

DRAFT Summary – PDT^{#25}

Project Development Team I-5 Willamette River Bridge Project

March 5, 2010 – 9:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.

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

ATTENDANCE

PDT Members

- Charlotte Behm – CAG Liaison
- Molly Cary – ODOT Region 2
- Chris Henry – City of Eugene
- Al Heyn – ODOT Region 2
- Kent Howe – Lane County
- Drake McKee – ODOT District 5
- Greg Mott – City of Springfield
- Ann Sanders – ODOT Region 2
- David Sonnichsen – CAG Liaison

Resource Team

- Douglas Beauchamp – Arts Consultant
- Jamie Damon – Portland State University
- Larry Fox – OBEC
- Nichole Hayward – CAWOOD
- Don Kahle – ADT Facilitator
- Justin Lanphear – CMGS
- John Lively – CAWOOD
- Kevin Parrish – Hamilton
- Suzanne Roberts – OBDP

Handouts (available at meeting)

- DRAFT CAG^{#25} + PDT^{#24} Summary
- DRAFT CAG^{#26} Summary
- Letters from CPC for Willamut Natural Area, Charlotte Behm and DEP members
- White board summary from Feb. 19 combined CAG/PDT meeting
- DEP Phase 1 Recommendations and Recommendation Summary

WELCOME AND AGENDA REVIEW

Jamie Damon announced that Megan Banks and Dick Upton were unable to attend due to personal emergencies. She then announced that she, Dick Upton, John Lively, Liz Cawood, Jyll Smith, and Larry Fox participated in a meeting March 4 to establish the purpose and direction of this Project Development Team meeting: to review and discuss the recommendations from the Community Advisory Group and reach consensus on a final recommendation to the Oregon Department of Transportation. The design proposals were presented at the Feb. 19 combined CAG/PDT meeting. Questions are welcomed and can be revisited, although in an attempt to make the most out of the meeting it is ideal to avoid re-presenting each proposal. Once questions are answered, the discussion can move into the report from the CAG meeting held Feb. 25. Jamie reiterated that the meeting held March 4

was to ensure different parties are on the same page and to outline phase 2. (Drew rough timeline on white board – see attached.)

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Design Enhancement Panel recommendation review –

Douglas Beauchamp recapped the timeline of the DEP process from origination to the present. A very pivotal point was December 2008 when the theme “Whilamut Passage” was established for the bridge aesthetic design. He also recapped how all involved parties became a part of each team; representatives from the CAG formed an eight member DEP, at which point it was decided to seek out three Art and Design Teams. He summarized the bundles and the areas located within those bundles – Bundle 1 includes above deck and roadway features, Bundle 2 includes the south bank interpretive area, while Bundle 3 entails elements on the north side of the river, under the bridges and the adjacent Whilamut Natural Area.

The overall design budget broke down to approximately \$600,000 for Bundle 1 and \$375,000 for each of the other bundles. It was not intentional, but the DEP ultimately chose to select a different ADT for each bundle. Lando and Associates, and artist Buster Simpson, were selected for Bundle 1. GreenWorks, partnering with various artists, was selected for Bundle 2, and Litus LCC, partnering with various artists, was chosen for Bundle 3. The teams submitted design proposals in mid-December 2009. When the final proposal came out in January 2010 many changes had been made to the proposals submitted in December. On Jan. 23 the DEP interviewed the three ADT's, and then met on Feb. 1 to consider each element one by one. The DEP ultimately agreed to forward their recommendations to the CAG. The DEP recommendations are moving forward to the PDT for a final recommendation of what to recommend to ODOT.

Jamie asked Greg Mott, Kent Howe, Al Heyn and Molly Cary (those not in attendance for the Feb. 19 combined CAG/PDT meeting) if they had any questions for Douglas or the other PDT members to ensure their understanding of the current discussions.

Kent Howe asked for clarification on the above deck proposals, which is where he focused most of his energy and evaluation.

Douglas pointed out the above deck proposals on the design boards, describing how the pylons have been the most discussed element, as well as account for the largest portion of the budget. He described the animated video presented at the Feb. 19 combined CAG/PDT meeting, which was intended to give viewers an idea of the experience a driver would have. He also pointed out another main point of discussion, the touch down point. The presented design proposal evolved significantly from the proposal submitted in December, without much time for discussion.

Molly Cary questioned if the design has potential to be modified.

Douglas confirmed that design modification is a topic of this meetings discussion. The group needs to make a decision that is acceptable by all parties, which may include the need for modification of design elements. Another topic of discussion is that the projected cost of

the two elements with most concern is almost \$500,000, which is a large part of the enhancement budget.

Greg Mott commented that after reading the letter from Charlotte Behm and the meeting summaries, a main thing Springfield is interested in are the ongoing details such as maintenance. He recalled seeing many other comments about maintenance in the meeting summaries.

