

DRAFT Summary – CAG^{#28} / PDT^{#27}

Community Advisory Group / Project Development Team I-5 Willamette River Bridge Project

September 10, 2010 - 10 a.m. to 1 p.m.

McLane Conference Room, Springfield ODOT Offices (644 A Street)

ATTENDANCE

CAG Members

- Rich Hazel – Laurel Hill Valley Citizens Association
- Greg Hyde – Willamalane Park & Recreation District
- Bob Kline – Harlow Neighbors
- Vicky Mello – CPC for Whilamut Natural Area
- Phillip Richardson – Eugene Parks and Open Space Division
- David Sonnichsen – Fairmount Neighbors
- Scott Wylie – Springfield Resident

PDT Members

- Molly Cary – ODOT Region 2
- Carl Deaton – ODOT Region 2
- Chris Henry – City of Eugene
- Kent Howe – Lane County
- Drake McKee – ODOT District 5
- Greg Mott – City of Springfield

Guests

- Charlene Larison – CPC for Whilamut Natural Area

Resource Team

- Douglas Beauchamp – Arts Consultant
- Sonny Chickering - ODOT Region 2, Area 5 Manager
- Jeff Firth – Hamilton Construction
- Larry Fox – OBEC
- Larry Gescher – Slayden Construction
- Nichole Hayward – CAWOOD
- Justin Lanphear – CMGS
- John Lively – CAWOOD
- Suzanne Roberts – OBDP

Handouts (available at meeting)

- Agenda
- ADT 1 RFP
- ADT 1 art inclusion zone maps
- List of those currently attending North and South Bank Parks advisory committee meetings
- Estimated Design Enhancement Budget

WELCOME AND AGENDA REVIEW

John Lively greeted the committees and introduced himself as the new facilitator. John then announced that Dick Upton and Jamie Damon would not be able to attend, therefore the meeting agenda was slightly modified. John reiterated the current state of transition with project staff and the actual project design phase moving into the construction phase.

Primary meeting purpose: Design Enhancement Steering Committee recommendations for ADT 1 Request for Proposals and selection committee, design enhancement processes moving forward, stakeholder groups, and budget review.

Ray Mabey was also unable to attend; therefore Sonny Chickering introduced the new Oregon Department of Transportation team and roles. Ann Sanders has been attending Community Advisory Group/Project Development Team meetings on his behalf, so he has remained informed. Ray will take over contract administration, working with OBDP and the contractor. Ray will also report back the progress of the project to ODOT and the legislature. Karl Wieseke will remain construction project manager. Sonny's role will primarily be to work with the CAG, PDT, and Design Enhancement Steering Committee, as well as the two cities and local officials in completion of the design enhancements. Sonny acknowledged the diligent work of the DESC members who have volunteered a lot of their own time to the project, also recognizing Douglas Beauchamp and John for their involvement with DESC. Sonny stated his goal for his involvement is to see positive steps moving forward with each meeting that occurs.

CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES

Jeff Firth introduced himself and noted that Hamilton staff are also in the midst of transition, therefore Jeff will take Kevin Parrish's place at the CAG/PDT meetings as Design Package 5 is underway and will phase into a project management role for the project.

Construction Update –

Falsework is up and arches are currently being poured. The crew will jack Span 2 in November and will follow with Span 3, then pour the upper part of the arch structure, followed by the deck. The box girder work will start from Bent 10 and work will move north. Spanning over Franklin Boulevard to Bent 6 will probably occur in November. An Interstate 5 traffic switch will likely occur early Fall 2011, followed by median work and the tear down of the detour bridge. Partial in-water work will take place during the current in-water work window, to construct the second work bridge approximately halfway across the river. The completion of the needed in-water work will pick back up in April for completion of the work bridge and set up for the removal of the detour bridge later in 2011.

Construction Questions –

Vicky Mello asked about the Canoe Canal Bridge progress. Jeff confirmed that the deck has been poured and the crew is working on rail. They will start demolishing the old structure the week of September 13. Pedestrian traffic will shift to the North Bank Path. Bicyclists will

not be able to ride, but will be asked to walk through. The shift will only last two days during which Staton will perform their demolition work, and the path will be reopened overnight. The tree wall between Canoe Canal and Willamette River Bridge is almost complete. The southbound on-ramp to I-5 from Franklin Boulevard is closed until December.

