

# Summary – CAG<sup>#26</sup>

## Community Advisory Group I-5 Willamette River Bridge Project

February 25, 2010 – 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.

Buford Conference Room, LCOG Offices

---

### ATTENDANCE

#### CAG Members

- Charlotte Behm – Springfield Neighborhood, CPC for Whilamut Natural Area
- Charles Biggs – CPC for Whilamut Natural Area (CAG Alternate)
- Eric Gunderson – ADT Facilitator
- 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
- Scott Wylie – Springfield Resident

#### Resource Team

- Megan Banks – LCOG
- Douglas Beauchamp – Arts Consultant
- Jamie Damon – Portland State University
- Nichole Hayward – CAWOOD
- Don Kahle – ADT facilitator

- Justin Lanphear – CMGS
- Rick Little – ODOT Region 2, PI Officer
- John Lively – CAWOOD
- Annie Loe – DEP Member
- Randy Nishimura – DEP Member
- Kevin Parrish – Hamilton
- Suzanne Roberts – OBDP
- John Rose – DEP Member
- Jyll Smith – ODOT Major Projects Branch
- Dick Upton – ODOT Project Manager, Major Projects Unit Manager

#### PDT Members

- Chris Henry – City of Eugene Public Works, Transportation Planning

#### Guests

- Charlene Larison – CPC for Whilamut Natural Area

#### Handouts (available at meeting)

- DRAFT CAG<sup>#25</sup> + PDT<sup>#24</sup> Summary
- Letters from CPC for Whilamut Natural Area, Charlotte Behm and DEP members
- White board summary from Feb. 19 combined CAG/PDT meeting

## COMMITTEE BUSINESS

*CAG*<sup>#25</sup> + *PDT*<sup>#24</sup> *Summary* – To be finalized at next normally scheduled meeting.

### WELCOME AND AGENDA REVIEW

Jamie Damon greeted the group and started the meeting by stating the meeting's purpose is to finish the discussion started at the Feb. 19 joint CAG/PDT meeting. The discussion is to decide how to move forward with the DEP recommendations. Jamie reminded the group of the committee ground rules; if there is tension during the conversation as strong opinions are voiced, a reminder to listen with respect and to share the airtime in the room. Listen with an open mind in order to work through the issues. Jamie came prepared with color-coded cards to use if necessary for incremental decision-making. She explained her *Red, green, yellow* card method. Green represents full support of question/idea posed, yellow represents support, with concerns and red represents so many concerns cannot support. Jamie led the group to revisit the definition of consensus, since the committee agreed to strive for consensus. Starting with a working definition, *consensus* means that as a group, we are doing our best to meet the concerns that people present. That might be that we meet, or that we try as hard as possible to understand and address all issues presented. If a consensus cannot be reached today, all input will be recorded and forwarded to the PDT. The goal is to get as close as possible to close the gap. Show a *Red, green, or yellow* card to voice whether or not you agree with this definition of consensus. (VOTE: all green cards with the exception of Bob Kline who held up yellow.)

Bob asked to understand what would happen if a true consensus isn't reached.

Jamie confirmed that if all green and yellow cards are shown, a consensus is reached.

Bob clarified that there will not be a vote, but responses will be recorded and forwarded to the PDT.

Greg Hyde asked to clarify who is a CAG member.

Jamie pointed out and explained that Ann Sanders is on both the CAG and PDT, therefore will be attending the PDT meeting March 5 rather than this CAG meeting. Jamie compared her experience on another project and expressed the strides made during a recent conflict resolution issue. The situation brought light to the value of relationships and the ability to implement things, which she felt was very relevant to the DEP recommendations.

