

EWEB Riverfront Master Plan Community Advisory Team (CAT)

Wednesday, February 24, 5:30 – 7:30 p.m.

EWEB Board Room

Present: Dave Hauser, Tom Hoyt, Mark Johnson, Pat Johnston, Desiree Moore, Dean Pape', Mary Unruh, Anita Van Asperdt, and Gary Wildish, members; John Brown and Bob Cassidy, EWEB Commissioners; Steve Newcomb, Mark Oberle and Jeannine Parisi, EWEB staff; Greg Brokaw, Kaarin Knudson, Lorri Nelson and John Rowell, Rowell Brokaw Architects; Julie Fischer and Ellen Teninty, T'NT Consultants; Tom Larsen and Nan Laurence, City of Eugene; Vicki Maxon, Recorder; Bob Hart, Kevin Matthews and Uros Zaklanovic, public.

1. Welcome and Agenda Review

Dave Hauser welcomed the group and reviewed the agenda. He noted that agenda item #6a has been moved up to agenda item #3b.

2. Minutes Approval

Dean Pape' noted that he left the February 10 meeting before the Building Mass & Height presentation, and said he would appreciate a brief review later in tonight's meeting. Pat Johnston requested that Dean's request be put on the parking lot.

The February 10 minutes were approved.

3a. Comments from Audience/CAT Comment

Bob Hart said he was surprised that a recent Register-Guard article had reported that the CAT is in favor of an 11-story tower on the property, as he didn't think CAT had approved that. He wondered if the CAT is going to set the Register-Guard straight on that issue.

Kevin Matthews reminded the CAT that he has spoken to them before about environmental issues, being the president of Friends of Eugene and also a former local business owner/operator, having run a firm with international investments for the last 18 years. He said as the CAT moves into analyzing the evolving master plan relative to the Guiding Principles, they will be able to provide some depth to the economic feasibility analysis. He added that, in terms of how the master plan can contribute to the vitality of Eugene and downtown, it would be apropos to look at overall occupancy and development capacity, trends and development rates for downtown, calibrate development on the EWEB site, and consider the portion of development anticipated on this site relative to the downtown as a whole. He closed by saying there are different methods in which to do that, and he hopes the CAT will select a good cross-section.

Anita Van Asperdt said she would like the design team to respond to Hugh Pritchard's concerns regarding economic feasibility.

Dave Hauser said it is his recollection that the CAT was asked to consider a tower, not approve it. Mark Oberle agreed, saying that a tower was an option, not a recommendation. He added that if one is talking about density, a tower is one way to get there, but whether that will work in Eugene or from an economic standpoint is another question.

Julie Fischer noted that density will be addressed at the March 3 public meeting.

Tom Hoyt noted that he had heard John Rowell speak to density and wondered if density is being dealt with in the design and, if so, that it be given careful study. He added that he believes Kevin Matthews has a valid point.

Kaarin Knudson added that some of the market reconnaissance is contained in the development information that was completed in summer or early fall.

3b. Consensus Decision-Making Discussion

Dave Hauser noted that at the February 10 CAT meeting and also at the February 16 Board meeting, a member of the public had criticized the CAT's consensus process. He said he was unprepared to address the criticism at that time and also hadn't looked at the CAT's ground rules for a while, and wanted to do a brief review of those. He said specifically he wanted to speak to the element of a trigger which switches consensus to a vote, and to review the sequence of actions that led to the recommendation that was made. He said that in his opinion, those actions were consistent with CAT process, but he asked CAT members for their opinion on two topics: 1) whether or not they feel the process was consistent with the ground rules; and 2) any insight they might have to reach a decision point more effectively in the future.

Dave then reviewed the CAT's consensus process, the backup decision-making trigger process, the voting process, and how those were applied at the December 9, 2009 and January 13 and 27, 2010 meetings.

Mark Johnson said he recalled that the group had considered many suggestions, but that maybe the issue was the fact that it was not clearly (verbally) identified that the backup system was being used.