Greg Mott asked if the announced Army Corps controlled river releases this winter are expected to impact the paths next to the river, and whether there are plans to put up signs alerting of detours. Jeff had a meeting with the Corps and was told to be prepared, although nothing has been discussed further. The Army Corps said they can control river levels to a certain point, but Jeff is doubtful that there is any way to really know. Sonny added that they've had initial conversations that have been pretty limited so far. The Corps won't even attempt to produce maps of what is expected. Linda Cook at the Lane County Sheriff's Office has set up biweekly phone meetings to help people stay plugged into the situation. There was some conversation about the work bridge elevation. The bottom of the work bridge poses a concern for trapping debris coming down the river. Larry Fox noted that debris and drift has previously piled up at the work bridge. Army Corps said there would not be higher flood elevations, but more frequent bank fills. Jeff noted there is a website that predicts flows that the team has monitored in the past. In addition, Larry brought up the environmental concerns, noting the project obligation to get equipment out of the waterway if water does come up. There is a monitoring station up river to help avoid environmental pollution issues. Chris Henry asked about the time frame of the controlled releases. Larry Gescher confirmed that the floodgates would be taken out of commission for six to eight years. Larry Fox added that the plan is for the Army Corps to work in order of priority based upon state of repair, noting that the entire project is not completely funded yet. There should continue to be public announcements in the newspaper, biweekly meetings, etc. Sonny promised to do his best to stay informed.

Rich Hazel confirmed that the sound wall adjacent to the southbound on-ramp would be topped out and completed prior to, and as a part of the ramp opening in December. Jeff confirmed that as the goal. Larry Gescher added that paving was to occur Sept. 10 and the block work is scheduled to start the week of September 20.

Larry Fox said that lighting for the southbound on-ramp was added to Design Package 4 as an addendum, and explained that it made sense to install lighting so that the ramp is pretty much complete when reopened. It will be a matter of whether or not they can get the poles in time and get them installed before the southbound on-ramp opens. If the poles are not received in time to complete the lighting before the on-ramp is reopened, there will be night closures to accommodate that installation.

In regard to the Army Corps controlled releases, David Sonnichsen asked how long the existing arch falsework will stay in place. He also noted that in the worst-case scenario, high water and a lot of rain, pressure could undermine the arch integrity. Larry and Jeff confirmed the goal of the design and timeframe is to minimize the time the structure is based upon falsework. Once the arches are in place, everything will be built from the arches up. However, the work bridge may still become an issue.

DESIGN ACTIVITIES

Design Enhancement Steering Committee RFP and process review –

Vicky reviewed the DESC process since the last CAG/PDT meeting. Four DESC meetings have occurred since the July CAG/PDT meeting. The DESC took into account CAG and PDT member feedback from past meetings and from interim discussions and have focused on ADT 1-above deck and roadway enhancements. As of August 31, the DESC has updated the Request for Proposals. They have also scheduled informational meetings and established a general timeline for ADT 1. Vicky and Bob Kline noted that all CAG/PDT members were sent copies of the two RFP iterations and were given a chance to provide comments, which have been integrated. Douglas noted a change in date for the informational day listed in the RFP, adding that details regarding location, etc., will be filled in.

Vicky mentioned that based on concerns expressed at the previous CAG/PDT meeting about ODOT maintenance's involvement, she has been in contact with Drake McKee, who provided feedback which was incorporated into the zone maps. Sonny also provided clear indications of what is or isn't a possibility.

Rich shared his feeling that e-mail can be a poor method of communication, depending on the topic. Some people make presumptions that everyone is checking their e-mail everyday. Therefore, to presume that no response indicates agreement or consent is a poor and inappropriate practice. After reviewing the RFP and previous meeting summaries, Rich pointed out a few specific examples from the CAG 26 meeting minutes, where Charlotte Behm mentioned that not all art has to fit a Kalapuya theme. Subsequently, there was discussion that no design elements would be offensive, but the entire bridge does not have to represent the Tribe. Rich pointed out that the RFP criteria 8 and 9 do not accurately reflect the previous meeting consensus that not all art enhancements have to be based upon the Kalapuya theme, but must not be disrespectful.

