to decide what we like, at which point we can figure out how to logistically make it work.

Megan Banks informed the group that concepts were posted on the Web site and she received about a dozen comments. They are summarized below:

- Some comments echoed similar concerns brought up during today's meeting.
- Fear they will be covered up with standard large ODOT signs.
- Litter.
- Create something that's not distracting, blends, and encompasses community.
- Consider combining concepts.
- Support for south bank ideas and support for north bank habitat ideas.
- Concerns about constraining costs and safety.
- Comments at open house included preferences for specific aesthetic designs, as well as comments similar to those David has made.

Charlotte Behm asked for a list of what each ADT team has been paid. She expressed concern for the lack of clarity about the process after Phase 1. She feels there are huge differences in the amount of work that each ADT has put into the concepts, and in some cases she hasn't seen much output. She urged the group to see who will produce and understand that some of ADTs aren't adequately producing results and therefore shouldn't be a part of the second phase. Charlotte also encouraged the committees to look at themselves as an employer with the need to find people who will spend money wisely.

Larry Fox commented that it is, and always has been, a DEP decision about which team advances to the second phase. Each ADT contract indicates the teams are only hired for Phase 1. Larry didn't have exact numbers on costs, but the numbers are extremely low compared to the fees they are used to. Larry projects that most will not make a profit and he believes the teams are happy to be involved in such an interesting project. At the end of Phase 1 the DEP will make a recommendation on who should move to Phase 2. About one-third of the design enhancement budget is allocated for Phase 1, the rest is for their completion. The DEP will work to adjust the final budget and design.

Bob Kline said that ADT #1 seems to be behind while the other two designs seem to be more realistic. He would like ADT #1 to know that his expectations are higher than what he's seen. He doesn't feel there is any detail to latch onto.

Scott responded that designing for each of the three domains, given various stakeholders, presents very different challenges. The scale differences are large and pose parameters around what a designer is able to create. He agrees that everyone is hungry to know more about the details. Scott noted that he doesn't want to defend any one group, but each ADT has different factors to deal with. ADT #1 is working on a vision seen at 60 miles per hour, which presents a very different and crucial element of design. Scott suggested that there is no standard of detail that is a one size fits all in terms of expectations at this point. He feels that for this reason alone, it was very wise to break the process into two phases, the first being a smaller portion. On another note, Scott mentioned differences in the amount of what is known in each design domain. He also mentioned that all people work differently, with different styles and techniques.

Jamie asked the group to give their worksheets to Megan and inquired about how long comments can be submitted on the Web site.

Megan said that the cut-off for comments was Dec. 17.

#### **NEXT STEPS**

Larry Fox said that design enhancement material should be ready for the next CAG/PDT meeting in early February. The next meeting will be scheduled for around this time.

Don Angermayer announced this as his last meeting, and recognized Drake McKee as his replacement.