

DATE: November 30, 2010
SUBJECT: Nov. 29 DESC/ADT 2 & 3 Meetings

PREPARED BY:

DESC members present Vicky Mello, Bob Kline, Charlotte Behm and Scott Wylie. Also present Sonny Chickering, ODOT, Douglas Beauchamp, Arts Consultant, Larry Fox, OBEC and John Lively, CAWOOD.

The schedule:

- 12 – 1 p.m. Meeting of DESC – Schedule for ADT going forward
- 1 – 2:30 p.m. DESC/ADT 2 meeting/discussion
- 2:30 – 4 p.m. DESC/ADT 3 meeting/discussion

Meeting Summaries

DESC Meeting 12 – 1 p.m.

Sonny discussed his concerns with the schedule proposed for ADT 2 & 3, issue of stakeholders and other items for clarification before meeting with the representatives of the ADT's. He re-stated his support for the CAG/PDT members being the key stakeholders for each ADT and invited to each ADT/Stakeholder meeting.

General discussion around the schedule, who the stakeholders should be, role of the CAG/PDT, differences between each ADT based on where the art will be installed, and how to engage CPC members. The number of meetings needed with each ADT before they submit revised proposals in March 2011 was discussed. Minor revisions were made to the schedule before the meetings with the ADT representatives. The agenda for the ADT meetings was set to include the new criteria, proposed schedule, and contracting issues.

Key points:

- Charlotte suggested separate meetings with ADT 3 and CPC members to works towards a buy-in of the art and the need to maintain them long term.
- Vicky urged further clarification of stakeholders, especially regarding ADT 2. Who are they, have they been asked and why are some groups represented or not represented.
- Sonny supported more discussions regarding the role of the CPC as key stakeholders. He was hesitant to support ADT meetings with CPC without other stakeholders present.

- Sonny concurred with the need to clarify stakeholders including contacting and confirming who can participate.

Page Two

DESC/ADT meeting notes Nov. 29, 2010

- Everyone agreed the CAG/PDT members are key stakeholders, but not all will participate, especially in each ADT meeting.
- Charlotte expressed concern about proposed art from ADT 2 meeting the criteria.

ADT 2 Meeting 1 - 2:30 PM

Robin Craig attended representing Greenworks and the artists.

Douglas outlined the three areas to be covered (1) new criteria and how it applies (2) proposed schedule (3) OBEC contracting/budget issues.

Each criteria was read with an opportunity for questions/clarifications from Robin and committee members.

- Robin generally felt comfortable with understanding the criteria and expectations of how they might impact the proposed art for ADT 2.
- Scott and Vicki provided clarification on the criteria specific to ADT 1 and how it can be interpreted to ADT 2 & 3.
- Robin asked for clarification of next steps if art pieces selected are now viewed as no longer applicable. Vicki emphasized that is not a decision for today, but for later in the process. Today is focused on how to make this process successful for all involved.
- Bob asked how the millrace interpretative work ties in. Robin reported they have a proposal in to OBEC regarding the work, but no contract in place yet.

Sonny reviewed the proposed schedule emphasizing a desire to get all three ADT's to a signed contract and started on Phase II work in May 2011.

- Robin asked for clarification of what is being proposed. Is it change to Phase 1 contract or a new contract? How are costs going to be addressed in this new process?
- Vicky and Bob clarified previous actions taking by CAG/PDT to move forward on art concepts presented by ADT 2. The CAG/PDT suggested additional criteria that the DESC refined as part of the RFP for ADT 1. Robin remembered the action by the CAG/PDT and the additional conditions listed at the time.
- Specific to ADT 2, Charlotte noted key changes since original art proposals including elimination of the path south of Franklin and plans to build new viaduct path. This creates new opportunities.

- Robin agreed and supported a more inclusive process with artists and stakeholder meetings. She recommended starting the next steps with focus groups, especially for maintenance issues, with minutes taken and submitted

Page Three

DESC/ADT meeting notes Nov. 29, 2010

- keeping all stakeholders informed. The number of focus groups is open to discussion, but Robin suggested probably 2 or 3 before meeting with the larger CAG/PDT.
- Bob emphasized the idea of creating opportunities for all stakeholders to participate in each meeting.
- General agreement with Robin and members of the DESC to the following focus group meetings lasting approximately 1 hour each:
 - Maintenance/long term care
 - Neighborhood groups/CAG/PDT
 - Meeting with Esther and David
- Douglas asked for clarification on proposed focus groups. Will they work for ADT 1, 2, and 3 all participating in each session?
- Robin thought all three potentially could participate in the focus groups. It might help each group to understand what the other is recommending and how they all link.
- Robin – Meetings would be a chance for (1) “brain dump” free interchange between artists and those attending (2) respond with what each heard and agree (3) make revisions, or at least have conversations about what revisions might result from the conversations, before submitting new material
- Charlotte asked for feedback on the proposed schedule, will it work, is it too tight?
- Robin felt the artists might be more concerned about the schedule, agreed it is workable and probably important to follow so Phase II can begin.
- Based on comfort with the final proposal date, Charlotte suggested a schedule of 2nd week of January for Focus Groups; 1st week of February for a meeting to review “what we heard:” and mid March for revisions if needed. General agreement to timeline presented.
- Robin asked about budget impacts. If artists start over, come up with new suggested art, are additional funds possible for ADT 2, covering expenses and cost of art?
- Charlotte asked Robin to think about costs going forward and come up with estimated costs to get from today through the April recommendations to CAG/PDT. Robin felt comfortable she can provide a range of costs to submit.
- Larry provided an update on contract issues/budget. What was originally estimated, what is left, potential for using some contingency to address increases based on this process and timing. Larry explained where the budget stood when work stopped on the first phase, amount estimated to complete and install artwork. Larry supported having a range of costs through Phase II. He is confident the process can move forward on current

