

WRB Design Enhancements Panel

Meeting #11– SYNOPSIS

Wednesday, January 6, 2010

Lane Council of Governments

4:30 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.

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

Absent: Randy Nishimura

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

Meeting Agenda

Don introduced the meeting and observed that the miscellaneous conversations among DEP members are great. Bob added that the DEP members must have missed each other.

Don stated that the goals of tonight's meeting are:

- How best to help the ADTs finish strong and successful. Taking a cue from John, the hope is to check-in with the DEP to get clarity on how decisions will be made.
- Decide whether to provide additional feedback to the ADTs, CAG-PDT, etc. since the DEP has a vantage point that no one else has. The DEP can determine how it can be helpful, if at all.
- Plan how to spend the rest of January individually and collectively. Don thanked those who have responded to Doodle calendar polls. He added that the DEP may decide that they don't want to meet again until after Phase 1 is completed.

Don noted that there will not be a full discussion on the ADTs tonight because there is not enough time. However, if there are "low hanging fruit" that everyone agrees on, those could be dealt with.

Don distributed copies of the ADTs and CMGS December 15, 2009 presentations and the Whilamut Passage theme to all of the DEP members.

Work to Date

Don shared that there has been the ODOT open house and a CAG-PDT meeting with the displays, both providing an opportunity to provide feedback. ODOT also hosted a virtual open house on its WRB Web site. Ended up with about 400 comments. The ADTs were asked to review the Whilamut Passage theme and filter comments through that. Then went back to original matrix listing key stakeholders and caretakers, and sent them the ADTs work to date and asked "is anything Dead on Arrival?" This was followed by the DEP's consideration of "All Over Delight" within the individual bundles. Don noted that there are now more than 500 comments. Don is looking for patterns in all that, which is a work in progress.

Whilamut Passage

Don said he thought it would be helpful for the DEP to review the theme. He asked Douglas for his suggestions on the best way to do that. Douglas responded that it was about a year ago that the design enhancements process had been launched with the design workshops. He noted that it is a good idea to remind ourselves where we began and see if elements are still relevant.

Douglas added that the theme is particularly relevant as David Sonnichsen is working towards having the bridge named Whilamut Passage. Douglas added that Randy had reminded the group in his comments that we don't want to bring a menu of concepts forward but a connected and cohesive design.

Don added that it was time to bring the theme back since we are at the point where we need to narrow our focus back down. Don asked that the group take a few minutes and reread the theme. After a few minutes to read the theme, Don said he was keying in on the last few sentences—"The emerging, proposed theme, Whilamut Passage, will guide design development, place-making, and shape a lasting identity."

Scott added that as he re-read the theme, he thought about tangible passages—people passing, etc. He noted that the DEP has also talked a lot about intangibles with the notion of passage. He doesn't see a lot of room for psychic time passage. He asked if the DEP thought it should push this aside in order to move forward and added that he doesn't believe the DEP should. Don responded that he feels like the first two areas could be either, as well as the third. Bob commented that passage in the area is framed by something greater—the geography, nature, the river and the surrounding environment. The theme doesn't get at that completely. Vicky added that it is not just a physical place but the passage of time, and that the ADTs have honed in on this. She added that she didn't completely understand the context of "psychic" as Scott referred to it. He clarified that it could be any intangible, nothing more.

Eric added that he still really values the theme and its meaning, and appreciates that the artists are still talking about it as a guiding principle. He added that having a central idea from which to generate more specific elements is similar to what is done when a building is designed. Although this central idea may mean different things to different people, it is still a principle from which to organize and move forward. Don added that the goal is durable solutions and hats off to the four who created a theme that is so durable. Bob commended Douglas for "passage" and Charlotte for "Whilamut." Charlotte acknowledged David Sonnichsen's and Douglas' contributions.

Feedback for the ADTs

Don stated that the ADTs are looking to DEP to help sort out the feedback from caretakers, stakeholders, community members, DEP members, etc. How can the DEP help the ADTs make sense of all that?

Bob said that for him, he needs time to absorb the multitude of comments. Originally, he thought the ADTs might "sell" the DEP on their favorite ideas but not so. Perhaps having the weekend to incubate and consider the comments, and then getting the DEP back together would be a good idea.

John asked for clarity about what DEP's charge is. Don clarified that there are DEP members "individually" and the DEP as a "whole." There is complexity around that distinction. Bob thought the responses were great and appreciated the variety of response types.

Vicky asked for information about bundle 1 and comments related to that bundle. For example, what did ODOT maintenance have to say? Don responded that he had sent out a matrix earlier in the day that includes comments from ODOT maintenance, EPOS, etc.

Eric said that the challenge of the DEP is to answer whether we have we given the ADTs a clear message for what we want, and he does not think the DEP has done that yet. Don added that one reason to provide the ADTs feedback is that we have hired them and we want like them to be successful.

Don said in his opinion, it is appropriate to ask how the DEP wants to spend the next 16 days. The extremes include not providing any more information to the ADTs to babysitting them and making them choose what the DEP wants. Somewhere in between those extremes could be where the DEP lands.

Don said that he asked Tulsi for more info about bundle 3 artists and Web site links were attached in an e-mail that he forwarded from Tulsi. He added that Robin will be down in Eugene to meet with the Lane Historical Society and do more research on that existing historic mill stone that is available for the project. Don added that he talked to Peg today. She said that she and Pat are going to Seattle to meet with Buster for a “sleepover in Seattle” weekend. They will be doing a “clean sheet” exercise to see what happens if they start over. Don shared the process that the Lando team uses, according to Peg: they absorb what everyone says and then solve problems. As they solve those problems, inspiration falls into place. Sometimes this happens towards the deadline. For that team, it feels like they are at about the halfway point.

