

Summary – CAG^{#25} / PDT^{#24}

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

February 19, 2010 - 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
- Scott Wylie – Springfield Resident
- Charles Biggs – CPC for Whilamut Natural Area (CAG Alternate)
- Eric Gunderson – ADT Facilitator

PDT Members

- Drake McKee – ODOT District 5
- Chris Henry – City of Eugene
- Al Heyn – ODOT Region 2
- Ann Sanders – ODOT Region 2
- Carl Deaton – ODOT Region 2

Guests

- Charlene Larison – CPC for Whilamut Natural Area

Resource Team

- Megan Banks – LCOG
- 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
- Larry Gescher – Slayden Construction

Handouts (available at meeting)

- Agenda
- DRAFT CAG^{#24} + PDT^{#23} Summary
- FINAL CAG^{#23} + PDT^{#22} Summary
- Design Enhancement Panel Phase 1 Recommendations
- Letter from CPC for the Whilamut Natural Area
- Letter from Esther Stutzman, Komemba/Kalapuya

WELCOME AND AGENDA REVIEW

Jamie welcomed the attendees and introduced Drake McKee. Drake reiterated his replacement of Don Angermayer as the ODOT District 5 representative, and expressed his eagerness to provide input. Jamie recapped the agenda, noting a few updates to allow for the DEP recommendations to be introduced and discussed. Jamie reminded the group that the overall goal of the meeting is to come to a decision as to whether or not the group wants to accept the DEP recommendations. The final consensus of the meeting will be forwarded to the PDT for their review.

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

CAG#24 + PDT#23 Summary – Jamie Damon confirmed the meeting notes as final after getting a group consensus.

PROJECT STATUS REPORT

Schedule and budget – Dick Upton announced that construction is underway and a contract is in place. Currently the team is in the process of getting prepared, ordering materials, etc. The first part of the permanent pile driving will be underway the week of Feb. 22. Dick expressed that this summer may be a zoo; elaborating that crews will be added and work will be in full swing. Dick addressed the broad schedule of the project, noting that January allowed for and was a good time to do a full project shake down, reevaluating schedule and budget. Fall 2013 is the estimated date for substantial work to be complete, while some park work will follow. Dick addressed the budget, explaining the typical process to account and accommodate for risk; they always anticipate/allow three and a half percent contingency in budget. The question of, “How do we treat risk on CMGC contract?” had to be addressed as ODOT is taking on more than usual. The budget normally allotted for risk and contingencies will now be designated into those two categories, rather than pooling as one. The total will add up to about six or seven percent – approximately \$9 million total for contingencies. With the schedule out about a year, budget adjustment has been a long and careful issue.

Scott Wylie asked for an example of what would qualify, or be considered as “contingency”.

Dick provided the example of while trying to get down to the bottom of a pier, hitting a solid rock would require some adjustments and potentially additional, unaccounted for funds.

Scott asked to confirm the definition of risk and clarified how the two allotments of funds will differ.

Dick concluded it is essentially a difference in terminology.

CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES

Kevin Parrish did not provide his usual power point presentation due to lack of progress to report since last meeting. The project finally had a break through with the railroad and the team proceeded with demolition over the railroad. The Northbound ramp demolition work is complete, with the exception of clean up on barriers, and will open this afternoon.

Moving forward, the focus will now be new construction. Kevin pointed out bent one, on top of the north embankment, above bent 2 on project map. Current focus is based on the construction of the cofferdam. The team had to build a four-sided cofferdam 17 feet below its current position. After the cofferdam is built, the first piling will be driven and work on temporary piles will commence to allow for construction of span one. Currently in the process of building reinforcement shafts and working through submittals. Kevin stated that ODOT and Hamilton contract process is done, and Hamilton is now in full contracting mode. As they get rebar cages together there will be a large amount of equipment at bent 3 and 4. There will be two drill rigs on the work bridge. The construction teams will more than likely start using Walnut Road more frequently starting March 22. The team is trying to get temporary work on the northbound ramp complete - need sign bridge foundations, wall, and temporary widening. The first step is to complete the sign bridge; widening will start April 12. There is another set of design packages for paving, guardrails and barriers - negotiations to start immediately. As soon as the cofferdam is built on The Canoe Canal, path detour to North Bank will be implemented, approximately April 1. Once detoured Slayden will come in and start excavating. The bridge is thought to be holding up retaining wall, so Slayden will have to make sure, and then they will remove $\frac{3}{4}$ of the old bridge leaving one lane open.