Vicky explained that the DESC intention was to remain broad and use positive language to represent the criteria, for example, they tried to avoid using the word *not*. Rich agreed that the use of positive language is appropriate, but pointed out where the criterion implies a requirement. David agreed with Rich, identifying the third initial proposal requirement, which suggests that all art has to reflect a Kalapuya theme. The *Whilamut Passage* theme talks about passages and the nexus of movement, including passage of river itself. The intention was not to have all work relate to our Native American culture. David suggested that criterion 3 could be amended or removed. Vicky asked if removal of the third criterion would alleviate concerns. Rich agreed with David that the removal would help clarify.

Chris shared similar concerns in regard to what the RFP is communicating to proposers. He said that after the CAG 27/PDT 26 meeting, there appeared to be silent consent to leave the criteria as it was and to allow artists to interpret. Chris reiterated Rich's point that there are no bad intentions with the criteria, but the criteria conflicts with what was previously discussed by the committees. Therefore as many as 20 points or more are devoted to

representation of the Kalapuya Tribe. The wording of the criteria might encourage a focus on *Whilamut*, but not *Passage*. Chris suggested the committees agree on what is really desired and put that into words within the RFP and criteria.

Bob recommended at the DESC meeting a point system that would give equal points whether or not the focus is Kalapuya-based. The scoring system would allow, if all items listed were considered, the award of all five points. Everything else would be given equal weight. Larry Fox recalled the DESC agreeing to not include a scoring system in the RFP. Based upon experience, Larry noted that people will respond to the RFP with a proposal they think will win.

Vicky reminded the committees that the intention of the RFP is to gain proposals for art enhancements, not building or engineering a bridge. Artists may look at something differently than an engineer; which was the primary reason for not including the scoring system. Molly Cary asked Douglas for his opinion on the artist view of an RFP, in general.

Douglas said that if a proposer wants to win, they would look at what is listed in the RFP and check off each item. On the contrary, an artist may decide and realize that a lot of the objectives are arbitrary. The problem is trying to evaluate what words *honor* and *respect* mean to an artist.

Bob asked why a scoring system should not be included in the RFP, at which point Larry said he could go either way, but added that either the scoring should be included or the wording should be revised for clarity. David shared that he'd prefer to see the DESC work with the scoring and not strike the third requirement. John reminded the committees that they need to be on the same page. Everyone may interpret the RFP differently; therefore when it is finalized and sent out, the committees need to know what it means.

Rich, David and Chris suggested amendments to the third requirement and criteria 8 and 9. All were in agreement of encouraging the theme *Whilamut Passage*, but also agreed upon the need to make clear to the artist that following the theme is not part of the criteria. Scott Wylie added that the balancing of words is incredibly important within the RFP and criteria due to *Passage* being half of *Whilamut Passage*, the true theme.

John clarified there were a couple of suggestions to the RFP and asked the committees for feedback. Kent Howe supported the suggestions. Charlene Larison commented on the amendment David suggested, and suggested her own revision. David explained that there would be an expanded group initially evaluating proposals. There will be ample opportunity for discussions and other people will be consulted to weed out anything that doesn't meet the agreed upon criteria. Vicky clarified that not every proposal will come back for review by the CAG/PDT, but the final three proposals will actually have designs to present to the CAG/PDT. Bob, John and Douglas all confirmed the RFP process: proposals will be received, and then an expanded DESC/evaluation committee will select three finalists who will present to the CAG/PDT. Vicky clarified that the original proposals will not include artwork or designs. Original proposals will describe past work and experience, as well as capability to meet requirements. Once finalists are selected, the WRB project will fund design development in order to get a visual proposal ready for presentation to the CAG/PDT.

Bob suggested that proposers be asked to initially propose design concepts. Douglas recalled that the finalist proposal will be available to the CAG/PDT, but ultimately the selection committee will provide a recommendation to the CAG/PDT. Larry elaborated that when finalists are chosen in the first round, those proposals may not come to a meeting, but will be made available to CAG/PDT. Douglas added that there is approximately a two-month window where everyone reviews the finalist ideas, at which point they will come back with final proposals and visual designs. If the schedule is followed, the final approval will happen in February 2011.

