

FINAL

Summary – Meeting #19

Project Development Team – I-5 Willamette River Bridge Project

*April 17, 2009, 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.
McLane Room (644 A Street, Springfield)*

ACTION ITEMS

The project team will:

1. Provide notice of the next PDT meeting date.
2. Modify the Design Workshop Report to include comments from the CAG and PDT.
3. Follow up with affected Laurel Hill Valley residents regarding their preferences on a stepped retaining wall and pursue a less monolithic design.
4. Modify the membership and format of the Design Review Panel based on comments from the CAG and PDT.

ATTENDANCE

Voting Members

- Don Angermayer – Program Coordinator, ODOT District 5
- Molly Cary – Environmental Manager, ODOT Region 2
- Chris Henry – Transportation Planning Engineer, City of Eugene Public Works
- Shashi Bajracharya – Transportation Planning, Lane County
- Greg Mott – Community Planning Manager, City of Springfield
- David Sonnichsen – Community Advisory Group (CAG) representative
- Larry Fox - OBEC
- John Horn – OBDP
- Matt Koehler – ASLA
- Kevin Parrish – Hamilton
- Suzanne Roberts – OBDP
- Rick Satre - ASLA
- Kalin Schmoldt – Public Involvement Coordinator, JLA
- Jyll Smith – ODOT
- Jiri Strasky – OBEC
- Richard Upton – Project Manager, ODOT
- Don Kahle – AIA

Resource Members/Voting Member

Alternates/Observers

- Megan Banks – Public Involvement Manager, LCOG
- Douglas Beauchamp – Lane Arts Council
- Jamie Damon – Public Involvement Manager
- Carl Deaton – Designer, ODOT Region 2 Roadway
- John Ferguson – T.Y. Lin International

HANDOUTS

- Agenda
- PDT #18 meeting summary (*Draft*)
- PDT #17 meeting summary (*Final*)

WELCOME & AGENDA REVIEW

Meeting purpose: Hear project updates, discuss upcoming design steps, construction schedule and public outreach opportunities.

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Summary of PDT #18 Meeting – The summary was approved with no changes.

PROJECT UPDATE

Schedule & Budget – Dick Upton said that work is anticipated to start on the south bank on May 15. Permitting challenges surrounding 6(f) approval by National Parks (NPS) will likely not allow work in the park until mid June. The budget is being re-estimated and will be available at the next meeting. The project is currently within budget.

Community Presentations – Presentations have been made to a range of groups to prepare stakeholders and the public for construction. Presentations are scheduled for the Board of County Commissioners and the Springfield City Council. Information is being prepared for the Eugene City Council. A meeting is scheduled with the Harlow Neighbors. Soundwall information was presented to the Laurel Hill Valley Citizens Association and polling information will be mailed at the end of April to help determine whether a soundwall is needed. Dick Upton and Susan Vickers made a presentation to the CPC for the Whilamut Natural Area to discuss 6(f) issues.

6(f) Update – Section 6(f) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act governs the use of lands that have received improvement funding from NPS. When impacts to 6(f) lands last longer than 180 days, the park must be compensated for that conversion to another use. Currently, the 6(f) approval is causing delays. Public disclosure of information about the process is required as well as identification and mitigation of potential impacts. Impacts include the use of N. Walnut, the staging areas, and noise. These impacts will affect about 17 acres. During the development of the EA, a deal was struck that would transfer ownership of a 28 acre property in West Eugene to the Eugene parks system in compensation. The property in question is adjacent to Bertleson Slough and is an extension of a natural area owned by the BLM.

David Sonnichsen noted process problems with the 6(f) process related to the fill pad at the north end of the detour bridge. Dick said that this process is separate and that similar problems will hopefully be avoided by working directly with NPS.

Public involvement – Megan Banks noted that there would be outreach by staff and members of the CAG and PDT in Alton Baker Park this afternoon (4/17) and tomorrow morning (4/18). The outreach is intended to bring attention to the detours. A media event surrounding the design workshops was held at The Atrium Building and covered by KEZI and the Register Guard. The event received several good editorials. Kiosks are now installed in the park and detour route signage is forthcoming. A brief project update mailing is in progress and will be followed by a more complete newsletter. Preparation is underway for a late spring or early summer groundbreaking event.