Next steps –

- Complete cofferdam on the Canoe Canal; implement path detour to North Bank April 1
- Drive first temporary piling
- Slayden to start bridge excavation
- Northbound ramp sign bridge
- Northbound ramp widening to start April 12
- Negotiations for paving, guardrail and barrier design packages

Construction questions - Charlotte Behm asked for clarification on what ‘bents’ are.

Kevin explained that bents are where the footings/piers touch down.

Chris Henry noted that a scheduling problem had previously been mentioned, and asked if that was still the case.

Dick clarified the problem mentioned was in regard to pushing the schedule out about a year.

Kevin confirmed that there was no problem, just a change; and asked for any other questions.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

Sound wall outreach - Suzanne Roberts informed that design work is continuing on Laurel Hill Valley Neighborhood sound wall concepts. Communication has been made through mailed letters and a neighborhood presentation. A meeting was held with Charlotte Behm and neighbor regarding the Springfield side, at which point it was determined that they are not looking for a lot of design.

Recent activity – John Lively announced that monthly site tours have started; scheduled for the second Wednesday of each month at 10 a.m. Two tours have been given so far, with one scheduled in March. John reiterated that he is the contact for anyone interested in a site tour. Even with little activity to view people have been fascinated and very interested. People have asked to come back; therefore a limit may have to put on the number of tours allowed per group/person. John has found that Knickerbocker Bridge is a great location to view the project, providing a great visual for those on tours. Flyer outreach was provided, as done before, to inform neighboring businesses of the northbound off-ramp closure. It was discovered that the impact is different as many commute from that direction. In his flyer outreach, John distributed flyers and discussed the long-term affects with the neighboring businesses. While there, John also provided information regarding the southbound on-ramp and found businesses to be very appreciative. John made a point to talk with the University of Oregon and Northwest Christian University and answered their questions. This time of year activity in the park is going to increase tremendously so efforts are being made to work very closely to make sure that no assumptions are made and no conflicts occur with in-park events and activities. Conflicts with the Truffle Shuffle were resolved and there are no conflicts with the Eugene Marathon. The PI team is tracking all events in the park and ensuring accommodations are made. John noted that Dick Upton and others, made a presentation to the Rotary Club and will present to the City Club Friday Feb. 26. Requests for future presentations are welcomed.

Laurel Hill Valley Neighborhood presentation - Dick and Jamie mentioned the Laurel Hill Valley Neighborhood presentation on Feb. 18. Rich Hazel elaborated on the presentation, noting how in many cases people do not pay attention to all of the efforts and outreach until the very last minute they are able to present specific issues. That aside, Rich felt it was good to give the neighborhood an opportunity to express their opinions.

Justin Lanphear mentioned that people are most interested in how well the sound walls actually function, curious if it will in fact reduce noise rather than the aesthetic value.

Rich summarized the opinions voiced at the presentation, mentioning that about 99 percent supported the sound wall, while the person most opposed lives in the location that is exposed to the most effective part of the wall.

Scott Wylie expressed his feeling that issues mentioned by Rich Hazel in regard to the Laurel Hill Valley Neighborhood presentation need to be diligently noted in order to be brought up in the future for new processes. It is important to make note of last minute ideas that came up too late, for the sake of future knowledge and/or planning.

Jamie questioned whether or not ODOT has an evaluation of effectiveness that is used for future processes.

Jyll Smith and Dick Upton both responded that they are not aware of an existing survey or process.

Rich noted how this could be a real opportunity for the future, mentioning the role perception plays on sound. The removal of visual elements can change the perception of audio; therefore to have actual measurements for future reference could be invaluable.

Dick agreed there would be a huge benefit to getting hard measurements and following up with a discussion.

Chris Henry added that he heard repaving of Interstate 105 made a bigger impact on sound than anything, noting there are rather inconclusive studies about pavement.

Larry Fox elaborated that paving gives perception of reducing sound, but ultimately only changes frequency not decibel level. Larry reiterated that the goal is to make people less disturbed, whether it's perception or fact.