Rich asked what would happen when that recommendation comes back to the CAG/PDT, and the CAG/PDT doesn't accept them. Douglas reassured Rich the CAG/PDT would be given a chance to provide feedback throughout the process. Rich added his feeling that it's inappropriate to have such a large group manage an art project, therefore the extended selection committee has been given a great deal of responsibility. Douglas agreed and added that the CAG/PDT approving the suggested RFP is desired in order to keep on track with the proposed timeline. Vicky said the goal of the DESC is to keep the CAG/PDT informed throughout the entire process in order to avoid surprises and make sure that everyone is on the same page. Ultimately the DESC goal is to relay and convey ideas and feedback of the CAG/PDT. John reiterated the importance of providing the DESC with support to allow volunteers to do the work that's been asked of them, in a timely fashion.

Bob asked if 10 - 15 proposals are received, whether or not the CAG/PDT will have a chance to review them. John clarified that once the RFP, criteria and process are all approved, the selection committee and DESC will start marching through the process and will keep the CAG/PDT informed. Sonny suggested that if someone wants a chance to evaluate all of the proposals, they should join the selection committee.

Carl Deaton made another suggestion to criterion 8, therefore John suggested each revision be reviewed and agreed upon. All amendments to criteria 8 and 9 and the third requirement were discussed as a group (Larry made the revisions listed below to the RFP document as suggestions were made and agreed upon). John confirmed that all attendees were in agreement with the revisions made to the document.

RFP revisions confirmed during meeting:

- Informational Day – October 25, 2010
- Criterion 8: Art proposals, which refer to Kalapuyas, must honor and respect their history, culture and perspective, recognizing that Kalapuyas are still here.
- Criterion 9: The overall experience should be respectful of Kalapuya values.
- Initial Proposal Requirement bullet 3: Demonstrate how art/design, which refers to Kalapuya culture, will honor and respect the Kalapuyas.

Bob questioned if the scoring system was to be included. Vicky mentioned a previous agreement to handle scoring at a later time.

Douglas said the proposal and process should not be driven by point totals. Scoring is acceptable and productive if used as a guide for the committees review. Molly asked how the award of the project would be defended without firm scores as back up. Douglas reassured that the vote by the selection committee is sufficient.

Vicky, Scott and Bob discussed how an artist would respond if they were not awarded the project, ultimately asking for Larry's blessing since he would be the one in the position of defending the selection. Larry was fine with leaving a scoring system out if ODOT felt comfortable with the decision. John concluded that scoring will be developed at the October 6 DESC meeting, but will not be included in RFP. Sonny suggested providing a scoring system to the finalists, which could be discussed further at a later date.

John confirmed there was consensus, which means the DESC will move forward with the RFP process and schedule.

DESC RFP selection committee recommendation –

Vicky identified three volunteers for the ADT 1 RFP selection committee: Chris, David Sonnichsen and David Lewis; she then asked if anyone else was interested. John reminded the committees of the time commitment volunteering would require. Including the volunteers identified, the selection committee consists of seven representatives (four current DESC members plus the other three identified). Bob expressed concern that of the seven-member group, three are CPC members plus David Lewis, all of which Bob feels have a bias toward the Kalapuya focus and could potentially outweigh the other members' votes. John reiterated the criteria, the RFP and the process were all agreed upon to follow and guide the process, and obtain a consensus, not a vote.

Justin Lanphear asked to clarify the DESC role in the selection committee. David Sonnichsen stated that while there are three members of the selection committee who are also CPC members, their involvement in the project is not as CPC representatives. David is on CAG representing the Fairmount Neighborhood Association and Charlotte Behm represents Springfield Neighborhood. Vicky is the one member on CAG who represents the CPC.

Scott asked if the DESC would also be acting as stakeholders for ADT 1. The decision to determine stakeholders is a part of the DESC work that still needs to take place, separate from selection process and committee.

Scott then asked if being an active stakeholder and being involved in the selection committee is a redundancy. John asked Douglas if ADT 1 would require a separate stakeholder group. Douglas said that certain people on the selection committee also represent stakeholder groups. Although they're on the committee, they don't represent the broad group of stakeholders that should be involved in January to provide feedback on the selection committee progress. Based on all feedback at that time, the selection committee will decide next steps and whether to reevaluate their selection.

