

## **I-5 Willamette River Bridge Project Design Enhancement Steering Committee**

### **Meeting Summary - DRAFT**

Sept. 13, 2013            10 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.  
CAWOOD conference room, 1200 High Street, Suite 200

*Attendance: Charlotte Behm; Bob Kline; Vicky Mello; Joe Valasek; Scott Wylie; Karl Wieseke, ODOT; Frannie Brindle, ODOT; Justin Lanphear, Cameron McCarthy; Nichole Hayward, CAWOOD.*

*Prepared by: Nichole Hayward, CAWOOD.*

### **Lillian Pitt “River” lighting**

Mikkel Hilde of the Lillian Pitt team asked Karl Wieseke if adding lighting to the “River” was a feasible option. Karl implied that he didn’t think accent lighting anywhere north of the bridge was an option, but offered to ask the committee. In his conversation with Karl, Mikkel offered to do a temporary installation to help the committee make a decision; he also offered to present a solar-powered option.

The only design enhancement with lighting is on the south bank.

Scott Wylie noted that the two pieces north of the bridge have different circumstances with the surrounding natural areas. He is usually an advocate and doesn’t support the prohibition of lighting art, but feels a decision should be considered case by case. Scott firmly supports the decision for no lighting, but liked the idea of trying it on an experimental basis.

Bob Kline asked if funding for the lighting would come out of their current contract cost. Charlotte Behm supported a lighting trial to see what the Pitt team has in mind. Vicky Mello shared her concerns: 1) cost, 2) drawing attention to the piece when people have already commented on that issue, 3) concern of how much light will overflow over into the park.

Joe Valasek noted the value of the artist being willing to pay for it, including a trial run, which is unusual and may impress that they feel it will add a lot to the piece. Scott reiterated his feeling that he feels they failed to address the foreshortening/angle of “River” and is concerned they may not be on the same page as DESC.

Bob asked about the size of the solar panels and expressed concern about how much the panels might distract from the art. Vicky asked for clarification on who would be the final decision maker if the Lillian Pitt team installed lighting as a trial. She suggested that the CPC for the Whilamut Natural Area should be given priority in making the final decision. Frannie added that the feasibility of lighting might also be a question of maintenance.

Justin Lanphear provided insight to the permitting process and environmental parameters associated with the Willamette greenway – it was a very long and costly process. During the previous permitting for the Willamette greenway it was determined that there would not be lighting installed on the bridge. He emphasized that permitting would be a lengthy process to even get to the trial installation. Justin advised the group to be cautious going down that road and reiterated that it would involve more cost in time and effort.

The committee agreed to maintain their decision of no light feature on the “River” piece for a broad spectrum of reasons.

### **Funding**

Charlotte expressed concern with the increased costs coming out of the design enhancement budget due to contract delays. For the CILOS project, the project has been delayed and their anticipated project cost has not been adjusted to appropriately address the impact.

Frannie noted that she and Karl were still in conversations with the City regarding the management of the CILOS project. ODOT and the City are figuring out how to hire Walama directly. Frannie and Karl are waiting for a response from Trevor Taylor at the City of Eugene. Vicky reiterated her concern for how inflation was addressed and acknowledged the administrative costs that weren't previously known.

Frannie and Karl said they don't know that the budget is insufficient and they were not aware of any concerns from Walama about costs. Charlotte informed that she has heard concerns. Karl reminded the group there are a lot of required costs that will come out of the budget. He noted that if there were ongoing delays for the CILOS project caused by ODOT and the City of Eugene, they would be managed appropriately, but that delay in DESC decisions will take time and cost money too.

Frannie shared that there is a budget for historical/cultural permitting that may have extra funds; she offered to check. Karl also noted that extra funds might be available elsewhere. They also confirmed there is a hold on the funding for CILOS, so it's protected and will not be used elsewhere.

### **North Bank and Canoe Canal Enhancements**

Justin reviewed his refined concepts.

Any combination of the concepts combined with the cost of the south bank enhancements total less than \$253,000. Several alternates are available that could be added. Justin noted that he wouldn't be able to get more accurate costs until they are into the construction-document phase.

Scott clarified that \$253,000 was the previous cost estimate and after the additional costs for the “Transportation Crossover,” they budget is closer to \$235,000. Vicky asked to clarify if costs include Justin's time, contracting, etc.? Is the cost inclusive? Karl confirmed the numbers presented assume they are Hamilton Construction costs. DESC

has a \$31,000 budget that Justin spends against which is already accounted for. Charlotte reiterated her hesitation to “spend to the end.”