Jamie explained that currently there are no resolutions to the maintenance concerns, which is part of what the PDT needs to address.

Douglas mentioned that the ADT process is broken into phases and the phase 1 design process cost about one-third of the entire amount budgeted for design of the enhancements. Currently, phase 1 contracts are over, pending the PDT approval, which will ideally lead to an ODOT approval. Phase 2 will require further contracts and agreements.

Greg questioned what is supposed to be conveyed to the traveler, specifically in regard to the pylons. Is the impression the traveler gets related to the materials and height above deck?

Douglas said he was sorry Greg didn't see the animation, which was a substantial part of the bundle's presentation at the Feb. 19 combined CAG/PDT meeting. Lando and Associates also have a narrative that elaborates on the conceptual idea and experience. Douglas personally feels *pylon* is a misnomer, and that these elements are more or less sculptures. He then invited everyone to read and look at the design boards.

Ann Sanders referred to the Feb. 25 CAG meeting summary, hoping to clarify what was meant by the mention that stakeholders have veto power.

Jamie explained there has been a lot of discussion around the issue of veto power, therefore she clarified it with Larry Fox in the March 4 meeting. The owners with fiduciary responsibility have the ability to say this is a no-go; the owners must approve. *Veto power* may have been poor word choice. Another piece of the stakeholder conversation that has sparked a lot of concern is where and how native themes are being represented. The CAG agreed that a condition of the final design is to receive stakeholders' input. The goal is to ensure they do not feel even slightly dishonored or misrepresented.

Ann asked if everything is supposed to be representation of the Kalapuya Tribe.

Jamie responded that was a topic discussed at the Feb. 25 CAG meeting and it was decided that not every element needs to be representative of the Tribe, but people voiced a need to maintain the theme "Whilamut Passage." Establishing which elements best lend themselves to be representations was discussed, and it was agreed that the Kalapuya Tribe should be deeply engaged in that conversation.

Ann confirmed the goal is to make sure nothing is dishonorable.

CAG recommendation –

Jamie transitioned into the CAG recommendations that were forwarded to the PDT. The CAG recommendations include a number of pieces and groups' input (letters from various groups included in the CAG meeting summary). Their recommendation was that the

conditions and design intent, established at the Feb. 25 CAG meeting, go in conjunction with the DEP recommendations forwarded to the PDT.

Charlotte Behm, as the CAG liaison to the PDT, summarized the current situation from the CAG point of view. The CAG has no major concerns with Bundle 3; in Bundle 1 and 2, the two items of concern in each bundle account for the bulk of the budget. There has been a lot of disagreement surrounding these elements, which led to the CAG meeting Feb. 25. The discussions have included a lot of opinions and emotion. The DEP essentially wanted the CAG to approve the whole package of recommendations, unchanged. In an attempt to keep the package of design elements as a whole, the CAG discussed and agreed upon criteria to be submitted with the recommendations. Phase 2 has not been contracted, so the question now is whether or not to support the art and artists for Bundles 1 and 2. This group needs to ask the questions: Is the art appropriate? Did the artist involve stakeholders and follow the process? Another topic of discussion to be addressed is technical issues, such as ongoing maintenance and safety. The criteria presented by the CAG is intended for all design elements and the goal is to ensure all elements meet those conditions, or criteria. Once the criteria was agreed upon, the group then discussed the design intent for the above bridge elements.

Jamie clarified that the criteria Charlotte is referring to are the *conditions* at the end of the Feb. 25 meeting summary. The CAG consensus was that those conditions will need to be applied to the entire package in order to move forward. The design intent was a way to establish what is desired. This was an idea Eric Gunderson proposed, in an effort to reach a common goal, artistically and aesthetically, without losing the design integrity. The other piece is the word *pylon*; it became clear that people were reacting to the word, and were having problems accepting the concept. These are sculptural elements that cannot detract from the structure of the bridge, but should not look as though they've been attached as an afterthought. Charlotte said that many of the concerns had to do with the simple fact that ADT 1 didn't provide much that was tangible for the DEP and for stakeholders until the past few weeks.

Larry Fox added that the original concept for Bundle 1, shown at the Dec. 15 open house, had similarities to the final concept. Larry briefly described the original design and shared that the team received significant feedback from ODOT and others after the open house/ As a result, the ADT revised the designs. He also pointed out a similar situation happened with Bundle 3 which changed one of their elements after the open house as well. Receiving feedback was the intent of open house so it is important to realize it wasn't just Bundle 1 that made revisions late in the game; it was intended as a part of the design process.

Charlotte noted that when Litus made changes to the Bundle 3 designs, people were involved. No one was involved when Lando and Associates revised Bundle 1. There was a process difference, which proved to be very vital.