Pat Johnston commented that her difficulty was that EWEB had hired an ecological consultant and that they were still waiting on his information, and that she didn't think it was prudent to continue to define a design in absence of that information. She said she understands that each step along the way isn't set in stone, but the CAT is still in the design process until all the information comes forth. She added that her concern in the decision the CAT made that night was continuing to invest money in design and still waiting to see if it was valid. She said that as far as making things better in the future, it would be helpful when the CAT knows they aren't going to reach consensus, to slow down and try to figure out what they're having issues with,

and try to overcome a stonewall. She said the vote felt rushed, it was at the end of meeting, and that it made it more difficult for her to reach a decision.

Tom Hoyt commented that he doesn't want to say anything that will interfere with 9-0 consensus. He reminded the group that he was the first one to have to fall on the sword during the consultant selection process, but that ultimately it was the right decision because in no way would the design process have worked without a local architect. He continued, saying that even though he felt at the time like he had been run over by a log truck, he changed his vote, which resulted in consensus. He said that he continues to think they can get to consensus and that, if they stick with it, they will be successful in bringing the community along too. He closed by saying that he is concerned that if the CAT has an 8-1 vote, there is not consensus, and that two years of process will have been wasted, so he will be going for consensus with everything he has.

Mary Unruh commented that it is her recollection that the CAT got to a point where they felt they had to make a decision because of the public meeting coming up. She said she agreed with Pat that the CAT needs to take the time to stick with the discussion long enough so that issues can be aired and everyone is heard. She agreed that when they go to backup decision-making, that should be noted more explicitly and made more formal.

Dean Pape' commented that he hadn't re-reviewed the process, but that he didn't recall something being voted on. He said he did recall being urged to move forward due to the short timeline and added that he has concerns about staying on the timeline. He thought that the CAT agreed that the person who can't reach consensus should come back with an alternative for discussion, and then move on from there. He noted that the CAT as a group still has a lot of issues to take care of. He also said he has concerns about the use of a parking lot because it still hasn't been put into effect, i.e., items put on the parking lot at a previous meeting have not been revisited at the next meeting.

Desiree Moore commented that she feels comfortable with how the CAT arrived at the vote and the process so far. She said she believes that the CAT wanted to take something to the Board to let them know that things were moving in the right direction and to update them on the design process. She said she did not feel like the CAT was saying yes to a final design, but was showing a live document that was still undergoing change. She added that she didn't feel rushed into the vote and also felt like the CAT was right on track with process, but that now she feels the process is going backwards.

Gary Wildish commented that in a lot of respects he agrees with Desiree, and feels that many of the issues that have been brought up actually were covered before the January 27 meeting. He added that he didn't get too hung up on process and felt that the issues had been taken care of previous to the consensus attempt. He also agreed with Desiree that it was his feeling that it wasn't a concrete decision that couldn't be changed in some way or form. He closed by saying he was comfortable with the process at the January 27 meeting, and that he still is, and that he is anxious to move on.

Anita Van Asperdt commented that she believes the CAT voted for the design team to move ahead with their work , and that she does not believe the CAT voted to not ever return to certain issues if they arise. She added that in the future the person who is not in consensus should be asked if they feel they have had ample opportunity to air their concerns.

Dave Hauser reiterated what he thought he had heard; that, by and large, CAT members felt the consensus process had been followed, though it may have been awkward at times. He briefly summarized the discussion: 1) in the future, be more clear about where the CAT is in the decision-making process so that everybody is aware, and to give the person(s) who may not be in consensus an opportunity to raise issues; 2) be respectful of the timeline and move the process forward, but that there may be times when the process should slow down in order to make every effort to get to consensus; and 3) not to forget about the parking lot at the end of each meeting. Dave said he appreciated the CAT's willingness to not cut off a discussion if someone isn't ready to, and also for their willingness to take the time to "clear the air."

Jeannine Parisi pointed out that the parking lot items are listed on tonight's agenda, under the title of Welcome and Agenda Review, and that some of those will be covered during agenda item #6.