Douglas suggested that ODOT should have a representative as a part of the selection committee. Vicky shared her hope to involve Drake, while Drake expressed his desire to

provide feedback and review any potential concerns. Sonny added that Drake has to be available for maintenance duties and in turn, suggested and appointed Ann Sanders to be a part of selection committee. Sonny added that he plans to stay involved in the discussions and attend meetings, but not as a selection committee member. Douglas concluded that the selection committee wouldn't officially meet until November, but will participate in informational meetings in October.

ADT 1 art inclusion zone review –

Vicky described the different views of the four inclusion zone maps. Larry noted that planned landscaping would eventually be added to the maps. The landscaping will be subject to change, but will be included for reference. Justin confirmed the landscaping currently shown on the maps was preexisting. He suggested that the trees that are to remain should also be added; Justin said he would provide that information to Larry.

Greg Hyde asked if the maps represented a significant shift from what was previously discussed. Vicky explained the maps represent an expansion of inclusion zones. Greg inquired about the interest in having native and well-selected vegetation on the embankments. Justin confirmed that having native vegetation is a requirement. Greg asked if Justin and the committees felt that requirement has been made adequately clear to proposers. In response, Chris suggested the information day as a good time to clarify those details for the proposers. Douglas added that original proposers would not need that information, but that it will be more critical that the finalists know those details, which will be much easier to manage. He also mentioned that details on what can or cannot be anchored would be addressed with the finalists in January.

Chris asked about the fence visibility. Vicky said ODOT has made the decision that there will not be any artistic design on the fence. Sonny added that art was originally going to be allowed on the fence, but once it was realized that the fence would only be 100 feet long, how visible the art would actually be and how it would affect the over all schedule, the DESC concluded it would not to be an optimum location. Greg asked to confirm if that meant there is no opportunity for above deck artwork. Kent noted where the criteria stated that any art on the bridge should not interfere with inspection. Vicky clarified that refers to the south side, but the section over river will not have any art above deck.

Sonny said he wasn't aware of the previous discussions, so he spoke with Dick who relayed that there would be no art attached to the bridge, Sonny confirmed that for the DESC. Sonny apologized for not informing Kent. Kent mentioned the possibility of artwork similar to a snooper crane. Sonny responded that would probably put the design enhancements over budget. Sonny then added that while he understands the desire to have artwork visible when driving over the bridge, he has no desire to revisit the decision. Bob inquired about the possibility of cantilever use, in which Sonny's initial response was that a freeway is a terrible location for art. Sonny had suggested the median on south side of bridge as a potential location for something vertical but it appears that is not possible either. He then pointed out that in order to have artwork on the median, ODOT would have to close the fast lane to perform maintenance, which will put people in bad locations and will make it very difficult to approve. Sonny and the DESC tried to come up with alternative locations, such as the sign bridge, as long as the artwork doesn't obstruct sign visibility or structurally compromise the sign bridge. There is concern about the sign bridge location. In addition the DESC asked

about the remnant columns considered in ADT 2. Sonny reported there is a chance that the DESC may be able to resurrect that possibility on the north side of Franklin. Larry added that despite challenges to find opportunities within the parameters of the highway; the desire to emphasize a “gateway” may still be accomplished at either end of the bridge without having to attach anything. Chris asked if there were light standards for the structure. Larry confirmed that no lighting would be installed on the bridge and the freeway, but would be installed on the ramps. Greg asked about the location of power lines and the impact on any artwork. Larry offered to add the locations of power lines to the inclusion zone maps for clarity.

ADT 2 and ADT 3 stakeholder groups –

John reiterated that the DESC has been asked to balance stakeholder groups for ADTs 2 and 3. Parks meeting notes were sent out to all members as requested. Larry added that the final meeting for the two parks groups would be held September 24, with a goal to gather their feedback on Design Package 5. Those two teams will be formally disbanded on September 24, at which point the stakeholder groups for those ADTs will need to be identified to move forward with design enhancements. Some of the same people who have been involved with the parks groups will transition over to the stakeholder groups.

Vicky noted the importance of identifying stakeholders for ADT 2 and ADT 3. The CAG/PDT has not spent a lot of time looking at each design element, therefore the stakeholders will need to work directly with the artists who will continue to refine their designs. Establishing stakeholders for ADTs 2 and 3 and deciding how to keep the two ADTs moving forward are agenda items for the October 6 DESC meeting. John and Vicky encouraged the committees to think about what stakeholders should be added.