Jamie mentioned the CAG's discussions about process concerns and efforts to try establish expectations moving forward. In particular, Bundle 1 feels behind schedule because of the lack of coordination with key stakeholders. It is clear that Bundle 1 is behind, therefore how do we get it up to speed?

Douglas elaborated on the rigorous grading period the DEP and ADT's went through, which really made each ADT address and amend their designs on the fly. In the case of Bundle 3,

the design is closer to the ground. What surprised him most is how the DEP declined to accept many of the Bundle 2 proposals. In theory, those concepts were farther along, but not supported. They only received funding for \$130,000 of the \$375,000 for Bundle 2. So the reshuffling of design elements at the Feb. 1 DEP meeting actually enhanced the amount for Bundle 1.

Larry added that funding didn't have any bearing on the selection.

Charlotte commented that Bundle 2 didn't shift. Another issue was that particular people felt that a lot of the art restated the river, instead of letting the river be naturally beautiful. For many Bundle 2 items the art is the center and the natural setting is the frame.

Jamie clarified by referring to page 10 of the previous meetings minutes, where Scott Wylie talked about Bundle 2 changes and the reasons for leaving design elements out of the DEP recommendations.

Charlotte said that the Bundle 2 team changed very little after receiving feedback. There are reasons for all of these occurrences.

Douglas added that Bundle 2 assigned a large portion of its budget to one particular work, and there was much discussion about commissioning this particular artwork when similar art was recently commissioned on another project.

Charlotte commented that a lot of Bundle 2 items weren't liked enough to even discuss further.

Larry noted that many elements had a gabion theme, but the only one that caught attention was the remnant column.

Jamie tried to set the stage for the PDT, noting that a large part of the discussion should deal with the DEP recommendations in regard to keeping the recommendations a whole package, while only particular elements pose concerns. There was a lot of conversation at the Feb. 19 combined CAG/PDT meeting and the Feb. 25 CAG meeting surrounding this issue. Much of the concern revolves around the DEP keeping track of the whole design, as they spent a great deal of time trying to ensure balance throughout the entire design of the bridge and how all of the pieces work together with the surrounding areas. The discussion of a whole design vs. elements was somewhat polarizing which made it difficult for the CAG to try and resolve concerns while maintaining the entirety of the recommendation. The discussion was not taken lightly, therefore the CAG made a great effort to encompass a way to move forward as a whole.

Charlotte shared a comment from an architect in regards to the concept of *plop art*. This refers to the design of a large structure, in particular, with artistic elements that do not look like an integral part of the bridge, but rather look as though they've been *plopped* on as an afterthought. In addition, the DEP got to the point where they weren't going to put art on the bridge. She suggested that the PDT revisit that concept. In addition to wanting a signature bridge, the desire is for the signature element to be integrated as part of the bridge.

Chris Henry asked if lighting of some sort is an option. He thought it was a really interesting concept and is curious if that is an idea that might make its way back to the design.

Charlotte felt the DEP didn't like the idea of lighting, nor was it supported by the Citizen Planning Committee for the Whilamut Natural Area. Lighting was first thing the DEP took off of the list of recommendations. The cost of the lighting application was huge and Charlotte questioned if it was conducive to the theme.

Chris then inquired if lighting could be applied at a later date.

Larry confirmed that lighting could be done later, although knowing early enough to install a conduit in the bridge would make the process much more efficient. The challenge is a water resource overlay zone that prohibits lighting that would have to go to the City Council for approval. The City Council approval was enough for Larry to steer clear of that idea. He has always thought lighting was a nice solution; it is being done on the Delta Bridge. In addition, lighting is prohibited on the north side (of the Willamette River Bridge?).

Jamie reminded the PDT of Scott Wylie's wish to maintain a level of joy in the process. She encouraged feedback from each PDT member to get an idea of how the committee felt.

Greg Mott shared his feeling of not being prepared to recommend modifications to what the CAG recommended. He expressed that if this moves on it will be a reality, but may have modifications. Greg then asked if the pylons are the only element in Bundle 1 being considered.

Jamie noted the feedback about images on the fences and reiterated that the idea is there to keep and modify.

Greg asked if there will be another decision point, and if the decision will go back to the CAG.

Jamie mapped out a rough schedule on the white board (copy attached). Due to the nature of a bridge project, a percentage complete was used to identify different check-in points. Jamie approximated that right now Bundles 2 and 3 are close to 30% complete. Bundle 1 is more like 10% complete, erring on the low end. Originally it was intended that the ADTs would be at a more equal state of completion. Bundle 1 needs to have robust stakeholder involvement to get closer to 30% complete and will require a much more aggressive plan of action. Bundles 2 and 3 still need work, but not quite as much in such a short time frame. Work on Bundle 1 needs to happen fairly soon to make a decision on what is moving forward and what is not. By June, we would expect that Bundle 1 will be 30% and Bundles 2 and 3 will be 50% complete. By fall of 2010, all bundles should be at 75% complete.