4. Report on EWEB Board Meeting

Mark Oberle began by passing on a big thank you from the entire EWEB Board for all the hours the CAT has put in, and noted that two Board members are in attendance this evening. He added that the Board is very appreciative of all the work the CAT is doing and realizes the difficulty of the work. He shared a few of the comments the Board made regarding the design:

- Too much open space
- Would like to quantify the value added by the open space
- Generally going in the right direction
- One specific piece of advice—don't set a trap for the future owner regarding the steam plant by showing a future use--include in the report that there are critical issues with building soundness, asbestos, etc.

Dean Pape' asked if the Board has been informed of the assumed setback, easement locations, etc, and that open space is captured in areas that are assumed to be non-buildable. Mark Oberle replied that they probably had not been fully informed, and that he thought that future presentations could do a better job of addressing why open space is there, what size it is, and what value it has.

Dave Hauser reiterated that the feedback from the Board was very positive and again passed along the Board's thanks to the CAT.

5. Information Update

Overview of Contaminated Site and DEQ Regulations

Mark Oberle introduced Steve Newcomb, EWEB Environmental Manager, who is very familiar with the EWEB-owned portion of the former Manufactured Gas Plant (MGP) site. Steve gave a brief history and background on the site, an outline of which follows:

- The site was operated between about 1907 and 1955 by several different companies that produced the gas that was used for street lighting downtown. Those operations resulted in contamination of soil at the site.
- EWEB purchased the site in the 1970's not knowing its history and learned that the site was a former MGP operation in the 1980's
- EWEB formed a partnership with the previous property owners to clean it up and developed an agreement that relies on DEQ rules and supervision for site cleanup
- EWEB spent several years investigating the site and developed a detailed risk assessment
- Developed a feasibility study that ranged from doing nothing to removing the entire site, along with the costs and benefits of doing each, and worked closely with DEQ throughout the process
- Preferred option consisted of moving the worst contaminated soil, capping the site with an impermeable surface, and retaining ownership so that EWEB could manage the site over time
- There will be a deed restriction which will indicate that contaminated soil will remain and needs to be managed in ways that limits risk of exposure
- DEQ is currently reviewing the last piece of the feasibility study, and the study will be out for public comment in Summer 2010
- Clean-up will begin in Summer 2011

Pat Johnston asked for a cost estimate if the area could be cleaned up enough to be buildable. Steve Newcomb replied that the last numbers that were looked at were between \$15-20 million. He added that clean-up of the site results in other risks, such as when contaminated soil is dug up and trucked through Eugene to a different location.

Pat Johnston asked for confirmation that clean-up is indeed required in order for the site to be buildable. Steve replied that management is required—monitoring of gas in the soil, etc., and that there may be other engineering ways to control the risk of exposure besides removal, but all at great cost.

Mark Johnson asked for confirmation that the current plan is to remove some of the contaminated soil. Steve reiterated that is correct, and that the worst areas will be removed and the entire site will be capped and sealed. He also noted that Alton Baker park is a former landfill, so this is not a unique issue. Mark Johnson then asked for confirmation that the contamination isn't leeching off into the river. Steve replied that the two paths for exposure are contact with soil or rainwater infiltration of the soil and subsequent leaching, and that by covering it with an impermeable cap, rainwater risk is eliminated. He added that he doesn't see a long-term impact on the river, as the contamination occurred 50-80 years ago.

Pat Johnston asked Steve to explain the cap. Steve Newcomb explained that a cap consists of dense clay, compacted, or a synthetic liner over the top, which is what is used for most landfills.

Tom Hoyt asked if the entire crater is covered when a cap and liner is used. Steve Newcomb replied that a crater isn't created, and that it is merely a cap over the top layer.

Tom Hoyt asked how potential contaminant migration from underneath is monitored. Steve replied that there is 17 feet of soil on top of bedrock, and that that is not an issue. Tom then asked if there is a risk to abutting properties. Steve replied that the primary migration risk is to the river with wells on the site, that the margin of the river is monitored very carefully, and that very low water conditions are the worst case. He added that there has not been measurable impact on the river or its organisms. Tom asked if there has been significant evidence of migration to date. Steve replied that there has not been, and that something going into the river would require site disturbance and erosion from the river.