### DEP RECOMMENDATION DISCUSSION

Dick Upton referred to his time spent making notes for the meeting, and apologized in advance for his reference to his notes and his potential to sound like a "finger wagger." Dick said that the discussions regarding the DEP recommendations and how to proceed has him "baffled." What is baffling is the magnitude of polarization. In the span of a few days, the committees went from being almost there to now being almost at war. After reviewing the project over the last week, it was obvious that after one year the project has been a huge success. Dick is totally impressed at the volume of work the DEP and ADTs have gone

through to arrive at the design concepts in discussion. “We had a meeting, all went to guns and are now at a loss.” Looking at what has been produced, Dick still sees a huge success and the ability to leave a legacy and show the work and partnerships involved. Emphasizing his hope to literally leave an on-ground legacy, Dick reminded the group how close to success the project is, *if* the teams can just let it happen and figure out how to move on. Dick questioned how the project got started down the path – as the CAG identified we have a great opportunity and have shown the willingness to invest in this place. The CAG also decided that there are talented people with expertise, which led to the agreement of forming the DEP to obtain expert recommendations. Now after thousands of hours, the DEP has provided great recommendations. Dick voiced the need to recognize that each of those 15 recommendations is at a different level of development. As for the first round of designs from ADTs, some concepts were appreciated and some weren’t, some went away, and the teams altered some. Dick listed an example – *Tree.Here.Now.* got more attention in the second round of designs. All ideas went to the DEP and were put into a decision process, hence the recommendation. Every recommendation will receive further refinement. Dick believes that the committee as a whole endorses the idea that each area will have a stakeholder group, and the ADTs will work together with that stakeholder group to refine the design concepts. Dick expressed his feeling that it’s naïve not to believe that each concept will evolve further. Making his own recommendation, Dick noted his thoughts that the CAG should thank the DEP and celebrate the huge success that came out of that process and their hours of hard work. The CAG needs to think in terms of how to move these recommendations forward and implement them. Recognize that each of the 15 design concepts will get a different level of development and attention. It feels like almost 13 of the 15 can go into phase 2 with minimal refinement, while two items, the pylons and what appears on the railing, need more intense stakeholder involvement and evolution. The DEP should also be a part of determining who should be in each stakeholder group and involved in the steps going forward. “We are so close. Huge success.” Dick mentioned his hope to figure out how to move past the gunfire and see the path forward. Process-wise, Dick informed the group that whatever comes out of the meeting, for the health of the project, will be forwarded to the PDT. Dick’s greatest hope is to go at the PDT with a strong, clear, concise recommendation of how to proceed, and hopes it doesn’t wind up a report of the who’s and why’s. Dick concluded with a plea to not be adversaries, rather think of how to move forward.

Jamie started the design recommendation conversation by using the *Red, green, yellow* card method to affirm the vision of the project. CAG had a deliberate discussion regarding why to create the DEP. Vision: Integrate artful design that speaks to the natural beauty and cultural significance of the area. Show of *Red, green, yellow* cards about the vision of the project - do you support that vision? (VOTE: All green with the exception of Scott Wylie who showed a yellow card.)

Scott Wylie’s concern is to be sure that cultural significance is seen very broadly and not culture in terms of saying, Italian, Balinese, etc. But seen as the culture of the fusion of things happening in Eugene, and Springfield.

Jamie reminded the committee and guests where the conversation left off at the Feb. 19 meeting. There were ultimately two groups – one group on the CAG felt strongly about the design as a whole, and keeping the design recommendations a whole package. While the

other group had concerns about specific elements of the design recommendations: the pylons, fence, and remnant columns. Jamie asked what kind of conversation has to happen? Who is a part of the process, who needs to be, what is the cost, how well does it meet the “Whilamut Passage” theme, what are maintenance concerns, etc. How do we move forward a set of recommendations to address those concerns?

Bob Kline agreed to those main items, and noted there is a list of concerns from the Feb. 19 meeting (white board printout) that should be passed on to the PDT to be addressed in the final design.

Jamie encouraged group commentary.

Eric Gunderson agreed with Bob. A very valid outcome would be that the CAG adopt the DEP recommendations with conditions, to be forwarded to the PDT.

Jamie questioned exactly what would need to happen to move forward? If the DEP recommendations are proposed with conditions, what are the steps taken? Specificity would be helpful. Thinking back to the Feb. 19 meeting, Jamie noted some of the concerns mentioned – process concerns with the Kalapuya Tribe not having been consulted enough; technical concerns with maintenance (climbing, security, etc). Jamie asked for group feedback on other concerns.

Bob mentioned tagging as a maintenance concern.

Vicky Mello suggested safety be in its own category.

Greg Hyde commented that safety could fit in the technical/practical category.