Recent activity (continued) – John Lively reiterated that given the increase in construction activity, there is a higher chance of conflict. The PI team will install a banner before The Canoe Canal closure. The goal is to keep path users aware and informed.

Rich noticed tagging on construction kiosks, noting that it's probably frustrating for some users to find access banned when no activity is going on. Rich expressed how tagging could possibly be an expression of disrespect due to an unnecessary closure. Rich asked how much thought has been put into that possibility.

Kevin responded that the construction team does consider that view point, but they are required to give a 28 day notice. Opening and closing of areas costs money. Tagging is inevitable and the construction team tries not to close if it's not necessary, but they also have to balance cost, notice time frame, etc.

Jamie asked if any action needs to be taken.

Dick brought up the efforts to recognize the reason behind tagging and vandalism and expressed that the primary reason areas must remain closed is the ability to clean up the area enough to make it safe. Opening an area back up is much more than moving barriers.

Rich referenced the closure of North Walnut Road, closed for construction traffic, even while construction is at a stand still.

Dick noted the continued closure of North Walnut Road is in part to keep people aware it is and will be closed.

Rich reminded the committees that different groups have different standards and can get caught up in what is 'normal' to them.

Jamie asked John if more communication is necessary, recognizing what appears to be an information gap.

John responded that he doesn't disagree. Different newsletters have and will go out and efforts are being made to provide reminders and opportunities to ask questions. North Walnut Road was opened for a race, so Hamilton Construction can and will make exceptions. John feels the problem is that people don't pay close enough attention, which can be a catch 22. It is so important with increase of activity that people are informed.

Next steps –

- Track and coordinate in-park activities

- City Club presentation
- Installation of banner for Canoe Canal closure
- Continue to provide Web updates
- Provide site tours – next scheduled March 10

DESIGN ACTIVITIES

Design Enhancement Panel report and recommendations - Jamie contacted all DEP members, and from her (an outsider) perspective, a majority of the DEP thought it was overall a good process. There was a lot of pressure from various angles, but most members thought it was invigorating and ideas were inspiring. Some expressed disappointment as well; they hoped the CPC members would share more. Jamie received input from David Lewis and Esther Stutzman: David felt as though he didn't get to participate. Esther was very disappointed with bundle one and the coordination of Kalapuya name. All DEP members want to participate in a larger debrief with ODOT; they don't want opportunity to go by the wayside.

Jamie mentioned the links to the DEP recommendations sent out in the meeting reminder and welcomed Douglas Beauchamp to start the discussion.

Douglas Beauchamp started with a quote by William McDonald referring to Roman architecture. The concept of engagement is very relevant to design. Douglas briefly described the history of how the recommendations were arrived at. Most committee members were involved throughout 2008, which led up to the ultimate group decision. Immediately followed by turning the focus to design enhancements. Committees met in Fall 2008 to discuss and eventually agreed upon "Whilamut Passage." Literature was produced to provide what "Whilamut Passage" means to the committees. In late 2008, the opportunity arose to bring together artists and AIA to work on design concepts. In late spring 2009, CAG/PDT appointed the Design Enhancement Panel, whom started meeting actively in June. The process got more complicated before it got simple. Larry Fox's matrix of opinions became pivotal. Through the summer, the DEP worked with RFS, Justin Lanphear created maps based on Larry's matrix, and in mid-August an RFS went out. Responses came back and the design team responded. In September the DEP launched extensive interviews. The DEP spent 2009 determining which elements were appropriate, resulting in the selection of three Art and Design Teams in October. The December 15 public open house was a good time to view the ADTs and their design concepts. Each of the three ADTs presented phase one concepts. After approval of concepts and budget, phase two will begin in March 2010. The designs from all bundles have been available for viewing. The DEP received concepts Jan. 22, met and discussed Jan. 27, then on Feb. 1 went through intensive evaluation, which resulted in a set of design recommendations. Since that time, things have been on hold, pending feedback from the CAG. Douglas turned the floor over to two reps of DEP/CAG – Eric Gunderson and Bob Kline.