Larry explained that 75% complete means there would be no significant changes. Usually if there are changes that late in the process, that means going backward and re-designing. Once the process passes the check-in in June, we shouldn't be asking for major change at that point.

Molly Cary asked about the need for a product someplace in the timeline, specifically for Bundle 1 since it involves the structure. There has to be a defined point in time that we have to know what is going to be attached to the bridge.

Larry commented that he doesn't expect anything will end up being attached to the bridge.

Kevin Parrish confirmed that there is some time for these decisions to be made and reiterated that it is best to do it right, even if that means adjusting the schedule.

Jamie added that working within the schedule has been tricky throughout the entire process.

Larry mentioned that the design process received a bit more time from Dick Upton at the March 4 meeting. Prior to the meeting, designs were supposed to be done early June. The project is currently on schedule for Design Package 5, but the time frame was discussed on March 4 and is now more flexible.

Jamie reiterated that Dick, Larry and Kevin are OK with the schedule, which seems very reasonable to all involved. Now the PDT must determine what needs to be done in a meaningful way, which makes it useful to know where the design needs to be and when.

Larry pointed out that we've learned a lot about what is not wanted or feasible, particularly in Bundle 1.

Greg questioned who specifically are the stakeholders being mentioned.

Jamie responded that Bundles 2 and 3 have more obvious stakeholder groups. The stakeholder groups need to be identified, and in Bundle 1's case, put in place very quickly. Also, a message needs to be included to send back to Lando and Associates.

Larry added that another agreed-upon facet of the stakeholder coordination, as has been done with Bundles 2 and 3, is the attendance at coordinated monthly meetings. Litus joined and attended meetings with park agency representatives, as did Bundle 2 with Springfield and Eugene. There have been no structured meetings for Bundle 1. People had a very short time to organize, do the actual artwork and engage stakeholders. Some also feel Lando and Associates didn't do that well, so we need to be responsible for structured, facilitated meetings for Bundle 1.

Jamie clarified that a stakeholder group needs to be established for Bundle 1 in order to coordinate and facilitate stakeholder meetings moving forward.

Ann referred back to Larry's mention that the original design was similar to the new design. If the PDT is trying to move these design elements forward with the CAG conditions, she asked if the questioned item could potentially look totally different than it does as presented today.

Jamie answered yes. She used a maintenance example: if the issue of the sculptures impeding access for a snooper crane between the bridges cannot be resolved, then the sculptures might have to be very different.

Ann voiced her concern that approving proposed design elements feels misleading if in the end the elements might be very different.

Jamie agreed. Some are very comfortable with that design process, while others feel it is a very foreign concept. What the PDT is deciding on is to move forward into a contract with the ADTs on these bundles and to address these issues and concerns. That could mean that Larry informs Lando and Associates that we've decided to go another route.

Ann asked if in June, when 30% completion is reached, would the ADTs come back to the PDT and present how the conditions will be met.

Jamie confirmed that they would.

Drake McKee questioned if the issues aren't addressed, or the transformed designs don't meet standards, whether or not there will be another opportunity to say "no?"

Larry's hope is that by working very diligently up until June, the key people that need to approve will be totally supportive of the design concepts.

Drake expressed a desire to be a part of the process and see how the design evolves.

Ann shared her feeling that she came to the meeting feeling like ODOT was going to have to say "no", and we (ODOT) want to get to a point where all involved parties are on board.

Greg said he feels less able to translate a project status to a percentage complete. He expressed concern that the ADTs will come back after spending all of their money and present concepts that aren't what the CAG and PDT agreed upon.

Jamie noted how managing the expectations of people is important, and what moves forward needs to be what people are excited about.

Kevin suggested that ODOT remember they will be the ones maintaining the bridge. Springfield and Eugene have bowed out of taking care of the long-term issues, so the main approval needs to be from the people who have to perform, ODOT. He also suggested managing public expectations of the design enhancements.

Jamie asked the committee who Lando and Associates need to be accountable to.

Chris Henry agreed with Greg's point about the cost from now until June, and shared his feeling that the project can't afford to lose more of the money available to build the enhancements. A process needs to be established, as well as a way to manage the process, so that each item is a "yes."

Larry suggested periodic combined CAG/PDT meetings that could serve as check-in points between the points listed in the timeline, on the board. The CAG and the PDT need to be involved along the way in case there is disagreement. He reminded committee members to be careful about framing criteria as expressions of like or dislike. Getting 100% consensus on personal artistic preference is hard.