Jamie asked for other conditions that would need to be met in order to support the DEP recommendations.

Bob brought up inspections; contractors must be able to inspect the structure.

Scott mentioned a couple of instances where the enhancement name tripped wires of alarm. Some names could be reflecting broader ideas – e.g. *Old Growth*, because of where timbers came from, etc. this element really referred to a lot more than just saying it specifically represents an old growth tree. The pylon referred to the weaving as a reference to the Kalapuya Tribe; they aren’t something that he thinks look like a basket, but indeed weavings would inspire other things immediately. Part of the ADT’s discussions is to review things that are not necessarily universally understood, but in one way or the other categorize an element.

Jamie asked if validating the design intent of the pylons, as a group, would alleviate concerns about the artistic integrity moving forward.

Scott responded, “I guess.”

Jamie questioned if others agree.

Rich Hazel expressed concern about the proper application of art that has to be explained. Art in standard of public works should not have every nuance visible. If the basic premise requires a cheat sheet, then the piece doesn't serve its purpose. Some of the elements that create a problem in that way can't necessarily be refined down. Circling back to the process, he doesn't want to get hung up on the artistic intention and while he understands the theme of "Whilamut Passage," he does not feel every element needs to be validated by the Tribe.

Jamie noted that everyone read (or had a chance to read) the letter from Esther Stutzman on how the Tribe wasn't consulted about the themes for Bundle 1. Her concern is utilizing Kalapuya themes on the bridge, carrying the Kalapuya word "Whilamut," and ensuring the engagement of the Tribe.

Vicky absolutely agrees with Esther's concern. Bundle 1 has a Kalapuya theme. She felt it was a very big injustice not to consult the Kalapuya Tribe. A dominant culture dictating what the design elements should be/mean/represent is an injustice to native people. At this point, Bundle 1 needs to have cohesion of all groups, and it's important they are represented properly.

Rich concurred that there was a misrepresentation on the pylons. Clarifying what he meant, in that we don't have to apply a Kalapuya theme to every aspect and element. Perhaps find a pylon design without a Kalapuya theme.

Lauri Holt suggested naming it differently.

Bob commented on the representation of an age. There is not a lot of weaving today, broad elements are an age-old representation of history of Native Americans. It doesn't say this is a Kalapuya basket, but is simply a representation.

Jamie reminded that the Agency said this is a government-to-government conversation, and the group needs to ask them which elements lend themselves to a Kalapuya theme. She suggested this is a conversation to have at a deeper level.

Bob said there was a decent amount of exposure to the Tribe and the ADTs were present at community meetings on several occasions.

Jamie reiterated how Esther's letter clearly states that a higher level of involvement is required.

Vicky elaborated that the Bundle 1 team was not in attendance at several of the meetings held. Specifically, her concern with the pylons is that they are within the park unit itself. From the stakeholder she is representing, they don't think pylons belong in the park for various reasons, such as safety, as well as the potential of the items listed in Esther's letter.

Jamie asked for elaboration.

Vicky doesn't agree with the representation of the DEP recommendations. Only one item on the list of DEP recommendations was unanimously agreed upon. The meeting ended with a very clear statement that the unanimous vote did not mean a "yes" vote to all selected

design elements, but meant an agreement to forward the entire list to the CAG. As a stakeholder she wrote a letter of concerns, officially from the CPC for the Whilamut Natural Area. The letter summarizes what she heard from CPC; those items need to be addressed and the CPC deems the pylons as inappropriate.

Jamie commented that despite Vicky's inability to attend, the letter was presented at the Feb. 19 meeting and Charles spoke on behalf of the letter. To clarify and understand, it was a unanimous vote to forward to the CAG. Is that correct?

Vicky confirmed; the DEP made the decision to bring these recommendations forward to avoid meeting at a later date. Vicky commented that the recommendation doesn't seem to be similar to what she recalls. She does want to make sure that from the CPC point of view, the following concerns are being addressed: safety, vandalism, and connection. Bundle 1 should've been above deck.

Jamie clarified her statement and desire for greater coordination with the park.

Vicky confirmed and addressed there are a lot of detailed concerns voiced from ODOT maintenance in the meeting minutes.