Greg noted that the parks meetings have included property owners, but not stakeholders and asked for clarification on what the expectations were for the group of stakeholders for ADT 2. John and Bob confirmed the stakeholders would be expected to work with the artists as advisors. Greg asked if the committees felt the monthly meetings would be sufficient. Larry deferred to the DESC, adding that the group moving into design enhancements hasn't been defined yet and is part of what needs to be determined. The list of those currently attending park advisory meetings was provided as a basis of discussion. Bob suggested adding two Kalapuya Tribe representatives. Scott nominated himself as an appropriate stakeholder for ADT 2. John reminded the committees that selecting the stakeholders for ADT 2 and ADT 3 will be a next step. The intent of mentioning it is to alert people that this topic will be coming back to the CAG and PDT. Rich noted that no residents are listed as potential stakeholders. David added that there isn't a huge level of neighborhood association involvement in Springfield compared to Eugene. David suggested the Harlow Neighbors as stakeholders for ADT 3 and suggested that someone contact John's Springfield neighbors. Douglas added his concern that the three City of Eugene representatives are from Parks and Open Space, therefore maintenance questions might not be answered. Phillip Richardson

confirmed that he would simply ask their department who the most appropriate person would be.

Bob asked for a brief ADT 2 and ADT 3 update. Larry noted that both are currently waiting for the DESC to launch them into Phase 2. They are awaiting a better definition of the process they will be asked to follow. Bob asked for further explanation of the additional contract with GreenWorks. Larry elaborated that ODOT has an obligation to add Millrace interpretive elements; therefore they've added an amendment with GreenWorks to design the Millrace interpretive elements to ensure they are cohesive with other artwork.

DESC next steps –

- October 6 meeting, 9 a.m. – 11 a.m. location to be determined (Vicky invited the new selection committee members).
- Evaluate and finalize scoring system for proposals.
- Establish and finalize evaluation process of proposals.
- Outline ADT 2 and ADT 3 items that need to be addressed; plan to come back to CAG/PDT with what has happened and process moving forward.

Design enhancement budget review –

John noted that there was some confusion surrounding the design enhancement budget and reiterated the importance of including those parameters for proposers. Larry quickly walked through the budget, noting that the City of Eugene gave a guideline for maintenance funding of an estimated 10 percent. Another unknown element will be how accurate the estimates by the artist actually end up being, which is the reason for leaving some contingency fund. Larry added that the costs listed reflect costs for design teams hired, not staff time involved throughout Phase 1. Sonny reminded the committees that the work required of the artist would directly affect the amount of money left for the actual design enhancements. Larry said he had not been informed of the budget allotted for Millrace interpretive elements. Bob asked if that fund would be available to integrate into the budget. Larry shared that instead of using interpretive signage, his hope is for a more integrated design element, which will help with the budget. Bob asked if a Millrace representative should be added as a stakeholder to ADT 2. Scott added that he didn't think the Millrace funds would be added to the ADT 2 budget, but that there might be abatement money that might have an impact. Larry noted that stream restoration falls primarily as a part of the landscaping plan--we're obligated to restore all areas of impact. Doug added that most of the small budget for ADT 2 has been allocated to stand-alone commissions.

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

CAG #25 + PDT #24 Summary – Accepted and finalized.

CAG #26 Summary – Accepted and finalized.

PDT #25 Summary – Accepted and finalized.

CAG #27 + PDT #26 Summary – Accepted and finalized.

Bridge name –

David said the process of the bridge naming was going well. On July 26 the Eugene City Council was addressed, at which point they endorsed the *Whilamut Passage* bridge name. The first body that actually voted in affirmation of the bridge name was the Willamalane Board. Thanks to Greg that affirmation was received before addressing the City of Springfield. On August 25 there was a presentation to Lane County Commissioners who were very supportive and are now looking at implementing a naming policy, which was not in place prior to the presentation. The City of Springfield was supportive but would like to wait until the City of Eugene's approval.

Next steps –

DESC will keep committees informed of progress to ensure a productive next meeting (meeting date to be determined at a later time).