DESIGN PROCESS UPDATE

Where we are in the design process – Larry Fox noted that Early Work Amendment (EWA) 2 has concluded. This work includes temporary work required for the contractor to begin during the

first season. The design team is moving forward with final design and an additional work package is coming in early summer that will focus on the southbound arch and ribs. This will be followed by the GMP phase in the fall and a post-GMP phase in April of 2010. The design team is now focusing on how to incorporate ideas from the workshops into the design.

Jiri Strasky explained that the approach span designs have been modified slightly. Instead of precast box girders, the approach span decks will now be supported by a cast-in-place multi-cell box girder. Jiri noted that the transition appears more uniform. The girders will be haunched to accommodate the longer span. One additional change will be the use of two columns on the northbound approach next to the railroad. One pier is not feasible because of environmental constraints.

Construction will begin with the construction of arch ribs connected by transverse girders. The ribs will be braced during this phase. After the horizontal girders are cast and the deck is laid, the bracing will be removed.

MASTER PLAN PRESENTATION

Larry Fox introduced Rick Satre. Rick was a member of the Steering Committee that organized the February design workshops and he will present the findings from the workshop to the group. Originally referred to as a "master plan," the document name was questioned by the CAG because it appeared to be too restrictive. The CAG suggested referring to the document as a "report."

Rick described the workshop document as a draft follow-up from the Steering Committee to help move the conversation forward. The document is partially intended as permanent documentation of the thoughts and ideas from the workshop but also as tool to help the PDT, CAG, and design team move from concepts to buildable components of the overall project. The document lists a number of actionable ideas that could become physical elements of the overall project and help create a signature place and crossing. All of the ideas are conceptual and in need of more development.

Rick noted several design suggestions from the document. The structure above the railroad would typically use a solid base and a fence though one possible enhancement could be the use of a different type of concrete or pattern that could fit with the Whilamut Passage theme. The concrete could reflect the geology or geography of the southern end of the bridge. A camas bulb could be incorporated into the concrete with the flower as part of the rail.

The walls do not need to be like other places on the interstate system. The walls could reflect the basalt environment or the transition from Glenwood to the Willamette Valley. Slope paving also presents opportunities.

There are opportunities under the bridges for treatment of the millrace, the exit of the Glenwood Slough, and the many intersecting transportation modes. Those features could be considered a nexus of connections that tell a story. The story of the south bank is of transportation and industry, while the north bank tells the story of restoration, preindustrial history, nature, the environment, and indigenous peoples.

Other ideas included improving safety and daylight for Canoe Canal, incorporating designs into the signbridge, material reuse throughout the project, and adding art and sculpture to the northern median.

Rick noted that the document before the committee is a draft and that another version will incorporate comments. Rick thanked ODOT and the committees. He explained that the Steering Committee was a group of volunteer consultants who organized and implemented the design workshops. That group concluded its work with the production of the draft workshop document.

Jamie Damon noted input from the CAG and their questions:

- The CAG was concerned that the title “master plan” would connote a confusing level of authority and they suggested instead calling the document a “report.”
- More information is needed about the workshops and who attended.
- The report should include more information about the site and the project context. If this is intended as a guide, it would be helpful to know about the park and natural area.
- It would be helpful to include the presentations by speakers at the workshop.
- Participants beyond the design community, such as the CAG and CPC should also be acknowledged.
- The matrix at the back of the document which shows how different parts of the site are being addressed needs to be described more clearly.
- The report could better articulate some of the emergent themes.

David Sonnichsen noted that the CAG was not of one mind on the report. Some considered the document to be for internal use by the CAG and PDT and not in need of additional reference material for the sake of outside viewers. David noted that he felt that the document could eventually be a useful document for the press and the public. He noted that the document omits references to Alton Baker Park and a description could be included alongside the aerial photo of the area. David appreciated the discussion of the emerging theme.

Jamie noted that Megan Banks would be gathering some of the additional information as an appendix to the report. The appendix will contain substantial documentation on the workshops and many of the concerns will be addressed there. The report itself is intended only as a summary. Dick acknowledged that the document could have some life beyond the committees and should be prepared as a publicly available project document. Jamie noted that it will be important for designers to understand the land uses if the report is to be used to implement ideas. Jamie noted that the CAG issued the list of issues for the PDT but they did not make a specific recommendation.