Tom Hoyt commented that if he was considering buying the property, he would want to insure that he is not responsible for any migration of contaminants to abutting properties. Steve replied that historically the former MGP site had a footprint and that the site is in the DEQ's records. He added that the abutting properties contain little pieces of the original MGP site footprint and that the City right-of-way also has little pieces of it. He noted that the issue of abutting properties will be taken care of as part of management of the site. Tom commented that it sounds like there are wide enough margins around the former MGP site to fully contain it. Steve replied that is correct, in perpetuity.

Pat Johnston asked what can be done on top of the contaminated area after it is capped and sealed and whether the area can be paved. Steve replied that it can either be paved or become an open space/park area. Pat noted that whether or not it is buildable, there may still be a problem with management. Steve replied that there would be a problem if the area wasn't covered with an impermeable barrier, but that vapor and a land barrier is what is being proposed.

Dean Pape' commented that his firm is currently working on a DEQ project, and that it isn't possible to build on a vapor barrier, and that his firm's concern is that it will get into the building and how to keep the vapor from entering an enclosed space. Julie Fischer added that in order to site a building, one has to dig downward. Steve replied that he is not saying that a different decision wouldn't be made, but that there would be engineering controls necessary to limit risk of exposure.

Anita Van Asperdt asked if phytoremediation (use of plants to absorb contaminants) has been considered, or if the area is so deep that that would not be an issue. Steve replied that is correct, because the soil area is 17 feet deep.

Ecological Analysis Final Report

Mark Oberle reported that EWEB staff has not received the final ecological analysis report yet, as the consultants are still waiting for one last piece of information regarding a cross-section of

the EWEB site. He added that he received an executive summary just prior to tonight's meeting that has been distributed to their places but is not for public review, and that he will e-mail the draft report to the CAT.

Dean Pape' voiced concern about being burdened by public meeting law if the executive summary is distributed to CAT members before it becomes public information. Mark Oberle replied that the summary contains essentially the same information that Bart Johnson presented to the CAT at the February 10 meeting. Dean reiterated his concern and stated specifically that he would not want it going to the media until it is final. Nan Laurence noted that if it did go to the media, it would do so with the specific notation that it is not the final draft.

Kaarin Knudson noted that she will clarify the public meeting law guidelines with Bart Johnson.

Dave Hauser asked if the CAT will be acknowledging that the work is ongoing and then taking questions on what has been presented so far. Mark said that is correct, basically just confirming what the CAT heard or didn't understand at the February 10 presentation.

Pat Johnston commented that she asked Bart Johnson some pretty specific questions before the February 10 meeting and that Bart said he would be answering those questions. Dean Pape' also said he asked Bart some specific questions. Pat Johnston then asked if there will be a discussion regarding the final report after the CAT sees it, and if Bart Johnston will be available to answer questions. Mark Oberle replied that he will see if Bart is available.

Desiree Moore commented that Bart's February 10 presentation gave the CAT a good idea of what he might be thinking and that he's now given them a draft plan, and she wondered why anyone would be surprised or taken aback by what is in the final draft.

Dave Hauser suggested revisiting this discussion at a later meeting due to time constraints.

5. Guiding Principles Review

Mark Oberle reminded the group that the purpose of this agenda item is to take a look at the master plan as it exists today and compare it to the Guiding Principles that were developed in September 2009. He said he realizes there may be some language in the Guiding Principles that is different than their current understanding of issues, but that exact wording or bullet points underneath each heading isn't what he wants to focus on this evening. He asked the CAT to grade how well this plan is meeting the Guiding Principles, based on today's understanding of them, using the traditional school grading system.

He then distributed an evaluation matrix to the CAT and explained the grading process.

After the CAT completed the grading process, Mark Oberle tallied the grades for each heading. He noted that one of the major areas of concern is economic feasibility, and that it has been a while since the CAT has heard a report from Chris Zahas of Leland Consulting.

After a brief discussion of the grades for each heading, Mark asked the CAT if they wanted to delve deeper into this discussion or queue it up for the March 10 meeting.

Mark Johnson commented that this gives the group an idea of where more information is needed, i.e., the final ecological analysis report that they will be getting soon.