Eric Gunderson presented recommendations, first clarifying that most attendees have seen the bundles, therefore only focusing on recommendations, not repeating all bundles. Work has continued, despite the need for feedback, a few art pieces have moved ahead. One, *Tree. Here. Now.* below the bridge on the North Bank of river evolved into a plaza below the

bridge - hard surfaces which artistically mimic water and allow water to be channeled to a very significant planted tree, which becomes symbolic of growth and life. Eric deemed this plaza the most significant place of all work due to accessibility. There have been significant improvements from what was presented before. Bundle one changed slightly – visible as a motorist, as well as visible as a biker, pedestrian, and from Franklin Boulevard. Eric showed a video to illustrate the experience the screen walls and pylons, as viewed by a driver.

Chris Henry asked to confirm if the screen walls are over railroad.

Erik confirmed the screen walls location and noted that they are a functional concern taken as an artistic opportunity. Suggestions of draped centenary at end, pylons that represent basket weaving of Kalapuya Tribe by utilizing symbols, colors and images to emulate the history. The pylons are meant to form a gateway, and could be hung from the bridge. The use of the pixilation and pylons emulates crossing the river. One artist suggested an update to the bridge column artifacts, and suggested the addition of chunks of glass.

Scott read his email response to Dick, who asked for impressions. In his email, Scott mentioned that the CAG recognized that truly meaningful involvement needed to happen, on and around the bridge while workshops aided ideas of art/design community. To continue the idea beyond the CAG spectrum, he found the origination of DEP to be an engaged, diversity throughout the course of work. Adding his feeling that it's paying off brilliantly. Scott described the process of selecting the ADTs as exhilarating – 14 concepts were developed for “Whilamut Passage.” Scott ended by expressing how his involvement and ability to help steward the DEPs flexibility is one of his most proud ventures to have ever been involved with.

Bob Kline noted the amount of work performed by the DEP over eight months, 14 meetings, five large binders full of communication (one books worth since last meeting held in December) – a total of thousands of hours put in. The ADTs presented design concepts in order to obtain an evaluation of concepts. Once surveyed, all input was compiled in Don's matrix using a number scale. This was the document used at the Feb. 1 meeting to begin discussion of narrowing down the concepts. In the Feb. 1 meeting the process was to look at the matrix and eliminate the lower rated concepts that were undesired. In looking at the lowest rated concepts, ten were discussed, and then eliminated. Then the DEP looked at the highest rated concepts, and agreed on ten keepers/recommended. With ten selected and ten eliminated, there were still quite a few to decide on. Of those concepts, ten motions were made, out of the ten, five were agreed upon to consider. There was a lot of give and take during process and a final motion was made for acceptance of these recommendations for the CAG/PDT meeting, which was unanimous. Bob and the DEPs final recommendation is that the CAG/PDT accept the recommendations of the DEP.

Douglas provided guidance and suggested the next step is to make a decision to support or modify the DEP recommendations, which will then be given to ODOT for review so that contracts can be made for early March, phase 2, which would continue into May. This would allow for a much more exact time line and specifications.

Larry added that the hope is to come away with approved recommendations. Larry encouraged the group to realize the concepts as presented, are not the final end point for any design. Everyone recognized the short timeframe, DEP staff worked diligently to connect

the artists to key stakeholders, and many attended meetings to convey restraints, etc. There needs to be more interaction during phase 2 for ultimate proposals. Today is not approving of exactly what is shown.

Jamie reminded that CPC input and letter from Esther Stutzman are available as handouts. (Both letters attached for reference.)

David Sonnichsen pulled the Fairmount Neighbors board and received ten responses - unanimously vote “no” on pylons.

Larry Fox noted that a member of Fairmount Neighbors (Name??) weighed in on the above deck concepts, supporting the fencing and pylons. When shown the final proposals, (Name??) is a yes vote.

Group discussion on coming to consensus - Jamie reminded the committees of the once agreed upon decision process for CAG/PDT, which is to strive for consensus. The CAG makes a recommendation to the PDT and then PDT makes a recommendation to ODOT. Jamie also noted that it might be necessary to do a follow-up with the PDT, as many members were not in attendance. Jamie suggested we have a conversation with all, then separate into CAG and PDT for smaller discussions.

Ann Sanders asked to confirm the height for the pylons.