Bob provided clarification that the pylons are technically adjacent, not in the park, on ODOT property.

Jamie concluded that the pylon touchdown and whether or not there is a touch point will require refinement. If it does touch down, the CPC says "no," and ODOT has many maintenance concerns.

Bob talked about perception. His was that the recommendation went as a recommendation; the DEP thought very seriously about each element and that was the whole recommendation. The DEP did not intend that the CAG would rearrange the recommendations entirely. Again Bob reiterated this is only his perception, but the DEP put a lot of effort into coming to those recommendations. "We've done a lot of work, please accept them."

Jamie noted that Bob and Vicky had a different understanding of DEP's support for the recommendations.

Scott mentioned the connectivity between different bundles. This was very loud and clear to the ADTs and was encouraged. He talked about how perception changes whether driving or walking; the notion of something changes its complexion to relate to those different perceptions. The DEP encouraged a flow to occur in many of the enhancements. Scott is sort of chaffing at the notion that there is an invisible barrier between above and below deck.

Jamie commented that Vicky's letter had more to do with the fact that it took them by surprise that pylons touched down in the park.

Charlene Larison said the pylons seem inconsistent with a natural area, clarifying what she thought Vicky was expressing in the letter.

Jamie noted there was a lot of conversation about something above deck, which now sounds like it is a park thing. The concept is different from what was expected.

Bob reminded and agreed with Scott's mention of perception, also noting that he sees the design being below deck as an advantage.

Jamie went back to Scott's mention of the integration theme, suggesting that further refinements and more processing of the concepts are needed.

Charlene asked if a refinement in the next part of process includes changing elements. Could the pylons become something entirely different? Does *refinement* mean making it safer or could the design/concept be totally changed?

Dick expressed his expectation that elements will evolve. That door is open. The team will learn as the project moves forward.

Rich questioned if Dick could narrow down the definition of *evolve*. He elaborated that perhaps the hope/fear is that a "legislative gut and stuff" will occur where the name stays the same, but the idea is completely changed.

Jamie suggested that in phase 2 there will need to be assurances to ensure stakeholders are involved and design integrity remains.

Group Agreed

Jamie encouraged more conditions from the group, if they are met, they potentially make the DEP recommendations acceptable.

Eric commented on the list of conditions being good, but suggested that the group needs to come together on the appropriate meaning. If all concerns could be fixed/addressed, what are we building that means something to us? The pylons are beautiful to him – connection to the ground, geological idea, draping and reappearing over bridge – elements that speak to him. Yes, the design is an abstraction, and steel is not bamboo, but Eric challenged the committee to find a theme and reestablish a common goal.

Jamie confirmed that Eric was trying to clarify intentions of pylons.

Eric suggested the group define what is desired. The pylons have meaning because the weaving has meaning - he took the blame for using the word *basket*, and causing controversy or misunderstanding – weaving is meaningful because stories emerge from the ground. The idea of a circle is meaningful in the present and to native peoples.

Jamie encouraged the committee to stick with Eric's idea. Think back to these ideas that were talked about years ago. Jamie started around the room for comments.

Greg passed.

Vicky would like to see more of a gateway illustrated, something from the side of the road. Her vision is something that would come up and be over the deck. Arch type idea is more recognizable, more distinct and very unique. She thinks a gateway of sorts speaks to the river below, as things are moving both above and below deck. Anybody could see and notice from a distance.

Lauri Holts touched on her conversation with Trevor regarding the sign bridge idea, something expanding. She mentioned that she doesn't have a vision and is open to ideas. As a park representative, she is concerned about safety and maintenance, as well as about the process and stakeholders. As far as aesthetics, she has no strong feelings. She does feel that if one bundle extends into another bundle, transition and how it fits are important. She concluded that she is comfortable with the suggested process of moving forward with conditions.

Jamie referred to Rich's comment at the Feb. 19 meeting that he liked the idea of pylons, but not these pylons. She asked Rich for elaboration.

Rich encouraged the group to rewind a few years and think back to the promise of a signature bridge, with money for signature elements. His immediate concern with a signature bridge is that a signature element can't be slapped onto a bridge. When he thinks of pylons he thinks of a gateway point. They are exclusively above deck elements and integral to the design of a bridge itself, matching and mirroring, and working with the actual structure. These concepts aren't pylons; they are not historically or architecturally accurate.

