

**WRB Design Enhancements Panel
Meeting #10– SYNOPSIS [FINAL]**

Tuesday, September 29, 2009
Midtown Arts Center
5:15 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.

Panel Attendees: Charlotte Behm, Annie Loe, Vicky Mello, John Rose, Scott Wylie
Absent: Eric Gunderson, Bob Kline, Randy Nishimura

Staff: Don Kahle, Facilitator; Megan Banks; Larry Fox, Justin Lanphear
Absent: Douglas Beauchamp

Don stated that the purpose of this meeting was a “clean up session.” He wanted to be sure the panel takes up some items that were requested but deemed non-urgent without too much time going by.

Don reiterated that John had received two calls from ADT members that were not chosen. Don repeated that he was available to sit down or call and explain the scoring and results. He repeated that he could share the scores anonymously, which would help delineate strengths and weaknesses of the proposal and/or interview. Larry added that it was important for the ADTs to see the full scores since more information is better than just a final score. Charlotte concurred that this was a good idea. Larry responded that is why OBEC does it that way.

Larry read the congratulations and TNT (thanks but no thanks) letters. Charlotte commented that the letters were nice. Don added that if ADTs call it would be used as a “teachable” moment, as Scott suggested, while giving them a sense of how the deliberations went.

John shared that this is different than art panels he has participated on. Typically, they don’t share scoring. Larry responded that it is helpful when the information is given out. Scott agreed, saying that in past competitions, he hasn’t gotten feedback and appreciates that we are providing some. Larry said that he believes it adds credibility. Without it, it would be difficult to determine whether it was a pure process.

Charlotte confirmed that we need to wait under the ADTs are under contract for any interaction. Larry distributed the scope of work and updated schedule. He noted that the scope of work is pretty much the same as in the RFS except that we have added the addendum bullet, highlighted the matrix and bundle map, and added the other ADTs as stakeholders.

Don reviewed the goals of tonight’s meeting—decommissioned columns discussion, bridge name discussion, timeline and role of the panel in the months ahead, and early inter-ADT work session planning.

Saving the Decommissioned Bridge Columns

Scott said that it struck home when he went to the ground breaking and walked between the columns as well as when he observed the beams and girders. Scott has been to places where remnants of the bridge have been left. Historic and intrinsic value increased as columns get older. He also noted that the crossing goes hand-in-hand with the millrace.

In his e-mail, Randy had noted that maybe Lando and GreenWorks would show a way to work the columns into their designs. Scott commented that the panel is discouraged from dialoguing

with the ADTs but decisions may need to occur before that. He asked about including it as a condition of the site. Could be used by designers to amplify their work.

Larry said that demolition is likely to start October 31; the subcontractor (Staton) could get to the columns in early November. Larry also added that it is not possible to save the cross beams and hammerheads—"wings," as Scott referred to them—so the panel should be thinking about the columns only.

Charlotte asked when they needed to know. Larry responded that he would have to do more investigation with Hamilton.

Don stated that his best case scenario was that no money has been spent; the ADTs haven't been obligated; the columns are still there; and the panel has put it out there regarding saving the columns.

Scott added that the columns bring stature and a large presence while adding to the possibilities for an ADT.

Larry added that reusing the columns is well documented in the Design Workshop Report. Annie and Don noted that Lando's proposal, as well as some others, mentioned the columns.

Don confirmed the panel's position: 1) Wait and see until November 1; 2) Don't do anything to columns before then; and 3) Present to ADT as an opportunity. Don said perhaps it shouldn't come from a panel member; focus on the facts.

Larry agreed to get more information on the demolition timing.

Vicky asked how this was different than the Millrace. Justin clarified that SHPO (State Historic Preservation Office) had already weighed in and ODOT had a regulatory obligation to do something regarding the Millrace. The old bridge columns, on the other hand, were not deemed to be "historic."

John stated that he was against the panel promoting any specific design elements in principle. GreenWorks should be able to say no to using the columns from the decommissioned bridge. Don reiterated a focus on the facts. Larry offered that it could be more global with a focus on the Design Workshop Report and provide them with the demolition dates. Don thought that would capture the urgency of Scott while staying out of the way of creativity.

Naming the Bridge Whilamut Passage

Charlotte stated that there is a good chance that the bridge will be named with something proposed to the OTC (Oregon Transportation Commission). The potential name might not be related to all the work that is being done. Charlotte read Randy's e-mail related the bridge naming. Randy endorsed the idea of naming the bridge "Whilamut Passage" because the bridge will be more important than any individual.

John noted that the panel was smaller than the CAG. Charlotte acknowledged that the proposed name should come from the CAG but the place to start is the panel.

John stated that he supported Whilamut Passage as the bridge name. Scott said his support was "rabid." Vicky observed that there was the potential for a political element to this issue.

Larry said that this could be a pioneering effort.

Larry said that what was being asked was a policy recommendation from the panel. Charlotte was following that process before going to the CAG.

Annie stated that she agreed with the idea and concept but asked if we could give it time to see how the ADTs respond? Charlotte responded that we don't have that time. Larry said that the panel could conditionally recommend the name. Annie said that she doesn't disagree but wants to give the ADTs a chance.

Don acknowledged there is a desire to not have the bridge named after a person since it is "bigger than a person" as Randy described it in his e-mail. By seeing where the ADTs launch and land with Whilamut Passage as the project theme it could be even better than we could imagine.

Annie confirmed that the next step is a recommendation by the CAG.

Don stated that the DEP is recommending the CAG endorse the idea of naming the bridge after the theme. He added this is positive because it reminds the CAG that they are connected to the panel. There were no objections from the panel.

What Happens Next

Don shared that: notifications to the ADTs went out Friday with one response; contracts will be sent this week with a scope of work; the end dates for Phase One have been extended a month in 2010; the NTP should be ready by October 15; introductions for the ADTs are scheduled for October 15 at the WRB project office in Salem; the CAG meeting will be either October 21 or 22; and an ADT open house and work session will be scheduled for October 22.

Don reminded the panel that it is important to optimize the ADTs' time. They are not getting paid much and it's a lump sum—they're not being paid by the hour. Larry added that facilitating stakeholder interaction will help.

Don noted that a midpoint progress report will be scheduled with the ADTs for late November, and the conceptual design and production proposal will be due mid-January 2010. The panel acknowledged these timeframes.

The group observed that it was important to include as many stakeholders as possible at the October 22 work session. The panel acknowledged the CAG as a stakeholder too.

John said that he did not think "mini-charrette" was the best way to frame it. He would prefer that the stakeholders present where they hold their "stake." It is not necessarily joint design; it is more important for the ADTs to get good clear stakeholder statements. Don offered "work session" as a name. John responded that he liked that because of the collaborative nature it conveys. Justin offered that focusing the conversation on the overarching intent on the project contributes to intent of the whole. Charlotte said she would like to get Esther there.

Larry said he will let Don know when the contracts are signed. He reminded the panel to be aware of the very limited budget the ADTs have for this project.

LCOG: C:\DOCUMENTS AND SETTINGS\ICLPL023\DESKTOP\DEP MEETING #10 SUMMARY 092909.DOC Last Saved: October 20, 2009