Kent Howe shared his lack of thrill with Bundle 1, and reiterated that his job on the PDT is to represent the portion of community that is Lane County, which applies mostly to the travelers on the bridge. The cities and neighborhood groups are doing a great job on below bridge involvement. When he thinks of a signature bridge he feels there needs to be more of an above deck delivery of art design concepts that people will view through that eight seconds of traveling over the bridge, and he doesn't see that in Bundle 1. That said that he does see the importance in keeping them together, as a whole design. He expressed his support knowing that Bundle 1 needs a lot of work.

Molly agreed with Kent about the importance of the through-traveler. With regard to Bundle 1, now we are more able to provide specific criteria and concerns to address. The ADT gave examples that allowed us to recognize more constraints, but it's feasible to give that feedback to them.

Charlotte reiterated her doubts that Lando and Associates should do more work, and expressed that she simply is not sure they are the right team for the project. Stakeholder groups are necessary for all of the bundles. She also shared that she's not sure that Bundle 2's stakeholder involvement has been sufficient. Charlotte has ideas of who should be a part of that group. Recalling the notions of a gateway, curves, blending and honoring nature, Charlotte feels those three things have continually been mentioned and need to move forward. She proposed that funding for the bundles should be renegotiated in June. Her reason behind supporting renegotiation is the concern of giving a team a budget, knowing they will use every last bit of that allowance. The bridge needs one signature element, it does not need 56 signatures: one signature, one message. If Bundle 1 is going to be redesigned, our one message should be finalized and confirmed beforehand. Lando and Associates' work has helped narrow down all of the design elements. Therefore if we can say that we now have these few elements, then we can focus on the message and theme, and strive to simplify that message. It is unclear where phase 2 starts. At what point in time will the decision of whether or not to use Lando and Associates be made? Charlotte then asked those who met March 4 if they would compose the group that manages the stakeholder involvement within each bundle, and if not, then who that would be and how they intend to hold the teams accountable for their involvement and overall satisfaction.

Jamie suggested that Charlotte's inquiry was a call to action for CAWOOD. She mentioned the existing circle of teams within the PDT, the CAG, and those involved in the ADTs, and questioned how to make sure all involved are out in the community.

Charlotte suggested asking and involving the CAG, as the community representatives to the project. A whole process is evolving that would keep feelers out in all the different directions and realms of the community. That is what makes this project most enjoyable. We simply need to think more about how to get people involved who have more experience and are good at maintaining lines of communication.

Ann asked if there would be an opportunity, once designs are more solidified, to go back to the public for feedback. Her fear is with the current design, comments have been 70-80% negative and as an ODOT representative she wants to be able to defend ODOT's decision as being one that was popular with the public.

Jamie responded that is where the public involvement teams can help. The goal is to get to the point where people want copies of this stuff, where people say, "This is exciting and I support this." Somewhere in the schedule, perhaps May or June, it sounds like we need to coordinate some public outreach.

John Lively supported the importance of stakeholder support before any public outreach is performed. Once concepts are presented to the public, there is potential the public will go off in many directions, therefore at that point we have to be comfortable enough to respond. It is too difficult to put a date on when that will be. Reaching a conclusion within the PDT to forward to ODOT needs to happen first, then stakeholder coordination needs to occur

and expectations will need to set for phase 2. Once those pieces fall into place, we can set a date for PI efforts with outreach. We do know that Bundles 2 and 3 will take less time to get there. Facilitating the process to get Bundle 1 up to date must happen before anything else. It is expected that the public will be excited about it at that point. The main point is that this bridge will leave a lasting impression. He mentioned as a person coming into the project late, he is very impressed with what has come out and how well the theme is blending. He encouraged the group and reiterated that we can't lose track, but there is still a lot of hard work to do.

Jamie referred to the timeline (drawn on white board – copy attached) in order to clarify the stakeholder group time frame. Once we have a better sense of who the specific stakeholder groups are, then we can address and schedule public outreach.

Larry addressed the issue of contracts. If we are sending Bundle 1 back in the process using Lando and Associates, we want to call it phase 2a, before we give a contract to take to the final stage. The design concepts could change significantly and Lando and Associate may not get to where we need them to. That is how we hope to handle the contractual side of the design enhancements.

Al Heyn shared his thought that it has appeared to him that Bundle 1 hasn't had a handle on the restraints all along.

Drake McKee responded that restraints were communicated to Lando and Associates when they met in November. It was made clear that there could be nothing in between the bridge and nothing touching down.

Al suggested someone be on the ADT to help guide that process, ensuring constraints are met.

Jamie agreed and reiterated that is the goal for creating a stakeholder group for Bundle 1. The appointed group would have to work closely with the ADT for Bundle 1 to ensure all issues are addressed. One primary issue revolves around a lack of confidence in Lando's ability to meet the given conditions and constraints. A lot of these issues aren't new and a more rigorous process is to come.