Charlotte shared her feeling that curves are very important to people, and she feels the pylons need to have curves. She'd like to see some sort of curve, a gateway that represents an arch. As for the conditions that will accompany the DEP recommendations, she agrees with the idea that the pylons should be above deck. As far as Kalapuya engagement, Charlotte mentioned her working with the Tribe 12 years ago, and she heard the same conversations about how much involvement deems an appropriate amount of cross cultural engagement. It takes a lot from the dominant culture to listen; we CANNOT put anything on the bridge that is offensive. The entire bridge doesn't have to represent the Kalapuya Tribe, but no elements can be offensive. If we don't pay very close attention to this, it will discount our work in the community. In addition to the conditions, she suggested that leadership needs to be looked at, and stakeholder coordination needs to be taken very seriously. Same goes for Kalapuya Tribe involvement, they need to really be engaged for her to be comfortable. She can move forward with trust in the process, if leadership will hold people accountable. She feels a commitment to, and knowledge of, how to get/keep stakeholders involved needs to be made. It doesn't matter whom, but someone who knows how to get collaboration throughout phase 2. Secondly, the accountability has to be clearly stated to ADTs. The only ADT in her mind that has done well with stakeholder coordination is Litus. She doesn't think it has to be Lando & Associates for Bundle 1; she suggested giving the bundle to someone who has a better track record. If Lando does get the Bundle 1 phase 2 contracts, she encouraged and stressed that someone needs to personally make sure better involvement happens.

Scott commented regarding the pylons, mentioning that Rich had a good point. Most of us feel that pylons are in a classic sense above deck elements; it may boil down to perhaps an unfortunate name. The thing that he finds successful is that art of all kinds are found throughout the WRB world; some are pictorial, some are metaphorical, and others are impressions. Art somehow moves you through, gives you feelings, which are not necessarily provoked by pictures. These pylons express a sense of upward movement, inspiration, feeling uplifted, color, texture, pattern, etc. As you drive by, the colors glisten, which to him says a lot of interesting things go on in this place. He thinks they will bring up questions such as “Who would create something like this?” which would anchor people as they drive through. Something a signature element should provoke is an awareness that a lot of things make this community what it is. An example is perhaps the counter color – we love to have fun here, there is a sense of fun in the sculptures (rather than pylons). Scott is hopeful that there is a sense of joy and creativity going into the process. Design, ideate, and integrate more. Scott knows that engagement is very hard work, but deep involvement with the Kalapuya Tribe is too light. Engaging the Tribe, rather than involving, seems to be a more appropriate way of giving with some sincerity. There needs to be joy continuing on, not only concern.

Bob attempted to provide a visual of passing across the bridge. If a sculpture is there, it will be noticed. You may not know what it represents, but you will notice it is different. Art is important to Bob, and he wasn't sure about the pylons at first. The more he looks at them and gets the dimension and magnitude, it's a feeling of goodness. The pylon feels open, like a horn of plenty. Historically, weaving is an important part of life. It represents our life from the beginning of time. Bob feels like the pylon brings in art above and integrates it below, adding artistic features that path users can enjoy. He sees the bridge as a passage for many. ODOT has been patient and held a public meeting with over 400 comments. Bob acknowledged ODOT for the efforts toward community involvement stating that no design will ever satisfy everybody. It might take awhile, but each person will see that difference can be appreciated.

Greg commented that it is difficult to understand his role as a representative of Willamalane, and expressed that a lot of his opinions on aesthetics are not reflecting his representation of Willamalane. His first thought is not to be too literal. As Bob eluded, the concept of woven material doesn't need to be an exact representation of authentic Kalapuya basketry. The idea of this being a natural area is very important, and he doesn't want to lose sight of that. It is crucial that is respected. Greg encouraged the committee not to lose sight of the essence of this project as a collision of nature and artifact. He also urged a second thought about having something non-natural touch the ground. Natural and artifact colliding can be beautiful. Whether or not this is a part of park or highway, it feels like a part of the park. People use the ground, and technically the pylon can't be a part of the park unless the owner says, but it still feels like it, which should be respected. View it as a seam that joins two parts. He expressed the need to be careful to not allow elements to be “plopped” on the bridge. Greg reiterated how important it is not to just consult, but to engage the Kalapuya representatives and people.