PDT Discussion – Molly Cary said that she appreciated how the document lays out the materials in one place with interpretation. Molly questioned the audience for the document and said she had assumed that the primary audience would be the project designers. Molly preferred that additional information should be included in an appendix to keep the summary brief and approachable.

Chris Henry appreciated the praise for the workshops and noted potential applications for the workshop format in the future. Chris suggested that the workshop document could have a broader application and could help tell the story of what the workshops were trying to accomplish with community interests in mind. The document is an opportunity to communicate what is going on and a window into the project. He agreed that brevity would help to tell that story.

David Sonnichsen suggested that the document could be very positive with some changes, but he was concerned that some of the deficiencies would only be reflected in the appendix and not in the publicly viewed portion. He reiterated concerns about calling the document a “master plan.”

Greg Mott agreed that “master plan” can have a negative connotation. He complimented the organization of the document and said that it captures the efforts along the way. He suggested that the document could be an easy reference for the public.

Shashi Bajracharya said that he liked the idea of the document but that Kent Howe could provide additional comments.

Don Angermayer noted that he had attended the first design workshop and that he appreciated having the information consolidated and approachable.

Dick Upton described the document as an artful, useful, and concise summary of the event. He noted that the group seemed generally supportive of the document but with some polish. He suggested that it would be important to continue to advertise the success of the workshops.

Molly Cary suggested darkening the text on page 22 to make it more legible.

Don Kahle noted that “Guiding Document” may be an appropriate name based on CAG feedback. He noted that a *summary* points backwards, a *report* sits in time, while a *guiding document* points forward, consistent with the use of the term *master plan*. David Sonnichsen noted that the document does serve as a snapshot of a current place in time. Larry Fox clarified that the intent is to provide guidance while also recognizing evolution in the process. After some discussion, the committee expressed support for the title “Design Workshop Report: Guidance for Moving Forward.”

Jyll Smith noted that the document should reflect the work that went into it, but it should also be brief for the sake of elected officials and the public. The document should direct attention to the appendix for more information. Larry noted that many of the concerns could be addressed with the addition of a few sentences to the summary.

Don Kahle suggested that the summary document itself could serve as an appendix to a larger document. Dick felt that the report as an executive summary would be more useful.

Kevin Parrish asked about the reasons for listing participants. Dick noted that listing participants would contribute to capturing the broader context of the workshop activities. Jamie noted that listing the names could help to find contributors if there are questions of interpretation. David suggested listing the Steering Committee as well. Chris noted concerns about inclusiveness and the diversity of representation. Listing participants can help build legitimacy in the process. Matt Koehler noted that the list would help demonstrate the unique backgrounds of the participants.

Megan Banks and Don Kahle will revise the document based on the suggested changes.

PROPOSAL FOR UPCOMING WORK

Schedule and design packages – Larry Fox raised the question of how to implement ideas into the project schedule. Larry noted the matrix at the end of the Workshop Report that demonstrates

the interweaving of design ideas. More explanation of the matrix will be included in the next version of the report. Schedule continues to drive the process. Early Work Package 2 is complete and the contractor will start within a month or so. Design will continue while they work. Work Package 3 is due at the end of June and includes southbound work on the arch and foundations, approach spans, ramp, retaining wall, Canoe Canal bridge and mainline grading. The GMP package is due in October 2009. The contractor will price the job at that time. Post-GMP is due in one year and is anticipated to include a significant change order because GMP will be based on about 50% design plans. Design elements for the GMP package have a very short timeframe. Dates given are for 100% of design.

Matching emerging design concepts with construction opportunities – Larry Fox explained the updated design input matrix. Previous incarnations of the matrix included potential design areas of input identified by timeframe. The matrix was reorganized for the workshops and constraints were listed to provide guidance and boundaries. The workshop elements are now tied to dates relative to the schedule for GMP or post-GMP phases. A number of decisions must be made for the GMP package in October.

The matrix tries to show which stakeholders need to be involved in order to move specific design elements forward. For example, parks groups have been active in the design of the EWP 2 alignments, and design groups working on Canoe Canal will be interacting regularly with Eugene Parks, the CPC, and Willamalane Parks and Recreation. The Kalapuya will be involved in developing themes related to the tribe. The matrix is intended to remind the team of who needs to be involved and to help avoid moving forward with ideas that have been rejected by jurisdictional stakeholders.