Charlotte added that the main issue with Lando and Associates is more than just maintenance. Based upon designs, it seems as though they haven't been to the site to view it. She expressed the importance of the ADT's learning what the goals are, what the theme is, and what the site is. They never immersed themselves into what the community is and wants. This involvement is going to be the most important part of ending up with a signature bridge. We are investing a huge amount in ADT 1.

Chris shared his thought that we already have a signature bridge. While the artistic enhancements are important, he doesn't feel they define the signature aspect of the bridge. The art can support it and complement it, but the structure itself is the signature. In regard to the process, he suggested the potential to present variations of the theme that all stakeholders are comfortable with; therefore doing some refinement with the public would be more feasible and realistic. He agrees the pylons are more visible elements, and he embraces the sculptural aspect of that. Chris also proposed the idea that the team could make the concept work, in terms of meeting criteria for the median and gateway, with or

without Lando and Associates and within the budget. He foresees every bit of money will be needed to build an artful signature element. If the design is thoughtful and artful, then Chris is less concerned about the statement it makes. He doesn't want to lose sight of creating some interest, as the potential of this bridge being recognized by national trade publications was talked about.

Jamie suggested this as a real opportunity for community representation.

Drake is in support knowing that district and maintenance will be engaged and that all concerns will be addressed. He is not as concerned with the design, whereas his focus is the maintenance. He does expect the process and teams to engage him in that respect.

David Sonnichsen shared insight from the last parks coordination meeting regarding a mandated type of fencing by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security. This fencing was described as a bar system, with a cage-like crosshatched design. David feels this will be imperative information for the stakeholder groups and design team to evaluate. There was a previous discussion of how the fencing might be painted gray to make it less obvious. David expressed his disagreement that the bridge itself provides a signature element for motorists and through users. They will have just a glimpse. He does think it is very important to include something aesthetic for the motoring public.

Jamie noted that it seems like there is support for flushing out the schedule more. There is still stakeholder group work to complete and it is not clear who will be responsible for doing the stakeholder coordination and appointments. Jamie refocused the group and reiterated the importance of finding closure, then suggested the use of her *Red, green, yellow* cards or a simple show of hands.

Ann asked to clarify that moving forward means not just about moving forward with these conditions, but also implies moving forward with Lando and Associates for Bundle 1.

Jamie reiterated that Lando and Associates contract will be incremental and there will be another opportunity to provide feedback.

Chris asked if there is a contingency plan in place, in the instance that Phase 2b is not reached.

Larry elaborated that if the project moves forward with Lando and Associates, the money spent that wasn't accounted for will have to come out of the budget somewhere. Larry added that possibility hasn't been discussed.

Kevin reminded the PDT that this artwork is not what Hamilton constructs. Commissioning a piece of artwork is not as bound to the construction schedule. If an element needs to be secured and made a part of the structure, then we have a different time frame. Kevin reminded that it is most important to take more time now, as the schedule has been amended from day one.

Charlotte questioned why no one has considered the option of not using Lando and Associates and if those in attendance at the March 4 meeting had a reason for supporting them as the Bundle 1 ADT.

Those who attended the meeting March 4 agreed and shared that there was no reason that Lando and Associates had to continue with Bundle 1. They were simply moving forward with the CAG recommendation, which included Lando and Associates.

Charlotte then posed the question: Do we use Lando and Associates or do we want to use someone else? She added that a choice to use an art team other than Lando and Associates was never really discussed by the CAG.

Jamie clarified that Charlotte is correct in that there was never discussion around Lando and Associates specifically. Concerns were expressed, yet whether or not to proceed with them was never fully addressed within the CAG. Jamie suggested that since the CAG never had that conversation, someone should have a conversation with Lando and Associates to present the conditions and constraints, giving Lando and Associates a chance they may or may not want to accept.

Greg asked about the constraint in regard to budget from this bundle. If we have the commitment for a specific amount of money from ODOT, is there a way to keep that money intact until the decision of who to proceed with is made, to make sure everyone is happy without losing money. He shared his feeling that this community will accept the design elements. Greg also agreed about the need to ensure the signature element and gave the example of a bridge on the coast. Unless you are aware of the history and details of the bridge, you wouldn't know that it is one of a kind by seeing it. It is important to have an associating factor and signature element with this bridge and the community needs to have more involvement in this process. He then asked if the money has to be spent within the fiscal year, and if that meant that a decision would be made within a couple of months.

Jamie confirmed the goal for Bundle 1 to reach 30% completion, which means a decision would need to be made no later than June.

Douglas Beauchamp asked if a vote or straw pole would be helpful in order to assess the groups' support of moving forward with Lando and Associates.

Jamie replied that the PDT still has to decide what moving forward is. Moving forward could mean many things, therefore that still needs to be defined.

Ann expressed concern for changing what the CAG recommendations look like.

Jamie concurred, but added that since the issue of using Lando hasn't been fully discussed, she encouraged that conversation to happen.