Bob asked if an ADT isn’t doing the job in two weeks, what would happen. Larry responded that there are a couple issues. One option is to go back to the Request for Services and proposals. Larry would need to talk to Dick about budget. Bob asked if an ADT would have to be paid for phase 1 and the general consensus was yes. Larry noted that it likely means starting over because a different team can’t use the ideas developed by another ADT. Larry also offered that there are different styles of working towards a deadline. For example, some finish at the last minute while others are done ahead of time.

Larry added if that the stakeholders with veto power have identified something or things as DOA, the DEP should not be moving that element or elements forward.

Justin added that January 22 should be the date that the DEP makes a determination of suitability. He noted that implementation budgets are still flexible. There is still work to be done as part of phase 1—cost estimates, specifications, etc.

Larry said the DEP needs to digest what is submitted before making any phase 2 decisions. For example, what will the DEP as a group recommend be moved forward? He added that the DEP needs to have fairly specific ideas to move forward to the CAG and PDT. Larry said he has sympathy for ADTs—they came into process late, had to get up to speed extremely quickly, etc. He supports doing what we can to make them successful.

Don said he would like to get back to John’s question about the DEP’s role. After January, need to move forward as one. Douglas added that he is a fan of voting. Seven of eight DEP members are here and a majority vote could be taken. If it is a close vote, the DEP could discuss but if it is not close, the vote stands and the group moves on. The first question is does DEP want to meet to discuss decision-making and ADT feedback? Don said he has no issues with that approach, He added that Dick Upton was available to come to a DEP meeting.

Vicky asked for clarity on decision-making. She hasn’t seen her e-mail today so it is hard to vote on a process. John asked about voting as a general rule and Don said he was fine with it. Don

added that the operating agreements say voting may occur. He added that his concern is how the minority feels about decision. Charlotte concurred that a vote would be a good idea.

Vote: would the DEP like to meet again before January 22? Results: three yahs, three no's and one don't know. Justin said that it should be clarified how a decision about bundle elements should be made. John said that is what he would like to know also.

Larry offered that there was a benefit to planning how to decide which concepts move forward. Scott offered that making a decision is a dynamic process. It is possible that can't have one decision-making process for the different decisions that the DEP will be making.

John clarified and Don confirmed that there are no issues with putting motions forth for the DEP to vote on.

The question was posed as to whether the DEP wants to give more feedback to the ADTs with respect to comments. This is different than what should happen as the DEP plans for post-January 22 work.

Don added that it had also been suggested that the DEP take more time to absorb the 500+ comments on the matrix. The group confirmed that it would be helpful to the ADTs if the DEP sifted the feedback.

Don reminded the DEP that they are responsible for protecting the whole and putting together concepts among bundles. He reiterated that it isn't time for new feedback, just organizing what has already been provided.

Eric said he would welcome meeting again.

John said he would change his vote and concurs that the DEP should meet again. **Updated voting results: four yahs and two no's and one don't know.**

Larry said that the most important decisions that the DEP has to make is deciding which elements should move forward. Really this is the whole charge of the DEP. Going on to phase 2 will be informed by that process. He added that there will be work that the DEP needs to do between phase 1, the who, and phase 2, the what.

Bob said that ADTs should take the feedback and sort it.

Charlotte suggested to Eric that DEP members could sort comments individually.

Don said a couple DEP members want time to absorb material. On Monday he will put out poll about whether to meet. He then Don clarified that the majority of the DEP want to meet and one item to discuss is a clarification of the decision-making process. Another element is how the DEP will process what they will be getting from the ADTs on January 22.

Charlotte reiterated that she is concerned that the DEP isn't focused and requested that Don do more to help stay focused.

Don confirmed that the DEP will meet Wednesday, January 13, 7:30 a.m. He added that another DEP meeting will occur Monday, January 25 for ADTs to present final concepts, 5 pm.

Charlotte said that to her, it is important as to who moves forward to phase 2. Larry clarified that in February the DEP will make recommendations as to which elements get forwarded to the CAG-PDT. Charlotte asked for more clarification on deadlines in order to focus the DEP's purpose.

The DEP discussed what it might identify: 1) What will be forwarded to the CAG and PDT; 2) which ADTs and/or concepts will move forward to phase 2; and 3) The timeline for what needs to be done when, such as the CAG and PDT meeting. No decisions were made.

Larry added that it made sense to have that meeting before the 22nd.

Eric concurred with the dates proposed by Don and added that another DEP meeting should be scheduled prior to the February CAG-PDT meeting. Larry added that the CAG-PDT meeting hasn't been set but they are expecting the DEP's recommendation on the elements that should be moved forward.

Charlotte added that she would like to DEP to adhere to agreements that are made. She also asked that Douglas be added to the leadership chain. Don said he welcomed Douglas' input.

Don agreed to provide shorter agendas and be more forceful as a facilitator.

Next meetings time (place to be determined):

- **January 13, 2010, 7:30 a.m.**
- **January 25, 2010, 5:00 p.m.**

January 6, 2010 Handouts:

- *ADTs and CMGS's December 15 displays (Don)*
- *Whilamut Passage theme (Don)*