schedule based on contract amendment already submitted to ODOT with cost estimated. He also confirmed that he has released \$2,000 each to ADT 2 & 3 to pay for time to attend the current meetings around schedule and how to proceed. Larry emphasized wanting to call this next phase IIA.

Page Four

DESC/ADT meeting notes Nov. 29, 2010

- Charlotte reinforced the timeline and the feeling that the schedule would allow for more conversations after March 15 if needed before final recommendations to CAG/PDT.

ADT 3 Meeting 2:30 – 4 p.m.

Representing the Litus team was Tulsi Wallace and Bill and Timothy Shaw.

Douglas reviewed the new criteria, emphasizing that the criteria is based on conditions agreed to at the CAG/PDT meeting when original art concepts were reviewed, refined by the DESC and approved by the CAG/PDT.

- Tulsi said she felt they are consistent with what they have already been working with. She suggested condensing them down to one or two words to help in reaching agreement on how proposed artwork conforms or does not. She also reinforced the involvement they had early on with addressing the Kalapuya focus.
- Sonny reviewed the schedule, goal to start Phase II by May, changes proposed by Robin and reinforced that we are looking to Tulsi and her team to respond to how much if any further changes are needed.
- Tulsi responded that based on what she has seen it seems like a new design phase is being proposed. Sonny, Larry and others emphasized that is not the case and indeed this process will be referred to as Phase IIA.
- When discussing including ADT 1 in certain meetings, Tulsi said communication might be a problem based on timing, the focus above deck and the experience of those viewing the art resulting from ADT 1.
- Larry agreed that with changes since this process started, a larger disconnect now exists between ADT 1 and 2 and 3 even though the criteria is meant to guide the overall theme.
- Tim felt the new schedule/process feels like Phase I again, even to the point of developing new concepts. It was emphasized that is not the intent.
- Tulsi discussed how much dialogue is needed before March, suggested a preliminary meeting to clarify, a meeting with a conversations about potential changes and a third meeting to review design iterations. She was interested in how what she has proposed compares to what Robin of Greenworks suggested.
- Tim – if both teams adhere to the criteria that will ensure compatibility of the artwork.

- Charlotte agreed and explained the process of using focus groups that Robin had suggested but felt that with ADT 3 there is a need for more interactions with Parks groups given the location in the Whilamut Natural Area.
- Bill felt getting feedback on the proposals is the most important aspect at this time.

Page Five

DESC/ADT meeting notes Nov. 29, 2010

- Tulsu is interested in the potential for a joint meeting with ADT 3 for focus groups, but emphasized the need for any meeting to be very focused and a facilitated process. The goal is for the most benefit from the time spent, not just revisiting what is already known.
- Charlotte discussed the potential differences currently between ADT 2 and 3 especially the point they are at in moving forward.
- Larry reviewed his concept of Phase IIA including (1) discussing specifics regarding criteria application to proposed art pieces at the first meeting (2) review what was heard (3) present to the DESC/CAG/PDT what the implications might be and then (4) final responses.
- Larry also reviewed the money available to launch IIA, timing for a contract and the need to work towards refinement of costs to complete the process.
- Tulsu agreed to come up with new cost estimate ranges and provide to Larry by December 28 or 29th.
- Charlotte emphasized the date of April 15 being important to be ready to make a recommendation to the CAG/PDT. Tulsu felt that is reasonable and is supportive of moving the process along to avoid some of the issues from the first phase.
- Vicky suggested the 2nd week of January be considered for focus groups with Tues, Wed, or Thurs. being identified as best days of the week.
- Further discussion of the focus groups including (1) meeting with Esther and David (2) Maintenance (ODOT) (3) Parks (CPC) (4) CAG/PDT
- Charlotte emphasized the importance of providing a specific time for each group and feels the Parks (CPC) might need one or more separate meetings with ADT 3.
- Tulsu emphasized it is important to make the process the best use of everyone's time and to focus on achieving agreed to outcomes. The meetings need to be facilitated versus a "free for all."
- Tulsu agreed to speak with Robin about how the focus group efforts can be combined for ADT 2 and 3, timing, and how to structure the meeting.
- Tim agreed that the key outstanding question is how to structure the focus group meeting for ADT 2 & 3.
- Tulsu offered that she and Robin could play a key role in facilitating the meeting, at least in recommending the structure needed to succeed.
- Tulsu also recommended that if a feedback form is used it is important for it to be very specific so the feedback provided can be quantified.

- Tentative dates of January 13 and February 3 were agreed to as a starting point for planning the focus groups meeting.
- Tulsi will communicate with Robin and Douglas regarding details. Douglas is to keep the rest of the group updated and facilitate final arrangements.