The matrix includes one decision that needs to be made immediately. That decision involves whether the retaining wall below the LHV soundwall should include steppes for landscaping to soften the wall's appearance and break up the monotony of the large wall. Because there is not enough time to engage outside design groups, the steppes (if desired) would be designed internally. The alternative is a flat 26-foot high wall.

Kevin Parrish asked whether the steppes were feasible considering right of way constraints. Larry said that they were possible, though the size will be dictated by the available right of way.

Don Angermayer noted that any plantings on ODOT right of way would be ODOT's responsibility and would look bad if they were not taken care of. Molly raised the question of whether there would be adequate space for plants to survive. Matt noted similar previous work that had used vines and Oregon Grape to discourage climbing.

Rick Satre noted that the concept had been proposed so as to mitigate the effect of an otherwise monolithic wall. He suggested that the terraces wouldn't need to be all the same width or even planted. A basalt themed soundwall may also look strange on top of a normal retaining wall.

Larry noted that the wall would abut backyards. Don Angermayer suggested that residents may not want maintenance activities in their backyards and he suggested leaving the space un-landscaped for residents to use as they pleased. Carl Deaton noted previous situations where ODOT has not needed to access the right of way unless there is a structural problem. He suggested that it could be problematic if the use is visible by others. Larry confirmed that there would be a mix of visibilities, with some parts visible by neighbors and from the road. Chris suggested that not including

landscaping could give residents more options. Molly suggested asking for preferences when residents are polled about the soundwall. Don noted that some people may prefer a vertical wall.

Jamie Damon suggested that CMGS could be charged with pursuing a less monolithic design and then engaging immediately affected neighbors. Molly cautioned against changing the design for each person. David asked whether there would be enough time for such a survey of neighbors. Dick said that neighbors would be engaged directly and the outreach could be comfortably finished within a week. Kevin noted that timing and pleasing everyone would be a challenge. Larry suggested using steps on the public right of way and flat walls elsewhere. He acknowledged the challenge of getting to a price by June 30 and building two months later. Molly expressed concern that making decisions one-at-a-time would result in running out of budget later on.

Design Review Panel – Larry Fox noted the general success of the workshops and the enthusiasm of the workshop participants. He noted that much of the process is still being developed and that the conceptual ideas from the workshop will now need to be honed into final designs and actions. The team has been struggling with how to move forward with the Phase 1 elements that need to be determined by October. The current proposal is to convene a group of design experts who were involved in the workshop process to guide the team as they move forward. The group is currently being called a *Design Review Panel (DRP)*. Larry noted that it seemed to make sense to continue to use design professionals who had participated in the workshops because they understand the need for a cohesive set of aesthetic enhancements that speak to the theme of the whole project. A small group could respond to challenges quickly and accommodate the necessary time-commitment better than a larger group. The group will have to be able to meet when the design team needs their guidance.

Two methods of engaging designers have been identified. The Request for Proposals (RFP), Request for Qualifications (RFQ) process is more fitting for the Phase 2 elements in April 2010, while direct appointments may be more appropriate for the upcoming phases. The DRP could help identify the local design teams to engage the design elements.

Larry explained that budgets will be developed for each design concept, but many of the basic elements are already budgeted as part of the design. The question now is how to enhance those elements. The design team will work with ODOT to determine those figures in order to determine what can be done now or what can be done by other groups in the future. Some ideas may require IGAs to determine the responsibility for maintenance.

A chart within the Workshop Report illustrates one way that the DRP could be used alongside the CAG and PDT. The group would include artists, landscape architects, CAG members, and architects who participated in the workshops. The group would largely let go of their own original ideas and coalesce around ideas that everyone can support. Three of the proposed members would be CAG members: Eric Gunderson, Scott Wylie, and Chris Ramey.

Jamie noted CAG comments and concerns about the use of the panel. The CAG did not issue a formal recommendation on the panel because they ran out of time.

- The CAG generally appreciated the value of design expertise on the panel and acknowledged their own limitations, however they wanted to see a stronger connection to DRP group.

- The CAG raised questions about the authority of the panel and whether the group could benefit from perspectives from outside of the design community. In particular the group recommended including the perspective of parks, the Kalapuya, and women.
- The group was perceived as being too large.
- The CAG did not want the DRP to be just another permutation of the workshop Steering Committee, nor did they want to be cut out of the deliberations.
- The CAG asked to see ideas in advance, to know when meetings would be held, and what topics would be reviewed.