Pat Johnston commented that she believes that these issues do beg more discussion at future meetings, and that she believes it is really CAT work and not design team work. She added that it is a good exercise from that standpoint and that it is helpful to know how CAT members feel about the issues and to understand how they graded the issues, and that the design team may benefit from that as well.

Kaarin Knudson asked the CAT if they had graded on whether or not they received the correct information from the design team, or whether they understood that information.

Dean Pape' replied that he graded based on understanding of the information.

Desiree Moore replied that she graded based on where the CAT is now, based on this information.

Pat Johnston replied that on some items, she would answer yes to both of those, i.e., sometimes she didn't get information and sometimes she didn't understand the information, or got a drawing and didn't understand the basis for the drawing, but that some of that was because the design might not have achieved that.

Gary Wildish replied that he is experiencing a learning curve as more pieces of information are brought in, but has a better understanding of how they fit, and that once all the pieces are together, he expects to be more comfortable with a lot of the information. He noted that the CAT doesn't have all the pieces yet, but that he believes that when that is received, it won't take 3-5 months to get the understanding, and that his level of understanding in the last couple of months is way higher than it was six months before that.

Dave Hauser replied that he gave a low score when he felt he couldn't answer the question, but that he was pretty comfortable across the board.

Desiree Moore said she would like to see more information and support around the economic feasibility component and that if the CAT doesn't pay attention to numbers, this process may all be for naught, and that she would like that information sooner than later.

Dave Hauser said he would like more conversation about public improvements that are embedded in the master plan and how that works.

Dean Pape' commented that will depend on how the development agreement will work, which may not mean that the public will be burdened with that.

Pat Johnston commented that in analysis of economic issues, the EWEB site is only a portion of the entire Eugene downtown, and potential total development of that, and how the EWEB site fits into that, i.e., so many square footage of office space, etc. She wondered if the CAT expects that to be comparable, or if there is truly a relationship.

Desiree Moore said she recalls that the CAT talked about that early on, that the downtown is not separate, but that she doesn't think the EWEB site should be burdened with giving CPR to downtown, but yet sort of a jump start to help that happen. She added that she wants to see the EWEB site be vibrant, new, and progressively move forward.

Nan Laurence commented that she recalled that Chris Zahas, in his initial analysis, said that the EWEB site is better suited for residential development and that the amount of commercial development would only be a few destination locations.

Desiree Moore replied that she totally disagreed with that, and that she thinks it would be the kiss of death to have residential development on the site. She asked the CAT to try to think of one place in Eugene where that is working at the current time.

Mark Johnson said it would be a good idea to hear from Chris Zahas again.

John Rowell noted that the design team has been diligent about the master plan being flexible, and that Chris Zahas had said housing seems viable, but that may not be true at this particular time.

Dean Pape' noted that if he was to look at the entire process, the last two pieces need all the other pieces in line beforehand. He added that the first six headings get passing grades from him, but for the last two he would run numbers to see if it works or doesn't work. He noted that certain elements aren't part of the CAT's purview.

Ellen Teninty reminded the CAT there are only three or four CAT meetings left before the next EWEB Board presentation prior to the open house on May 12. She suggested that the CAT needs to hear what input the design team requires to meet the MOU requirements by the end of the contract, and to set priorities in order for them to meet their contract responsibilities within that time frame.

Kaarin Knudson added that the design team needs to get an agreed-upon framework before conducting a detailed analysis, and that they have been careful about stewarding the money which was allocated to the financial consultants. She said a spreadsheet will be produced that shows relationships, but not dollar values.

Dave Hauser said that in his view, riparian treatment and mix of use begs that question, and he noted that EWEB Commissioner John Brown also asked that question, and that a part of that conversation says that public spaces are essential to making the master plan work. He added that the CAT owes it to the EWEB Board to spend a little bit of time on that, and that maybe it just takes some convincing and sharing with the CAT that there are some possibilities feasibility-wise.

Gary Wildish agreed that much of the current work is now the CAT's and not the design team's, to go through the Guiding Principles and see how the CAT understands them. He agreed that talking about these things takes time but, to Ellen Teninty's point, the CAT needs to talk amongst themselves and, if that means an extra meeting or two, that goes with the territory.