Larry confirmed the criteria of six-foot maximum height. He agreed with Ann that the pylon appears to be taller. The artist made pitch for making them taller and was told that if the proposal is accepted, height would be a good discussion to have with ODOT. Larry reminded the committees that concepts are not final final.

Ann expressed her concern with voting if what is being voted on has potential to change, e.g. she would vote according to confirmed height of pylon.

Carl Deaton shared that the pylons pose a huge maintenance concern, and expressed that even he wanted to climb on them. Carl doesn't think the pylons are a good idea. He doesn't personally like the aesthetic value of the pylons, although he likes the fence and pixilation. It should be visible from pedestrian bridges for traffic and people. The remnant columns brought up concern, and he ultimately would like them removed. He would like to be able to work there again, from construction point of view, and the columns would pose as an obstacle.

Jamie asked Carl to clarify what kind of impediment he feels the columns would pose.

Carl explained they would be deemed as “historical” providing the example of the wetlands. As for the other elements, he had no particular dislikes. Some items removed, he liked the aesthetic, but isn't privy to the costs.

Drake McKee had a meeting with his district who had major concerns with the suspended pylons. They become part of the structure, which brings reason for inspection. The cables could get in way of a crane and would also need to pass inspections. The district is concerned with the impact weather could have, which could add to load weight. Drake reiterated this is a major concern; therefore he and district 5 vote “no” to that. Another

concern with the pylon is graffiti – gray paint is used for cleaning up graffiti due to its availability and cost, therefore the pylons could wind up being more difficult and expensive to clean up. Other areas that are not as easily accessible are an above ground maintenance concern. Drake mentioned that access is not an off-the-table, deal breaking concern and it can be worked through. Based upon the pictures, he is very against the 45 degree angle of the foothill fence. People can climb on, weight is added which means there could be a possible load failure. This could be compromised and worked through as well. The pixilation design would require obtaining an inventory/stock pile of replacements. Fencing isn't a huge maintenance issue, but the district would ideally like the ability to fix and keep as originally intended. The remnant columns brought up concern with giving baskets, the material is very sharp, which could cause problems. The last concern is with life cycle on sloped paving in Canoe Canal area, suggesting that voids are addressed. The concern is creating a space that is not attractive for inhabitation. The only “no” vote from Drake and district 5 are the suspended pylons.

Jamie clarified that “no” means they do not see any way to compromise.

Drake responded that unless there is new information available, they have a lot of concern and as of right now, “no” means without compromise.

Charlotte Behm asked if the bundles could be voted on separately. Charlotte essentially supports bundle 3. There are more details to be worked out, but the group did a great job, kept people involved, etc. She found Carl's concern about the remnant columns in bundle 2 interesting in regard to becoming historical landmark. She has concerns with old growth being tagged and/or carved. Charlotte understands this is about the Millrace, but this is not an old growth area, therefore does not see the relevance. Charlotte read a letter she wrote voicing her opinions. Letter as follows:

I was elected as the CAG rep to Bundle #1 so I feel I must go on record that I oppose the proposed designs for Bundle #1 and the hiring of Lando Associates for Phase 2.

The priority of the CAG/PDT during the first year was to have a bridge that presented a gateway to travelers, was a reflection of our particular place, and enhanced its natural surrounding. This art, in my opinion, does not meet any of these criteria. It's a missed opportunity to install something that represents our place uniquely and beautifully.

Although the artist states that the art reflects our theme and location, I think that connection will be totally unrecognizable to anyone who hasn't been told what they supposedly represent.

The response I have heard consistently about the fence is "Allstate Bridge," or "The Adam's Family." Even if the hand did represent our place, I question if its pixel construction will be visible at 60 mph, and the same for the pattern on the other side.

The proposed ideas have come from 1-1/2 weeks of work with no public process, as the Lando group got together at the last minute after they were informed that their prior work was probably not going to be accepted. The group has shown very little interest in learning about our area and talking to the local people. When they made their presentation about this art, they noted four times that this art represented the Kalapuyas, even though they had never talked to any tribal members about it.

I believe that it is fiscally irresponsible in these times of financial constraints to give more than one half million dollars to an artist whose design has not been refined enough to know what

materials are going to be used, and has not looked closely enough at the landscape to know if the art would be visible from key locations. Why half million? It's too round of a number and we need more accountability.

