

**I-5 Willamette River Bridge Project  
Design Enhancement Steering Committee**

**Meeting Summary - DRAFT**

February 13, 2013 2 - 5 p.m.

CAWOOD conference room, 1200 High Street, Suite 200

*Attendance: Charlotte Behm; Chris Henry; Bob Kline; Vicky Mello; Joe Valasek; Scott Wylie; Frannie Brindle, ODOT; Donna Ferry, ODOT; Donnell Fowler, ODOT; John Lively.*

*Prepared by: Nichole Hayward, CAWOOD.*

Meeting purpose: Review proposal evaluation scores for the north bank of the Canoe Canal proposals and select artist.

**Introduction**

Frannie Brindle referenced the recent staffing transition and assured the DESC that she will be involved throughout the duration of the project and her job is to aid and support the committee.

Donnell Fowler introduced herself and stated how she has been involved since the start of the Willamette River Bridge Project and is a resource for Donna Ferry.

Donna Ferry answered a question from the previous meeting – Karl Wieseke will provide an update on the status of the above deck sculptures at the next DESC meeting.

**Evaluation/procedural questions and clarifications**

ODOT attendance at proposal review meetings depends on the project. Some projects require experts such as engineers, environmental specialists, etc. to be present. An ODOT procurement person always leads the evaluation meetings to ensure due process.

Evaluators can include notes and comments on score sheets, but are not required to submit comments. Scott Wylie asked if comments would be summarized or synthesized when provided to the artists. ODOT confirmed that individual comments listed on evaluation sheet would remain a part of that sheet.

Joe Valasek announced that he removed himself from the evaluation process due to his relationship with Betsy Wolfston. ODOT asked that he still sign the Nondisclosure statement and include that information on the Conflict of Interest Affidavit.

**Proposal for north bank of Canoe Canal evaluation**

The committee reviewed individual evaluation scores for each section of each proposal, as well as totals and averages for each proposal. Betsy Wolfston was the clear winner with initial points.

Scott asked to discuss evaluations before making a selection solely based on points, because he scored based on the exclusion of some items not explicitly stated in Request for Proposals. Chris Henry pointed out that scores should be based on only what is included in the Request for Proposals. Donnell agreed that the discussion might be relevant in the big picture, but should not be considered part of the selection process.

Scott expressed his concern about the fence on the north bank of the Canoe Canal and how the fence will directly affect the experience of the selected art. If there is interest in changing the fence, it must come out of the existing design enhancement budget; the fence in question is galvanized, the other that will be installed will be black powder coated. Frannie confirmed there is money for fence in the remaining design enhancement budget. The exact amount is uncertain. The proposing artists knew there would be a fence there. Donna suggested the group avoid scoring based on a guess of whether or not the artist was aware of the fence. She reiterated that all artists were allowed to ask questions.

Across the board, the scores for Betsy Wolfston were higher than the scores for Lillian Pitt's proposal, which is powerful in this type of procurement process. Scott and Charlotte Behm agreed that they'd ultimately be happy with either artist.

### ***Round table feedback***

Chris struggled with translating his initial reaction into numerical scores, and decided to score based on subcategories. Chris felt the mural had a positive effect and enjoyed the sense of honesty, human connection, movement, nature, etc. whereas his experience with Lillian Pitt's proposal was disjointed. There were a lot of elements, but no connection between them.

Bob Kline shared similar feelings as Chris. Betsy Wolfston's mural was more dynamic and was well scaled. He agreed the elements on Lillian Pitt's proposal distract from the focus instead of complementing it. Betsy Wolfston's mural was positioned well for light and represents the Kalapuya people well - fish, natural vegetation, people, etc. Bob felt the ceramic pieces were distracting and shared concern about the sandblasting process. Betsy Wolfston's mural was dynamic whereas Lillian Pitts' was a static display with no flow and not enough depiction of water. Bob did not feel it was a good use of space.

Scott agreed about the strength of Betsy Wolfston's mural. The tiles may distract from the mural. Scott felt there were much better ways to incorporate the tile. He felt Lillian Pitt's multidimensionality was a better integration of the elements than the tiles in Betsy Wolfston's mural. Bob noted how Betsy Wolfston's proposal indicated there was room for ideas and suggestions of what could be included. Scott also expressed concern about

the accuracy of the canoe depiction – one proposal had distinct front and back and the other proposal did not. He would like to be sure the one selected is depicted accurately.

Charlotte felt Betsy Wolfston's proposal lacked representation of the wolf, but appreciated the whole fish and felt like the artist heard their concerns. She also pointed out paint in the sandblasted lines is important for visibility, based on her experience with maintaining the Talking Stones that used a similar process. They have had to repaint. She suggested including a wolf depiction on the tiles. Ultimately, Charlotte liked both proposals, although they are very different from one another. She loved the mural with people depicted.

Vicky Mello enjoyed the large movement scene and mirrored effect. She felt the fish was accurately depicted and thought the tiles would complement those on the south bank. She suggested more muted colors and surrounding the mural with seasonal additions. Lillian Pitt's proposal would be great for those who already know about Kalapuya culture, but requires more information to fully understand.

Charlotte asked the artist of the DESC if they felt Betsy Wolfston's mural would translate well in the actual size. Joe felt that with such a large application, it might have even larger impact as people would be able to see it from a distance, especially since it's a living scene.

Vicky asked if he felt moss would become a maintenance problem. The sandblasted lines would likely require similar maintenance to a roof in order to mitigate. Scott felt confident it would not need a lot of maintenance and may result in a nice, aged effect. Scott added that the artist indicated the use of a mirrored effect that was not very clear – he loved the idea, but would like more detail on how the effect will be achieved. E.g. sand, glass pieces, etc.