PDT Discussion – David Sonnichsen asked about a follow-up conversation between Dick and Charlotte Behm. Dick noted that governance was the predominant issue. The CAG and PDT were formed to give guidance on the process, but now there are questions about who will be providing guidance on what and who has the authority to make decisions. The team would like to preserve the energy of artists, architects, and landscape architects, but they don't want the CAG and PDT to feel pushed aside. Dick affirmed that the CAG and PDT were still in a decision-making role but suggested that artists, architects and landscape architects could still be involved by sending a smaller group off to do work and bring a product back to the decision making groups. While there may be issues of diversity, he suggested that the process structure seemed sound. Larry noted that the DRP would essentially be a volunteer extension of the A&E design team. Generally the process would not be substantially different otherwise. The PDT and CAG have felt left behind because so much happens on the project between meetings and the groups get too much information all at once. As an extension of the design team, the DRP will not function in a vacuum: any RFPs will describe the work involved and the relevant stakeholders to involve.

Carl Deaton agreed that the PDT and CAG were too big to address specific details. He agreed with applying ideas from the workshop to solve specific problems. He suggested that the DRP would do what is needed and then report back to the larger groups. The group cannot be insular and needs to be able to speak to the different communities. Someone should take notes on each meeting to keep everyone on the same page and to prevent communication problems.

Dick Upton suggested that the membership of the DRP could change based on the issue at hand. He suggested including an ODOT representative and challenged the team to make the group smaller and more diverse.

David Sonnichsen noted that the CAG had not had the opportunity to nominate a member for the panel.

Chris Henry agreed that a panel as extension of the design team made sense. He had no problems with the team pulling in resources as needed and then reporting back to the groups. He noted that the chart in the summary appears to assign power to a small subset and he suggested revising the graphic to better reflect the role of the CAG and PDT.

Greg Mott said that he understood the constraints and did not want to needlessly complicate the process. He noted that as long as the process follows a menu approach and avoids situations where "what were you thinking?" decisions were being made outside of the CAG and PDT (as with the type selection,) then the important thing is getting the bridges done. Jamie Damon asked for more clarification on how to distinguish the types of decisions. Chris suggested sending out a group email

if any drastic changes emerge. Greg noted that some decisions may arise that have not been considered before and others may be strongly attached to elements that directly concern members of the group. Treading on that sense of ownership should be avoided.

Shashi Bajracharya said that he understand the time constraints and preferred simplifying the process.

Molly Cary felt good about the process

Don Angermayer agreed with keeping the process simple. He advised moving efficiently and keeping maintenance choices in mind.

David Sonnichsen said he could not approve of a panel of eight men. He asked whether any of the DRP members would be paid. Larry noted that he did not personally select the people for the panel and that a number of candidates had been discussed. Don Kahle had contacted people to see if they would volunteer their time. Don Kahle will be paid as a staff member. Phase 2 will require producing RFPs and the writers of those RFPs will also be paid. The conceptual "Design Implementation Team" will be paid staff and would include Larry Fox, Douglas Beauchamp, Megan Banks, and Justin Lamphear (ASLA). The DRP would be separate from paid staff and a guidance document is being developed to help prevent conflicts of interest. The initial proposal with eight men was not deliberate. Matt noted that the search for volunteers included all of the professionals in the city.

Jamie Damon summarized the group comments: There is support for a panel as an extension of design team though the panel needs to be more diverse and avail itself to the CAG. More checkpoints are needed and the CAG/PDT should maintain their roles as decision makers.

Chris Henry asked whether it would be possible to receive weekly updates prior to meetings. This would help prevent surprises, keep the groups informed, and allow clarifying questions beforehand.

Don Kahle noted that he had spoken with landscape architect Penny Lowe who would like to join the panel. Don also spoke with Jyll Smith about the use of a blog. While blogs are against ODOT policy at this time, the AIA may be able to contribute a password protected blog to the process and provide updates about what is going on.

David Sonnichsen stated that he would not be able to support for the concept because the CAG has not been allowed to choose its representative. Dick agreed that the invited groups should be able to choose their own representation. Don Kahle suggested that representatives should have been involved in the workshops. He also noted that not all nominated representatives would be interested in all of the concepts that the DRP will need to address. Dick suggested postponing any adoption of the panel at this time. Larry cautioned that the design elements in Phase 1 would be missed if the process is delayed. He expressed skepticism about addressing the Phase 1 elements even if the use of the DRP was approved today because of design concerns and contract questions.