I think that we could do much better in spending our money to find art that is attractive, fits our place, honors nature, and reflects our historical and present people. – Charlotte Behm

Chris Henry expressed his desire to trust the process and find ways to accommodate and mitigate issues addressed up until this point. Tagging will happen and basket construction exists along I-105. The design team will work with ODOT to figure out how the cables can be worked around. Trusting that those details can be worked out, Chris acknowledged the bold statements and added that art is interpreted differently, and everyone will experience it differently.

Jamie confirmed that Chris was in support of DEP recommendations.

Greg Hyde spoke on behalf of Willamalane who support the DEP recommendations. They focused their review on bundle 3 until today. There are concerns, but feel they can be addressed and worked out. Willamalane felt the proposals were quite responsible, based upon feedback from parks. Greg questioned why the slope paving didn't make it to the packet of recommendations, but concluded that he trusts it will be resolved. Willamalane supports bundle 3. Taking off the Willamalane hat, speaking as a private citizen, Greg thinks the pylon controversy discussed is important and valid concerns have been made and need to be addressed. He feels the pylons will give this bridge a signature that people in the community feel has been missing all along. If installed, people will be talking and the bridge could bring national attention. He thinks it would be a shame to not have an element of that scale and magnitude.

Bob Kline reminded the group that art is in the eye of the beholder. Bob likes bundle 1. Bob agreed that this is a conceptual phase, and OBEC and the team need to be concerned about the concerns people have mentioned. Bob expressed that design cannot be based on avoiding tagging, as people will tag if they want to tag. The most logical step is to move forward with design and have a process to fix it. Bob feels as though the recommendations are a good compromise, featuring great things and resulting in a signature bridge. Bob votes "yes" for all.

Eric Gunderson emphasized how the committee did a great job subtracting elements, while keeping a bigger picture in mind. It would be a tragedy to lose that big picture. As a CAG member, Eric hears and appreciates the technical concerns about pylons, and he understands as an architect. Eric added that every design element added will need special care, and he would like to accept the technical challenges knowing there will be details to work out. He will vote "yes" for all recommendations.

Rich Hazel mentioned a disjointed feeling. Rich is concerned that analysis of risk can and will lead to paralysis of fear. Rich encouraged the team to work with it in a way to make it safer, but understand it *is* a risk. "We have life to work through, and not be so fearful." He is concerned about the construction of ruins. When he thinks of old bridge columns and constructing ruins, he respects the process, but is concerned it will be directed toward compromise. Therefore the overall vision may get lost. Rich likes the concept of pylons, but doesn't care for the proposed design, and doesn't feel they make the statement that they

should. Rich concluded that the team can't micromanage every level, and will probably vote "no" overall.

Charles Biggs referred to the five points brought up in the letter from the CPC, pointing out how very troubling he found it that cultural representatives weren't more involved. He also found the pylons to be problematic. Charles concurs with Charlotte and seconds her motion to vote on individual bundles.

David Sonnichsen noted that Bob Kline's motion did not receive a second.

Jamie reminded the committees that CAG does not operate in that parliamentary fashion, which Bob confirmed.

David voiced his support for bundle 3 concepts, and appreciates the maintenance concerns and agrees they need to be resolved. He reiterated the need to think of lasting qualities and durability of what is put in the park. Surprised that some people say everything can and will be tagged, he feels some things are susceptible, and some aren't. Bundle 2 concrete remnant columns with gabions on top filled with rubble/glass didn't strike David, leaving him to question the artistic value. He doesn't want to compromise on design and let them become permanent fixtures. The old growth looks like a laminated piece, not an old growth tree.

Eric clarified the columns are made out of remnants from work bridge.

Jamie asked David to repeat his concerns about the old growth.

David feels the old growth looks laminated. As for the pylons, he is appalled by process of what brought them forward. He does not think the woven material has anything to do with Kalapuya basketry. He also sees it as a potential climbing hazard and a means to catch plastic bags and other wind born objects. David is very much opposed to the pylons – they were proposed at the last minute and were not available at the open house for viewing.

Jamie asked Charlotte to repeat her concerns about the old growth.

Charlotte explained that it's not an old growth area. The maintenance has not been addressed and she questions what will happen over time.