Dave Hauser asked if the bullet points under the headings should also be graded so there is some level of priority, and to see where the greatest departure is. After a brief discussion, the group agreed to complete the grading process as homework and to write down any questions that come up. Mark Oberle agreed to e-mail the grading forms to the CAT and they will be sent back to Mark when they are completed.

Mary Unruh asked for clarification and agreement that the basis for the grades is whether or not the design reflects the CAT's understanding to this point and the quality of discussion. She noted that to do one or the other and not both wouldn't show common ground, and that the CAT needs to grade the same way on the same basis. Dave Hauser said it is his understanding that what is being graded is the current design framework's ability to address the Guiding Principles.

Dean Pape' said he sees the master plan as not only visual but written, so he sees the grading as one and the same.

Pat Johnston noted that one of the largest tasks is writing the narrative of the vision, and that it is her feeling that those words need to come from the CAT. She said that if the CAT does their homework well and raises questions, and the design team can either say they will cover that or don't have the same information we have, then what the CAT says about these things can be incorporated into the document anyway. So in actuality, the CAT is not only grading, but it actually propels the CAT to the next level of work.

Desiree Moore commented that what she heard Ellen Teninty say is that the CAT is running out of time for the amount of work that still needs to be done. She said she is surprised that at this late in the game there haven't been some subcommittees created that could have met with the design team and done research, a report, etc. in order to move forward. She added that she is not 100% sure there is time to adequately do that, and wondered if there is the possibility of a contract extension.

Dave Hauser said he believes the CAT may find alignment around 70% of the issues, and a limited time could be spent on where there is departure or questions. He said he doesn't think every bullet item needs to be discussed.

Kaarin Knudson pointed out that the team had never discussed that the CAT would be responsible for writing the supporting documentation in the master plan. She then asked if it would help if the design team went through the Guiding Principles and bullet points and made note of how the design specifically addresses these issues, and then the CAT would have a sense of where some of the invisible information is in the drawings, how the design team has been responding to the guiding principles, and what is missing.

Dave Hauser said that would be very helpful to inform grades and thoughts. Kaarin Knudson said that a document will be e-mailed to the CAT soon. EWEB Commissioner Bob Cassidy pointed out that, in compliance with public meeting law, the CAT should e-mail their responses individually to Mark Oberle.

Tom Hoyt commented that the CAT needs to keep their eye on the finish line. He added that he thought April would be the last month of meetings but now it sounds like that may not be true, and asked for an explanation.

Kaarin Knudson said it was RBA's understanding that tonight's meeting was a check on information and process, and that some things didn't fall under particular bullet points that are important to certain guiding principles.

Tom Hoyt asked if there is a target date for completion of the process. Kaarin Knudson replied that the May 12 open house is the target date, and that the public event dates shouldn't be pushed back.

Mark Oberle noted that staff will go back to the EWEB Board prior to the end of April, and that indeed the CAT will not be writing the master plan, but rather the consultants will produce an outline and will run that by the CAT, then back to the design team to flush out, then run it by the CAT one more time for edits consistent with the design and public input, and then make final edits for the Board presentation.

Dave Hauser asked if it is accurate to say that tonight's exercise might help the design team to better plan the short time left. He added that he thinks it may inform the design team and staff to spend more time, but that the CAT could also get suggestions on how to use the time that is left in the best way. Kaarin Knudson said that is accurate.

Anita asked for confirmation that RBA will provide their assessment of how the design meets the guiding principles to the entire CAT before they do their homework assignment. Mark Oberle reiterated that the CAT's grades and questions will be sent only to him, and that he will compile the information and re-distribute it to the CAT.

Desiree Moore commented that she too hopes that the information RBA gives the CAT will help that process to be time well-spent.

6. Outstanding Questions or Issues

Guest Opinion for March 3 Outreach

Ellen Teninty noted that Mary Unruh's op ed piece will be in the Register-Guard and that print ads will run on Sunday, February 28 and Monday, March 1, with further media (including TV) coverage on Tuesday.