Carl Deaton agreed with the use of design professionals but proposed including a silent observer from the CAG and PDT who could witness the process.

Jamie noted that the CAG did not have the opportunity to vote on their representative but she asked the PDT whether there is support for letting Larry and Don create a panel based on the discussion:

- Greg Mott had no issues but noted that the idea was too new to be able to appreciate the details.
- David Sonnichsen was not comfortable. He expressed skepticism of the potential delays.
- Molly Cary supported the panel idea and bringing in specialized individuals to address the different elements. She also supported using participants from the design workshops.
- Shashi Bajracharya supported the idea.
- Chris Henry said that he supported the idea but also wanted to represent the CAG's interests. He suggested using a survey to select a representative and gather comments.
- Carl Deaton supported the concept and idea.
- Don Angermayer requested that a member of the CAG or other group be present and able to ask questions.

Jamie Damon noted the general support for the DRP but with changes based on the discussion. The team will find a way to modify the list of members with the help of the CAG and clarify how participants are involved.

CONSTRUCTION "PRIMER"

Kevin Parrish explained that 6(f) issues are preventing early work in the park. A special dispensation is in place that allows work on the south bank. Kiosks have been placed in the park and property has been rented in the southeast quadrant for the project offices.

Permits are anticipated on May 18. The current plan is to build an access road under Franklin to access the south bank. OBEC will survey and lay out the roadway and high water line in preparation for the June 1 in-water work window. Work will have to remain above the high-water line until the hydro-acoustic deadline has passed. Construction will begin with a work bridge on the west side of the decommissioned bridge, followed by a work bridge on the east side. A third crew will work under the structure. Because access is restricted to the south bank, there will be some unavoidable inefficiencies. There may be some temporary changes to Franklin to facilitate safer truck access. No significant impacts are anticipated from these potential traffic changes.

The Section 6(f) issues should be resolved by mid July at which point work can begin on the north bank. The staging area will include the old landfill and a working area around the bridge. Detours will be provided around the worksite. Initial work will include a temporary retaining wall to move the trail away from the Canoe Canal bridge and improve spacing and sightlines. A trail that was impacted during construction of the temporary bridge will also be restored. The goal is to complete the temporary work before the rains come. The ground at the north bank will need to be raised 5' to accommodate the work bridge. Demolition of the decommissioned bridge should start by September. It will also be necessary to build the retaining wall in the southwest quadrant in order to raise the grade of the freeway before the fall.

Jyll Smith asked about the installation of cameras to allow the public to observe construction. Kevin said that the issue would need to be addressed by ODOT ITS. Dick noted that conditional approval from FHWA will allow some of this work outside the park.

Chris Henry asked about the path closures on the south bank. Kevin said that flaggers would be used for any temporary closures. The path will need to be moved several times and a permanent alignment has not yet been determined. Chris confirmed that the Canoe Canal passage would be built first to allow traffic to detour. Kevin noted that detour routes would be flagged during the day but open on nights and weekends. A detour or temporary delay will always be available for impacted paths. The park kiosks will also include this information.

David Sonnichsen asked where deconstruction of the decommissioned bridge would start. Kevin said that deconstruction would begin on the south bank. Materials will also be stored on the south bank. Steel and concrete from the deconstruction will be recycled.

NEXT STEPS

The team will contact the PDT with the next meeting date. CAG and PDT meetings may be combined to avoid duplicating efforts.

CLOSE

FLIP-CHART NOTES

SB Ramp Retaining Wall – *less monolithic*

- CMGS develop ideas
- Discuss ideas with neighbors
- Consistent application of wall
- Minimize ODOT maintenance needs
- Consistent views for other neighbors
- Develop criteria for designs to show neighbors
- Limit choices to meet schedule
- May not finalize by 6/30/2009

PDT Direction on Design Panel

- Have CAG vote on their representatives
- AIA support wiki/blog about design
- Retain CAG/PDT decision making structure/authority
- Move efficiently - do right thing
- Design Panel as an extension of Larry's Design team making interim design decisions
- Use "Guidance" to guide decisions
- CAG participate as observers
- Simplify process
- Bring new ideas/information to CAG/PDT as early as possible
- Need weekly (?) updates -- more communication!
- Some participants in charette