Ann clarified her impression that the DEP recommendation included Lando and Associates and their design, which in turn means that is a part of the CAG recommendations as long as those conditions are met.

Jamie asked for a show of hands from the PDT members in support of going forward with Lando and Associates for Bundle 1. (Of the eight PDT members present, Chris Henry was the only one who raised his hand indicating support for Lando and Associates for Bundle 1.)

Kevin stated with an eight member DEP, six members supported and two didn't.

Jamie confirmed that those members that supported Lando and Associates supported the whole of the DEP recommendations. She once again reiterated that this is the first time this conversation has been presented at length.

Chris asked if there is a possibility that the other two design teams could pick up Bundle 1.

Larry responded that we have to be careful due to the public selection process, which appointed the three ADTs. There has been no guarantee to any team for phase 2, but keep in mind they were publically appointed. He shared concern of what the public and community will think if we go back and reappoint a different team.

Chris wondered if the two other teams could be solicited for Bundle 1, and stated that if the decision is made to not move forward with Lando and Associates, two other publicly appointed teams who have performed better in regard to the presented conditions and constraints are already on board.

Jamie mentioned her feeling that Bundle 1 elements require a completely different skill set than Bundles 2 and 3.

Douglas agreed, saying that the bundles entail very different environments for the artists. If the project keeps moving forward without a firm decision of which art team to use for Bundle 1 then time dwindles for a new and different team to step in, which ultimately decreases design options. It is difficult to go against a six-month process, and he expressed his thought that Buster Simpson and Lando and Associates may not produce changes in the next two months that would be accepted. The new schedule allows up to 12 months for another team to catch up with the other two bundles. There are artists out there who can address the conditions and constraints, therefore to continue trying to force something that hasn't been working may be inefficient.

Ann commented that she's not personally involved with artists, therefore she is not going to be as comfortable with being involved directly.

Jamie reminded Ann how much CAG/PDT input can influence the design, also reminding her of the reason for appointing the DEP.

Charlotte noted the progress made on Bundle 1, and referred to being all over the place six months ago. The process has come a long way in that ideas and concepts have been significantly narrowed down and constraints have been presented and agreed upon. If the decision is made to go out and hire a different design team, we will not have to start back at the beginning.

Larry suggested that very specific requirements are presented in a request for proposal, and as one of those requirements ask proposing teams to actually propose their art. This idea would allow us to select based on the art, not the team.

Charlotte interjected that Buster Simpson would be welcome to propose.

Douglas suggested, given the new timeline, a number of ways to proceed. The PDT can fully accept the CAG recommendations, partially accept them with additional conditions, or

reject them entirely. Given those three options, there are now a number of options for addressing Bundle 1 concerns.

Justin Lanphear underlined what Douglas said. The whole process of design on this project has molded to shifting timelines and new information. It has been an entirely different design process in itself.

Jamie asked the PDT if what is being said is that the PDT does not intend to move forward with Lando and Associates.

Justin asked if an RFP, with specific parameters, be issued and open to all for submittal of their concepts. If so, and it's really open to all, and Buster Simpson could come back into the process. He asked if that would create a public perception concern.

Larry reiterated how this scenario happens all the time in the design world and is very common in public processes. While it's common, the decision has to be defensible.

Douglas provided an example in the Eugene Library; the design was rejected in the initial round and was re-done.

Kevin asked for a projection of how many other artists would be willing to step in at this phase.

Douglas responded that the original selection process didn't ask for artists or art. The process was a selection of teams that proposed for all three bundles.

Molly agreed to the decision to issue an RFP.

Larry added a word of caution regarding elements that are Lando and Associates' ideas, and that it is not right to move forward their idea if we don't move the team forward as well. If we choose to select a new artist, we will potentially be required to eliminate Lando and Associates' concept.

Chris clarified that the intent is not to eliminate the fence idea, and added that he feels it is up to each artist not to steal an idea or concept.

Jamie mentioned how there will be tradeoffs either way the PDT decides to proceed.

Ann said that after having attended the Feb. 19 CAG/PDT meeting, she is still hung up on feeling that the DEP recommendation was to move Lando and Associates forward. Therefore if the PDT decides to exclude Lando and Associates and issue a new RFP, it doesn't feel like support for the DEP recommendations.

Jamie reminded the PDT that they do have the right to change the recommendations and explained the idea of maintaining the whole design had more to do with elements, not as much with the artists.

Douglas shared his opinion, reiterating he was not speaking for all DEP members, that the six who supported the whole would more than likely be disappointed. Among those members, some really like Buster. He then reminded the PDT that the DEP was an advisory committee.

Ann expressed feeling more unsettled about the situation hearing that six of the eight are in support of Bundle 1 and would be disappointed.