7. Closing Comments/Next Steps

Check-In on March 3 Public Event

Julie Fischer told the CAT that registration for the public event is going well. She reminded everyone to send meeting notices to friends and co-workers, and added that tomorrow she will be e-mailing the public meeting agenda to everyone on the mailing list, and that the CAT will get a copy. She noted that facilitators are still needed for the 15-minute small groups and that she will send out instructions, and that the facilitators can arrive early for a debrief and question and answer session. She asked that CAT members let her know if they don't want to facilitate or if they aren't able to attend.

The parking lot items from the last meeting were noted and briefly discussed.

Kaarin Knudson noted that a PDF of the open space drawing had been sent to the CAT. Gary Wildish asked for confirmation that this drawing does not incorporate any on-lot private open space that might exist. Mark Oberle replied that is mostly true.

Regarding the possibility of a pedestrian bridge on the east end of the property, Mark Oberle reiterated that the CAT has been hearing mixed signals from the public about it being shown on the design drawings—some want it shown, some don't—and that at some point the CAT will need to decide how to handle the bridge in the Master Plan.

Gary Wildish commented that Nan Laurence had brought up how the EWEB site is connected to the world around it, and that he believes that showing that connection is not a negative, but on the other hand, if it is shown, people are afraid it might be built. He added that he doesn't believe it is part of the master plan, but just an example of an opportunity that may or may not exist, and whether or not it is built will be up to someone else.

Another CAT member commented that the bridge possibility has more value than just its pedestrian use, i.e., eliminating a power line over the river if the bridge were built, so that would be a plus, and that both negatives and benefits of the bridge should be considered.

Pat Johnston spoke to the connection issue, saying that the roads show connections because there are roads outside of the boundary, but that the site is not on as firm of ground regarding the bridge. She noted that the other side of river where the bridge would land is open space and natural area and, if the bridge lands on that, it will raise controversy, but if it lands on a space that connects to a path, it doesn't raise controversy.

Mark Johnson noted that the CAT has not discussed details about where the bridge will land. Gary Wildish agreed, saying that the CAT will not be making that decision.

Desiree Moore asked if the bridge could be left open for discussion if there's a benefit from it.

Anita Van Asperdt commented that she believes it can be mentioned in the master plan as landing in open space on other side and that it will require careful study.

Julie Fischer noted that she has heard some people say they don't want to look at a bridge but that they don't mind a power line, and that she has also heard that there are already enough bridges over the river.

Mark Oberle said that a potential compromise would be to not show the bridge on the drawing because of public concern, but to mention in the narrative that it was an idea that was discussed that brought positive comments but also concerns.

Mark Johnson said he is fine with not showing the bridge on the drawings. Gary Wildish agreed.

Desiree Moore voiced concerns about transparency if the bridge were in the master plan text but not in the drawing. She said it should be shown on the drawing in order to get feedback, and then remove it later if necessary.

John Rowell noted that the bridge is shown on the drawing right now and would have to be taken off, but he agreed there has been some excitement about it. He said it could be taken off the drawing but that the design team would need direction from the CAT to do so.

After a brief discussion, Jeannine Parisi noted that there was a meeting with City staff, and that she believes there was tentative agreement that the bridge should be included when the next bike and pedestrian plan update happens. She added that it seems logical that it is referenced in the master plan as a potential future bridge that needs more study, and that the city bike/pedestrian planning process is a natural place for that conversation to happen. She added that if the reference to the bridge were made in the master plan, the CAT would still need to decide how to illustrate it--i.e., as a dashed line (tentative) or not at all.

As Dean Pape' had to leave early, it was agreed that the land use discussion would be revisited when he was present.

Tom Hoyt asked how many more CAT meetings have been scheduled. Ellen Teninty replied that the next meeting is March 10, that she assumed there would be no meeting on March 24 because that is during spring break, and then two more meetings on April 14 and 28. She added that the open house celebration will be held on May 12.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:34 p.m.

**Next Meeting: Wednesday, March 10
 5:30 – 7:30 p.m.
 EWEB Board Room**