Before I begin, I'd like to acknowledge the people that helped make this project possible. It took a collection of friends and family that pushed me through these last three years, and I couldn't be more grateful for how they kept me afloat. I'd also like to acknowledge that all this research is built on the knowledge from an endless list of inspiring authors, specialists, and passionate community members. And lastly, I'd like to thank Mark for ushering me through this experience with long conversations hashing out ideas and giving all the support I needed to make it to this point. Also, shout out to Jeff for being a guest speaker on the tour!

So to start us off, I'd like to walk you through my presentation

Read from screen

1. **Project Scope**
   a. The project has three main phases that built on each other
      i. First, was the deep research into aggregate networks and materials in Oregon
      ii. Second was developing a way to reveal these networks to the public
      iii. Which came down to implementing a critical tour as a means of communication

2. **So what am I talking about when I say aggregates?**
   a. In Oregon, aggregates can be broken down into two simple categories
      i. Hard Rock, which…
         1. Read screen
      ii. Sand and Gravel, which…
         1. Read screen
      iii. When compared to other mineral extraction, these materials are relatively benign and small-scale, often fading into the backdrop of our expanding world

3. **Maps** - So to situate aggregate extraction in the larger context, I created this map noting all known aggregate mines in Oregon – where the red triangles are sand and gravel, and the black are hard rock. The Willamette Valley and River Basin are of important to note since that's where most of the Oregon's population lives, and thus most of the state's aggregate needs. There is also my critical tour route between Eugene and Oakridge.
   a. As of 2012, there are roughly 2500 active and inactive – aggregate mines in Oregon.
   b. While each individual footprint is relatively small, collectively, this is a massive impact on the Oregon landscape

4. **Material Network**
   a. The aggregate material network is pretty straightforward; there is a source (a mine), and a destination (development or project site) – most large-scale aggregate project **use** comes directly from the source
   b. This segment is replicated over time, moving from various sources to various destinations…. but this line segment only tells us so much

5. **Network Expanded** –
    a. There are skeletons and there are future projections
    b. There are past, preset, and prospective networks
        i. For instance, active mines were started in the past to feed projects that are now complete, but the mine continues to operate to feed current development.
            1. As you can see, that framework repeats itself for prospective projects

6. **Importance**
    a. So why is understanding this material network important?
    b. Read screen and elaborate
    c. And after doing extensive research on aggregates in Oregon, gaps were found…

7. **The Gap**
    a. Invisibility of aggregate networks to the general public
        i. For instance, locations, data, politics, and reverberations
    b. Lack of a process to engage with these issues and network

8. **Filling the Gap**
    a. To fill these gaps, I developed three approaches that work in concert with each other
    b. So I'm filling the gaps in knowledge by understanding the networks through language
        i. This is manifested through a narrative script
    c. The critical tour, which allows me to illuminate the physical network locations and foster deeper discussion with experts
    d. And the narrative tools, which allow me to reveal hidden narratives and intersections

9. **Critical Tour overview**
    a. **So what are critical tours, and why is it my method to fill these gaps in knowledge????**
    b. Critical tours are a practice where artists host a group of people on a guided tour of various sites while facilitating discussion along the way with the intention of shifting the viewer's perspective of the sites.
    c. Critical tours are distinguished from conventional pop-culture tours because they are explicit about this intentionality and reflexivity
    d. These tours are highly critical and intentional about the processes of engagement, narratives and information being disseminated, and the locations visited
    e. They highlight unseen intersections in the landscape
    f. It's about showing folks a new way of seeing instead of what to see
    g. There's an emphasis on including an array of voices
    h. In the end, it's really about value finding and about disrupting our conception of reality
    i. A last important note is that these tours are flexible – they're meant to be tweaked and experimented – to remain fluid with new findings

To be more specific, using the characteristics and format of critical tours, I was able to create a process for exploring aggregate networks, while also illuminating the complexities and hidden narratives at play.

10. **Precedents**
    a. To focus the tour development even more, I leaned on precedents. These projects played an important role in selecting sites for my tour and how I planned to explore my selected sites
    b. Margins in our Midst (2003)
         i. CLUI
    c. Silicon Monuments (2012)
         i. Elliot Anderson
        ii. Used augmented reality

11. **There are so many mines in Oregon, and for a reasonable tour, I needed to distill it down to a consumable sample size**
    a. It's important to note that 90% of extraction is within 35 miles of development. It's a very localized process, so I decided to focus on Lane County to express this locality. I referred back to the material network and searched for connections in Lane County.

12. **Common narratives**
    a. From there, I focused on reoccurring narratives I found through research, which are….

13. **Sites**
    a. After focusing my region, I was able to take what I knew about the material network and common narratives to find sites that represented these convergences
    b. I'd like to note that the contested quarry at TV Butte anchored my search, while Oakridge provided a great study of rural extraction and Eugene showed us the urban pressures pushing rural extraction
    c. So as you can see, we have an array of sites that express the past, present, and future of the material network

14. **Site Context**
    a. Here's a map to give you spatial context

15. **Oakridge**
    a. Here's a bit zoomed-in look at the Oakridge sites

16. **Eugene (both slides)**
    a. And Here's a zoomed-in look at Eugene locations

17. **Tools**
    a. These sites are complex and are entangled in a larger material network, though this isn't apparent when you visit the sites. These sites blend into the every-day landscape and need facilitation to be connected.
    b. So to illuminate the connections, I developed a three tools to support exploration on the tour
         i. Guidebook

1. Filled with facts, images, maps, and resources about each site and aggregates in general

    ii. Narration

2. At each site, I read facts about the site and tied talked about how the site fit into the physical material network. This was all supported with meditations on more abstract and theoretical connections

    iii. Narrative Tools

3. These physical tools are used to reveal hidden narratives at each site, which I'll talk about more in a bit

18. Guidebook
   a. Quick overview of important contents

19. Narrative Tools
   a. These tools connect common themes I found through research - themes I talked about earlier - with multiple specific narratives at play on each site

20. How-to
   a. At each site, these tools are to be held up to unveil hidden narratives, and when overlayed with other site-specific narratives, intersections in the network can be discovered
   b. For instance….. *read screen*

21. So, this is how it all came together
   a. Here's the group at our lunch stop – the Willamette Fish Hatchery in Oakridge

22. Sites page
   a. Here's the group touring several sites

23. Tools page
   a. Here's how the tools were used

24. Reflections
   a. Tourists brought new questions and ways of seeing
   b. The guest speakers brought nuanced understanding of the site and its larger network connections and reverberations
   c. As we traveled through from site to site, the network began to become more apparent around us
   d. I also found that facilitation was needed to connect the sites, as some sites had little evidence that aggregates were so central to its story

25. **Next Steps**
    a. The tour is fluid and is designed to change with new information and perspectives – it has to ability to follow the network as it changes over time
    b. I'd love to incorporate more guest speakers at various sites – even having different speakers for another iteration of the tour
    c. For a more condensed version, the tour could be focused within the network – for instance, the tour could just follow basalt, or just sources
    d. The tour is easily replicable and would be interesting to see the response from a different group of tourists – maybe a broader community, or a specific interest group
    e. The tour can also be used as a format to explore other material networks – ranging from local to global.
    f. The tour format could also be translated into a web-based app for asynchronous tours.

What the tour does is provide a foundation for exploration – a way to reveal and decipher the networks and landscapes we rely on every day. As we explore this material network, these sites become a part of our cultural framework, and we begin to develop new relationships with these landscapes in the process.

Thank you.