Jamie reminded the PDT that more time has been provided and there are significantly refined concepts that didn't come until later. We are at a much better place to craft a more efficient and inclusive RFP, knowing that the money spent in phase 1 helped arrive at this point.

Kevin added that this is an evolutionary process.

Charlotte commented that taking the six elements and take two that will be similar in concept, simply performed/created by a different team would be consistent with the DEP recommendation. The DEP decided to narrow down the concepts; therefore we are still essentially honoring what they've selected from the whole lot of concepts.

Ann referred to the agreement to move forward with these elements in conjunction with the agreed upon conditions, and stated how the conditions were brought about because of the dissatisfaction with Bundle 1.

Justin clarified that the conditions established apply to all three bundles, which means all design elements.

Jamie asked Ann what her main concern is.

Ann expressed the desire to honor the work of Lando and Associates, and after hearing Doug say that six people supported using them, she continues to get hung up on the fact that the DEP was very adamant it was a complete package.

Justin added that of the 15 recommendations that came out, it was underscored that there was an understanding about work that still needed to happen. They were looking at the whole of these various elements and how they interrelated, but things can change and will evolve.

Larry suggested that if indeed the decision is to put out a new RFP that a more traditional type of RFP be considered. This would cut out months of process involving stakeholders, etc. He expressed concern about selecting an artist that can't meet standards and ending up at the same point, whereas a more traditional RFP would select the art itself.

Charlotte asked if the bike path changes on the south bank would be revisited in phase 2.

Justin answered that in terms of how the deletion of the path will affect the art will most certainly be addressed.

Chris suggested using a placeholder for the path.

Larry said the teams would leave behind whatever they can.

Charlotte confirmed that all of the path work would go into the work with GreenWorks.

Jamie thanked Ann for sharing her concerns.

Drake commented in regard to the fencing proposed, as he thought the only fence was over the railroad, and was under the impression it wasn't required over Franklin Boulevard, therefore access is still an issue.

Kevin shared his concern/opinion that whoever writes the new RFP will need to be very clear and specific with conditions and constraints.

Molly concluded that there was a communication issue; therefore it would be good to find a way to be more finite about it.

Larry added that those things, referring to elements such as the fencing requirements, were not well communicated as absolutes. Nothing came back to the ADTs as an absolute "no" and there was an expectation that ODOT maintenance would step in if necessary.

Drake expressed at that point in time the design was still vague and he didn't want to hinder the process.

Larry concurred and shared that people were too generous; ODOT didn't want to come in and squash anything, yet they rejected items at a later date.

Kent asked if there is a need to send a message to the DEP as they may need to be around for the upcoming RFP process.

Justin suggested, in an attempt to address Ann's concern about keeping the designs as a whole, that a DEP liaison could be a part of stakeholder communications.

John mentioned it was important to Dick that the DEP members continue to be involved and be active within stakeholder groups.

NEXT STEPS

- Move forward with Bundle 2 and 3 with conditions from CAG/PDT
- Develop a Bundle 1 RFP with conditions from CAG/PDT focused on sculpture above deck in highway median and on the fence
- Define the stakeholder group for Bundle 1 in order to:
 - Develop an RFP with specific criteria
 - Review/select proposals
- RFP Criteria:
 - Conditions
 - Owner criteria
- Larry Fox to inform Lando and Associates there will be a new RFP issued
- Jamie Damon craft a message to the CAG and copy DEP to inform of outcomes

Conditions and Bundle 1 Stakeholder Group to accompany CAG/DEP Recommendations – PDT^{#25}

Project Development Team I-5 Willamette River Bridge Project

March 5, 2010 – 9:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.

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

Conditions/Considerations

- Messages to Bundle 1 ADT:
 - Need confidence that conditions are met
 - Need to know that they understand our site and community
 - Need to understand the importance of above deck element to the community
 - Need to understand the above and between deck constraints
- More CAG/PDT check-in points/meetings
- Focus on one signature element
- Remember original intent for signature:
 - Natural
 - Curves
 - Don't detract
 - Something above
 - Makes a statement
- Develop a more integrated stakeholder process; identify "reach outs" into the community
- Clearly identify stakeholders for each of the bundles
- Need to vet with broader public; make sure public is supportive
- Importance of a significant art statement above the deck – thoughtful and artful
- More time for Bundle 1

Bundle 1 Stakeholder Group

- ODOT – Dick Upton
- Kalapuya Tribe – Esther Stutzman & David Lewis
- Maintenance – Drake McKee
- Safety – Carl Deaton
- Art/Design – Douglas Beauchamp and additional DEP liaison (?)
- Project Manager – Larry Fox
- Community – CAG liaison (Suggestions: Scott Wylie, Eric Gunderson, Charlotte Behm)
- Lane County – Kent Howe and additional PDT liaison

Phase 2 Timeline