Bob added that the mirrored effect may distract from the simple, clean sandblasted lines and suggested that the artist do a test to view. Chris agreed that the tiles would complement the camas life cycle tiles on the south bank.

Scott suggested the use of additional color in the tiles, while Bob pointed out the rendering with tile took attention away from the mural. Joe identified the photo of existing tile applications versus the rendering to give the DESC a more realistic view of how they'd look installed. Vicky added that the tiles need to be big enough with a distinct image on them, so they are visible and people don't try to cross the canal to see closer.

### **Proposal selection for north bank of Canoe Canal**

The DESC unanimously agreed to proceed with Betsy Wolfston as the selected proposer. Donnell captured revisions from the conversation to include as part of the negotiations with the artist. Charlotte asked who would speak with artists, which Donnell confirmed was not yet defined.

Chris suggested clearly defining expectations for conversations with the artist now, to avoid confusion and miscommunication with the committee.

The majority of DESC members expressed concerns about providing ODOT with “input” that gets relayed to the artist, and would feel more comfortable being included in that conversation in person.

Frannie suggested that ODOT present a draft Notice to Proceed, including a budget, then reconvene as a committee and include the artist, ODOT maintenance (Karl Wieseke and Drake McKee) and discuss the variables as a group. ODOT’s role will be to capture the conversation, so it gets included in the scope of work.

Donnell confirmed that once the Intent to Award is issued, the other proposer will be able to protest. Then once that period passes (7 calendar days), Donna will inform the artist. At same time Intent to Award is issued, proposers not awarded will be notified. Intent to Award will be issued Friday, Feb. 15.

Bob suggests waiting until the group reconvenes to have any detailed discussion about the artwork. Donna agrees. If community members or artists ask DESC questions, Donna encouraged them to provide people with Donna’s name and number and she will be able to provide them nonbiased information.

All DESC members signed and returned their evaluation binders.

### **Litus contract update**

Donna and Frannie will work on this together. The contract is currently just a matter of executing the contract. Donna developed a draft and looked at it with ODOT Maintenance and Karl Wieseke. Maintenance had comments on tile installation manual and Karl suggested his contractor install the tiles with consultation by the artist to ensure sequence is right and installation proceeds as intended. ODOT can move forward with a purchase order, which will speed the process. Vicky asked about Litus LLC’s role in the originally named Bundle 3, including the CILOS. Frannie confirmed that breaking the two parts of their work into separate contracts was discussed, but for now moving forward with a purchase order is the next step. Extra tiles will be delivered for long-term maintenance and the committee will discuss the timing of installation at the March DESC meeting.

Charlotte noted that in sharing comments about the tiles in Betsy Wolfston’s proposal, they didn’t talk about replacement tile and should include replacements in negotiations for the north bank of the Canoe Canal.

There were questions about the placement of the camas life cycle tiles and DESC suggested someone ask Esther to confirm the order of the camas cycle.

### **Next steps and agenda**

## **Develop March 18 DESC agenda**

DESC confirmed the next meeting for March 18, 2 – 5 p.m. at the CAWOOD office. Nichole will confirm Justin Lanphear and Karl Wieseke's attendance.

DESC confirmed the following meeting with the selected artist for north bank of Canoe Canal, ODOT Maintenance and Karl Wieseke for April 3, 2 – 5 p.m. at the CAWOOD office.

There was a question about the timing of the slope paving and how that will affect the installation of either bank.

Confirmed agenda:

1. North Bank preliminary concepts
  - General discussion
  - Feedback for refinement
2. Interpretive displays – additional updates
3. Canoe Canal
  - a. North bank
  - b. South bank
  - c. Slope paving timing and art installation
4. South bank stormwater drainage strip/seating area
5. CILOS – additional updates
6. Above deck enhancement updates
7. Construction update

## **Interpretive element update**

Frannie provided a brief update on the status of the interpretive elements. She recently met with Justin and historical and cultural experts. Placement still needs to be determined; there is potential for an interpretive area on Knickerbocker Bridge. If an interpretive element were installed on the Knickerbocker Bridge, ODOT might be able to participate in the rail replacement cost, but would also need the City of Eugene and EWEB to collaborate and cost share. The DESC asked to be included and made aware of that process. The permit for interpretive signs looks pretty flexible and everyone is interested in collaborating to make them more interesting and inviting. Chris mentioned the City guidelines for park displays and suggested finding a marriage of both practical and aesthetic design.

Committee members recalled that Dick Upton previously established an expectation that Kalapuya tribe will be represented on the north bank and the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde on the south bank. The committee also noted that David Lewis previously talked about doing something in a Kalapuya style since it's Kalapuya land. Charlotte suggested that it would be nice to match the theme of the project. Chris thought David's intent was to represent who was here – the Kalapuya. Charlotte suggested something that

represents the Kalapuya past, present and future and would like to have David talk to DESC about ideas. Frannie will discuss with David.

ODOT has a historical context document on the Eugene Millrace and will provide DESC with a copy of that.

### **CILOS update**

Frannie and ODOT are suggesting to separate the CILOS project and enter an IGA with the parks. Since the area is not on ODOT right of way and ODOT has no future ownership, the idea would be to transfer funding to the parks. They have the ability to work directly with Walama and Nearby Nature to complete that work. Some are concerned that the parks would chew up administrative costs. Frannie suggests itemizing and limiting the amount to contain and ensure funds are available. Vicky felt administrative costs should be above and beyond CILOS budget, since it was not an issue when they approved the budget for the project. Charlotte agreed.

Some expressed concern about tracking those allotted funds over the years and Chris felt it would be easy for the City to track. Frannie will discuss with Trevor Taylor and provide more information at the March meeting.