Justin’s estimates carry a 16 percent contingency, which is a reasonable percentage at this point in time.

He highlighted the most cost effective combination totaled \$210,000.

### **Highlights from conversation about North Bank concepts**

- Brown vs. blue/gray basalt
- Crushed rock base; subgrade geo-textile fabric to keep layers separate; sprayed, washed, compacted; repeated; keys in and compacts itself. It has a consistency more like asphalt.
- Rained on vs. dry – might be slightly more packed down when rained on.
- No concern of erosion. No concern of washing out.
- Boulder size – large: 4-5 feet wide by 3-4 feet tall; medium: 3-4 feet wide by 2-3 feet tall; small: 2-3 feet wide x 12-24 inches high.
- The contractor will find boulders that fit within parameters. They will get a truckload, flag the correct size, then Justin will review selection. Karl is able to take someone out to identify the type.
- Quarry sand cannot be swept. Trade-off with maintenance. Maintenance area is concrete.

The committee agreed to support North Bank concept B.

North Bank alternates:

- Rock salt finish – three votes
- Additional 3 inches of concrete – one vote
- Metal edging – four votes

### **Highlights from conversation about Canoe Canal concepts**

- More boulders the better.
- Concept D - more staccato
- Concept C - like transition of boulders to river rock, more natural
- Concept C – concern of migration for the area between the path and slope. Crushed quarry sand is way cheaper. That area has been removed from the enhancement area per previous conversations, so Karl has to figure out what to do with it. Committee liked crushed granite to break up concrete; Karl will pursue, but will manage budget and decide.
- Bob preferred Concept C, but went with majority.
- Charlotte suggested more boulders to break up concrete.
- Who maintains bark? More concern about maintenance of bark.
- Scott suggested planting vegetation in the corners of Concept D to deter cyclists or a boulder on western edge of the river rock. More boulders.
- Possibility to extend rock into zone between path and slope.

- Concept C – has nice flow and color; prefer bark or decomposed granite vs. basalt.
- Concerned about bark migration. Support all bark.
- Charlotte liked boulders in Concept D.

The committee agreed to support Canoe Canal concept C with minor revisions.

Canoe Canal alternates:

Embedded river rock – three votes:

Two supported river rock in three areas, but not at corners.

One supported river rock in mulch areas next to bark path.

Rock salt – one vote

#### NEXT STEPS

- Justin and Karl Justin to revise drawing for Canoe Canal Concept C.
- Justin to ask about quarry sand under “Blue Camas Tiles”.
- Justin to revise and send Canoe Canal Concept C electronically before parks coordination meeting on Oct. 4.
- Scott to talk with Karl and Justin regarding boulder selection.
- Potential for another meeting at CAWOOD for to review final budget.
- Nichole to look CAG/PDT past meeting notes for conversation with Devin Laurence Field regarding modifications to flower petals.

#### **DESC future**

The committee suggested having a final meeting at CAWOOD to review the final budget once all of the costs are accounted for. Otherwise they agreed to piggyback onto the parks coordination meetings for the CILOS project. Parks will meet in the morning, and then move into a second meeting to discuss other items so that those interested could stay for it. Location would change to district.

#### **Quick enhancement updates**

Karl provided brief updates on the enhancements under contract:

- Victory Builders are starting sand blasting. Starting in center to make sure it’s done before rain starts.
- Set one Blue Camas tile for practice yesterday. Will continue after night paving next week.
- Visited rhiza A+D and saw progress. Very exciting.

Charlotte suggested giving a photo to Esther Stutzman and the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde.

#### **Meeting action items**

- 1) Karl to inform Mikkel Hilde and Lillian Pitt that lighting is not an option on "River" for a variety of reasons.
- 2) Karl and Frannie to investigate historical and cultural installation budget to identify any available funds.

- 3) Justin/Karl to proceed with North Bank Concept B.
- 4) Justin to revise Canoe Canal Concept C to reflect slight adjustments noted in meeting; he will send electronically prior to Oct. 4 parks meeting.
- 5) Justin to inquire about use of quarry sand in area between Canoe Canal Path and slope under the Blue Camas Tiles.
- 6) Scott, Justin and Karl to coordinate schedules and communication for boulder selection.
- 7) Nichole to look at CAG/PDT notes for conversation re: Devin Laurence Field's conditional approval.
- 8) There is potential for an additional meeting at CAWOOD to review final budget. To be determined.
- 9) Committee suggested piggy backing on the parks coordination meetings to discuss CILOS project. Interested parks coordination attendees would be welcome to stay for the meetings.