Lauri Holts commented that bundle 3 was her main focus; supporting bundle 3, she felt the process was good. She was asked to share the concerns of Eugene Parks and Open Space Division regarding the ultimate goal, process, and funding. The Parks and Open Space Division feel that there are lost opportunities. They are also concerned with the spaces under bridges, as well as with \$110,000 allotted for restoration work. They want to make sure the funding for art, a one-time opportunity, is used for art. The City will not seek funding for artwork, but can seek funding for restoration in the future. Other concerns expressed are with *Tree.Here.Now*, The Pacific Dogwood is beautiful, but they have concern with how hearty the species is and suggests consulting with someone who knows more about the species and will make sure its able to survive in that environment. This is a concern that can be worked out. There was not a lot of comment surrounding bundle 2, but there was surprise to see Millrace elements removed, as she understood we wanted that historical element. Old growth and remnant columns don't represent the history as much as Millrace elements did. The Parks and Open Space Division agree that the process for bundle 1 was

not as complete and did not involve the right players. Lauri expressed her disappointment visually and thinks there is more that can be done and more discussions to be had.

Scott Wylie brought to light that in looking at the overall list, there were families of design elements and it was difficult to pull the families apart. He feels elements have been pulled and created a full picture. He asked the group to keep in mind that it is to last 100 years and things that may seem more interesting down the line. The remnant columns are not just about a column of bridge, but also about transformation of things over time. Scott thinks it will be good to leave something that won't necessarily make sense to someone down the line – leave something to question. Incompletion is art just as much as a complete, detailed sculpture. All kinds of art happening, the locations are all very different, so the nature of things means the bundles have natural reason to be different. Scott plans to adamantly continue to support everything the team has done.

Dick noted that early on when the DEP processes were established, the team fundamentally turned over the enhancements. He would like to keep ODOT in the position to get group recommendations. The Millrace is a requirement and will be tied into bundle 2. Dick expressed his confidence that the outcome of the meeting will keep progress moving forward.

Jamie suggested the group take time to digest the commentary and talk with each other over lunch. Jamie tried to get all concerns down and summarized on white board. (White board summary attached.)

Jamie guided the committees to strive for a clear direction on what happens next at the end of the meeting. Jamie reminded that the CAG established protocols of striving for consensus. It is possible to forward a recommendation even if not a consensus. It needs to be addressed that half the PDT is not in attendance. Nine CAG members stressed support for bundle 3, with minimal concerns. On bundle 2 there were five CAG members who said they fully support all DEP recommendations, four outright and one mostly supportive with minimal concern. Other members expressed concerns with bundle 2, concluding that maintenance and design refinements need to happen, but those members don't feel like the refinements are reason enough to vote "no". Jamie asked the group, "IF we addressed maintenance and design refinements, could we get more support?"

David Sonnichsen said "no" elaborating that it is too quick of a discussion. He heard that a bike path wouldn't be where he originally thought; therefore he feels he needs to learn more. It seems that if there isn't going to be a formal path through the area anymore, David questioned who is going to go in there to engage with the art.

Jamie asked if there is an easy answer for David.

Dick confirmed that David is accurate – ODOT is not planning on replacing the path south of Franklin Boulevard.

Chris Henry noted that not replacing the path immediately doesn't mean it will never happen.

Bob was shocked and asked for clarification on which path is not to be replaced.

Dick pointed out on the project map and explained the evolution of the original idea of looping at Pioneer Parkway. After talks with the City of Springfield, it was decided that the path that will now be continuous; to keep/replace the original path, was about \$1.4 million.

Bob confirmed and announced that he was referring to a different path.

Jamie asked if the team were able to address maintenance and plan to have further discussion, etc. if that lends more support for bundle 2? Is there anybody that still says no, still a deal breaker? Again reminding that these items will need further process/discussion.

Charlotte asked if agreed upon, does that mean the committee will work with Greenworks to sort through the issues.

Eric expressed concern about breaking support into bundles and voting. Based on discussion, objections mentioned are with remnant columns, pylons, and old growth. Is there a way to accept and address those three items separately?

Jamie responded yes, but acknowledged that we would have to schedule another meeting to discuss and decide.

Eric concerned that if bundles are voted on has separate entities, elements that are OK and supported will be lost.

Dick asked Larry if it would be feasible to accept all recommendations with the exception of those three elements, and then decide on process to address those exceptions.