Jamie checked in with group, noting that as the discussion went around the room people provided a lot, adding to conditions and elaborating on the design intent of the pylons.

Douglas Beauchamp reminded Jamie that she had started a three legged idea of conditions, of which art got lost as the third element. Doug noted that the discussion about the design intent of the pylons didn't touch on the other areas of aesthetic concern. He suggested conditions for the art category: Does it have appeal? Is it moving? How do we respond to those questions both as integrated group and regarding individual elements?

Jamie focused on pylons because they initiated the highest level of angst within the group. Given what Douglas said, are there artistic conditions to be added?

Scott suggested making sure within the range of things we have and the diversity generated here, that everything is doing something differently. He wants to make sure that the wholeness of the diversity that the committees have worked to achieve is realized.

Jamie suggested adding integrity to the art category.

Charlotte shared that all art doesn't have to be specific to the Kalapuya Tribe, but must at least honor, not dishonor, them. The above deck designs, if used, need to reflect their people well. She doesn't think anyone would want to be offensive, and they are the ones that would know whether or not something truly is offensive.

Rich concurred with Charlotte and stated that avoiding dishonor doesn't necessarily mean honoring them.

Jamie clarified that there is a commitment to not dishonor the native people. She also commented that Rich was trying to say that we should be sensitive not to dishonor, but that doesn't necessarily mean we have to honor them.

Charlotte replied that she is under the impression that people want the Kalapuya Tribe involved. How much representation is questionable, just as long as any representation used is not offensive.

Vicky expressed the need to follow the theme of "Whilamut Passage."

Eric mentioned the word *passage*, elaborating that the range of time spent and experience will vary from person to person over time.

Bob alluded to having to make a decision under the pressure of time and money. We were always aware of time and cost restraints, which was a huge element of decision.

Jamie agreed with this ongoing issue.

Scott talked about the diversity of the elements. In Bundle 2 nearly all art was swept away from the river, because of the recognition that the river itself was art. Not that the art was bad, but it was too distracting to the river. Where the ADTs didn't put things tells as much as where they did. There was a lot of sense of space and occasion with those choices. Scott encouraged the recognition that natural beauty is a part of the whole design. Part of the

enhancements is celebrating nature as it is. Living things create a sense of something. See the natural world in conjunction with art - a fusion that becomes one experience.

Jamie started to wrap up the meeting attempting to frame the next steps. She suggested forwarding the list of conditions and design intent of pylons with the DEP recommendations. Show *Red, yellow, green* cards to show support of forwarding recommendations with conditions and design intent – these elements would be moved forward accompanied with the list of conditions and design intent to go into phase two for further refinement. (VOTE: All green votes, except Rich who showed yellow and Charlotte and Vicky who did not show a card – explanations listed under final card vote below)

Charlotte asked to clarify that all 15 elements will go forward or if the whole list will go forward with these conditions to be applied to all 15 recommendations.

Jamie confirmed the conditions would go along with all 15 recommended elements.

Kevin Parrish added that all elements would be refined in the next phase.

Jamie reiterated the intent in saying these conditions are necessary and would result in addressing all elements.

Vicky recalled hearing Larry Fox say that stakeholders have veto power.

Jamie confirmed that is her understanding as well. The owners need to accept and be on board for what is being proposed. She heard a lot about building trust for these recommendations to be accepted by the stakeholders. In order for this to work, these (listed on board) conditions need to be met.

#### **Final Red, yellow, green Card Vote**

(Green – full support; Yellow – can support, with some concern; Red- so many concerns cannot support)

All CAG members showed green cards with the exception of three; Vicky Mello, Rich Hazel and Charlotte Behm all showed yellow cards. (David Sonnichsen and Dave Carvo were not in attendance.)

Vicky Mello's input – She needs to see what happens down the road.

Rich Hazel's input – His biggest concern is integrity. He believes the DEP should not be micromanaged. Certain elements pose concerns, but he respects the DEP and wants to trust the process. Wait and see what happens.

Charlotte Behm's input – She needs to wait and see what happens down the road. She has little confidence in Lando & Associates' ability to listen to stakeholders. Real concern about Lando and its ability to get interested and produce. She can go with it, but is still very concerned. She thinks how this (referring to the conditions set forth and intent of design) will be communicated needs to be addressed and questions how the response will be assured. Need to make sure the phase 2 design teams listen and look at the actual landscape.

She can support the other elements given the conditions set forth and feels better with the other ADTs. The rest of the art feels better with the conditions proposed.

#### **NEXT STEPS**

- PDT meeting Friday, March 05, 2010 9:30 a.m. - 11:30 a.m. (Jamie concerned about David Sonnichsen's absence, as he is the CAG representative to the PDT. Charlotte agreed to be the alternate CAG representative to the PDT.)
- DEP recommendations, list of conditions and list of design intent goes to the PDT, PDT will deliberate and forward to ODOT.
- Work of DEP is done. Some members may be involved as stakeholders in the phase 2 ADT processes. (Dick Upton clarified and encouraged that any one with current stakeholder involvement continue those conversations and cooperation. Don Kahle expressed that although the DEP is finished, they ask that people stay nearby, because if something substantial changes we may need to reconvene.)
- CAG will remain active until the end of the project.

# Conditions and Design Intent to accompany DEP Recommendations – CAG<sup>#26</sup>

## Community Advisory Group I-5 Willamette River Bridge Project

*February 25, 2010 – 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.*

*Buford Conference Room, LCOG Offices*

---

### Conditions

#### Process –

- Promote a sense of joy moving forward
- Accountability to process
- Need leadership to collaborate with stakeholders
- Greater coordination with stakeholders (park and maintenance)
- Kalapuya Tribe to be engaged deeply (which elements lend themselves to be representative of the Tribe, cannot dishonor)
- Clarify design intent with stakeholders
- Assurance around design integrity
- Involve Jiri with the bridge

#### Technical/practical –

- Maintenance (vandalism, ability to maintain, bridge, park)
- Safety
- Inspection (ability to be inspected)

#### Art –

- Preserve range/diversity in all realms
- Connections between elements
- Every element doesn't need to represent the Kalapuya Tribe, but cannot dishonor
- Maintain theme of "Whilamut Passage"
- Promote range of passage (time and experience)
- Recognize natural space and area as art (a part of the whole design)

### Design intent of pylons

- Passage of many
- Marks a special place
- Horns of plenty/open to sky
- Tell a story – stories emerging from the ground
- Weaving symbolism – don't get stuck on "literal"
- Geologic connection
- Gateway – they are connected to roadway and travelling public

- Unique
- River below – movement above and below
- Mark beginning/end, a crossing
- Integral to design and architecture of bridge
- Mccullough
- Above deck
- Curves are important to community/bridge
- These are not pylons
- Color, texture, pattern, movement - evokes feelings
- Upswept - upward movement
- Counter culture - sense of fun in our community
- Sculpture
- Area under bridge feels like Park – respect
- A “seam”
- Area is a collision of natural and artifact

### **Green, Yellow, Red Card “Vote”/input**

(Green – full support; Yellow – can support, with some concern; Red- so many concerns cannot support)

All CAG members showed green cards with the exception of three; Vicky Mello, Rich Hazel and Charlotte Behm all showed yellow cards. (Note that David Sonnichsen and Dave Carvo were not in attendance.)

Vicky Mello’s input – She needs to see what happens down the road

Rich Hazel’s input – His biggest concern is integrity. He believes the DEP should not be micromanaged. Certain elements pose concerns, but he respects the DEP and wants to trust the process. Wait and see what happens.

Charlotte Behm’s input – She needs to wait and see what happens down the road. She has so little confidence in Lando & Associates ability to listen to stakeholders. Real concerned about Lando and their ability to get interested and produce. She can go with it, but still very concerned. She thinks how this (referring to the conditions set forth and intent of design) will be communicated needs to be addressed and questions how the response will be assured. Need to make sure they listen and look at the actual landscape. Need to get into it more. She can support the other elements given the conditions set forth and feels better with the other ADTs. The rest of the art feels better with the conditions proposed.