Larry told Dick that we are under very tight time frame. If there is a way to provide more time for those elements that need more discussion then more time will need to be provided by the Agency. Larry addressed the notion of not working with Lando & Associates noting that could be a larger issue, which would cause the project to lose time and money.

Bob suggested the group go ahead and vote and pass that information to PDT, so they can be the ones to decide if they want more conversation or want to move forward?

Jamie recognized that multiple process suggestions had been brought to the table, and suggested sticking to one at a time.

Charlotte commented that the hand design and pylons account for about 90 percent of funding. Similar to the old growth and column remnants that also account for about 90 percent of funding; pointing out these are the items of concern, which use the most funding.

Bob reiterated his suggestion to vote to get a majority.

Jamie suggests a straw pole to simply get an idea of where the group stands. If you were to remove elements of concern, would you support the DEP recommendations?

Charlotte asked for clarification on what is being voted on?

Jamie told the group the goal is to see where the group is at and reminded that the goal is to establish next steps. We can't resolve today, so we either make a recommendation or we schedule another meeting.

Rich Hazel agreed with the areas of concern and agreed on the priority of those exceptions. He could support the recommendation if those exceptions can be addressed separately.

CAG members vote – Show of hands – Bob Kline and Scott Wylie vote “no”, cannot support.

Jamie asked again, if CAG recognize that these are areas that need more process and further refinement and agree to make that happen, does the group support the rest of the recommendations?

Bob and Scott still vote “no”.

Jamie restated there are areas with concerns and we probably need to have further discussions, and suggested another meeting.

Bob suggested a vote on the recommendations as a whole or bundles and passing along to PDT.

Rich noted that even with another meeting, the CAG may not be able to come to conclusion therefore suggesting the members either say yes or no, and then give those responses to the PDT.

Scott explained his reason for not raising his hand. He supports it as a whole, not in support of supporting it with exceptions and would like to move forward with the entire thing. He does not feel he can set elements aside, but can support a package realizing everything brought up is legitimate and workable. The only absolute disagreement he has is perception that Lando & Associates has not been working hard.

Jamie asked if the group agrees on the areas that need work?

David expressed that he respects Scott and can be swayed about pylons, but does believe that Lando has been disrespectful to the process and is afraid that people will go back to Lando and say, “Let’s alter pylons a little bit”. He also thinks they until last minute waited, have a big name artist, the Kalapuya Tribe doesn’t like, the CPC doesn’t like, therefore he thinks Lando doesn’t deserve more time to try and make it right now.

Jamie noted the committees identified areas of concern and suggested to the committees that all of the feedback should be forwarded to the PDT (CAG representatives are on the PDT) and let the PDT decide on which recommendations to forward to ODOT.

Ann Sanders commented that ODOT has worked hard to make this about the people and if the decision is put back on them, it is no longer a decision of the people.

Douglas Beauchamp suggested a separate CAG meeting to refine ideas, and then hand off to PDT as quickly as possible. He reiterated that phase one is complete, so it’s hard to go back.

Jamie commented that ODOT needs to make a decision on how to move forward.

Eric supports Doug’s idea for a CAG meeting within a week, then forward conclusion on to the PDT.

Jamie confirmed date and times with CAG members – Feb. 25, 6:30 – 8:30 p.m. at LCOG offices. Megan Banks to confirm location is available.

Ann Sanders expressed her concern of whether or not weather and natural elements have been taken into consideration.

Larry responded that the engineering involved to attach to the bridge is doable, but hasn't been done sorted through yet. There are obviously concerns about load bearing, and there are challenges to face, but engineers will overcome.

Jamie concluded and reminded the group that the goal was to get to the immediate next step and although it feels like the meeting is ending in the middle of a conversation, she tried to impress that we aren't leaving on a negative note, just inconclusive.

Megan asked if we are we still in discussion of sound walls.

Jamie asked if the sound walls need to be validated for movement forward, and questioned if that should be done now or at next weeks meeting.

Jamie commented that the PDT follow up meeting will have to be remote.

NEXT STEPS

- CAG Meeting Feb. 25, 6:30 – 9:30 p.m. at LCOG Office
- PDT Meeting to be coordinated for the week of March 1