

Summary – CAG^{#27} / PDT^{#26}

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

July 9, 2010 - 10 a.m. to 1 p.m.

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

ATTENDANCE

CAG Members

- Charlotte Behm – Springfield Neighborhood, CPC for Whilamut Natural Area
- Dave Carvo – Glenwood Neighborhood Group
- Lauri Holts – Eugene Parks and Open Space Division
- Greg Hyde – Willamalane Park & Recreation District
- Bob Kline – Harlow Neighbors
- Vicky Mello – CPC for Whilamut Natural Area
- David Sonnichsen – Fairmount Neighbors
- Scott Wylie – Springfield Resident

PDT Members

- Chris Henry – City of Eugene
- Al Heyn – ODOT Region 2
- Kent Howe – Lane County
- Drake McKee – ODOT District 5
- Ann Sanders – ODOT Region 2

Guests

- Charlene Larison – CPC for Whilamut Natural Area

Resource Team

- Megan Banks – LCOG
- Douglas Beauchamp – Arts Consultant
- Jamie Damon – Portland State University
- Larry Fox – OBEC
- Larry Gescher – Slayden Construction
- Nichole Hayward – CAWOOD
- Don Kahle – ADT facilitator
- David Lewis – Confederated Tribes of Grande Ronde
- John Lively – CAWOOD
- Suzanne Roberts – OBDP
- Jyll Smith – ODOT Major Projects Branch
- Steve Turner – ODOT Design Build Program Manager
- Dick Upton – ODOT Project Manager, Major Projects Unit Manager

Handouts (available at meeting)

- Agenda
- DRAFT CAG^{#25} + PDT^{#24} Summary
- DRAFT CAG^{#26} Summary
- DRAFT PDT^{#25} Summary
- Design Enhancement Steering Committee Phase 2 Recommendations

WELCOME AND AGENDA REVIEW

Meeting purpose: Design Enhancement Panel appreciation and Design Enhancement Steering Committee update and Phase 2 recommendations

DESIGN ENHANCEMENT PANEL APPRECIATION

Dick Upton handed out certificates of appreciation to DEP members Vicky Mello, Bob Kline, Scott Wylie, Charlotte Behm, Don Kahle and Megan Banks. John Rose, Eric Gunderson, Annie Lowe and Randy Nishimura were unable to attend. Dick will send a handwritten note of thanks with the certificates to the DEP members who were unable to attend.

PROJECT STATUS REPORT

In Kevin Parrish's absence, Dick summarized the progress on the bridge and noted that the falsework is starting to look like arches. Construction is moving along well. Beams were set on the Canoe Canal, and the deck will be poured in early August. Crews have started stripping forms off columns on the Willamette River Bridge. Dick described how a column on Bent 2 of the main bridge ended up with a faulty pour – there were issues with vibrators and cages that caused voids in the pour. Hamilton hired a crew that rehabilitates old bridges to remove the bad materials and repair the work. Dick complimented Hamilton for being so responsive to getting it repaired.

Larry Gescher added that the northbound off-ramp opened the evening of July 8.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

Recent activity – John Lively noted that the next project newsletter is planned for August and will be the same format as the spring newsletter. He also described his efforts visiting businesses on Franklin Boulevard handing out fliers and answering questions in order to keep them informed. Businesses have been very positive and appreciate having advance notice – the outreach and efforts have been greatly appreciated. He also mentioned the new path safety video public service announcement, project webcast and blog. Jyll Smith, Suzanne Roberts and Jamie elaborated on the blog. Jyll's goal is to provide more close up shots and to post once each week. Jyll also mentioned that people are following the project Twitter account and that new WRB displays were installed on the Knickerbocker Bridge. Vicky Mello complimented the displays on the Knickerbocker Bridge. Jyll added that the news crew she met at the site on July 7 had done research using the new Knickerbocker Bridge signs.

Dick and John briefly mentioned the meetings with the City Council and the Willamalane Board of Directors, noting that all went well and were very positive.

Dick acknowledged David Sonnichsen's recent and ongoing involvement with the naming of the bridge, pointing out the July 26 hearing before the Eugene City Council. Dick added that the Springfield City Council did not want to take formal action regarding the bridge naming, but did express support.

Charlotte Behm suggested that those interested pick up copy of the *Springfield Retrospective and Visitors Guide* that feature articles about the bridge naming and Springfield City Council.

DESIGN ACTIVITIES

Design Enhancement Steering Committee report and recommendations - Jamie Damon summarized the DESC work to date gathering information and feedback from committee members in order to finalize design enhancement criteria and Phase 2 next steps.

Vicky Mello referred to the sequence outlined on the white board (attached) and elaborated that all feedback obtained over the phone or via e-mail has been reviewed and compiled into one draft document listing criteria, pre-proposal activities and proposal requirements (provided at meeting and attached). Vicky asked the group to take formal action in support of the DESC, their involvement in the process and support to move forward. She then suggested taking a vote. **No vote was taken at this point.*

Anne Sanders asked first to hear the feedback the DESC received, which Vicky described as being positive responses from all. Utilizing the positive response, the DESC came together after obtaining a variety of criteria from a variety of sources, including public comment and previous Requests for Proposals.

Jamie noted the intention of the DESC is not to get ahead of CAG and PDT, but to keep all committee members and staff in the loop and avoid surprises at meetings.

Vicky asked again if any members of the CAG or PDT objected to the DESC continuing work.

Steve Turner brought up a recent meeting at OBEC in which the ultimate project owners discussed maintenance. Some indicated the need and desire to be involved in specific conversations, particularly in regard to the use of certain materials. The proposed criteria mention ODOT maintenance staff; Steve asked that they include other owners as well.

Vicky confirmed with the meeting attendees that there were no objections to the DESC continuing in their work. She then identified their meeting goal to finalize the proposed criteria, encouraging the committee to briefly look for any glaring items that were left off or not accurate.

Jamie clarified the proposed DESC criteria were based on previous drafts from CAG/PDT meetings, as well as feedback from the last public touch point. The DESC sent out a draft, received comments from the committees, Jamie revised and Scott Wylie made final revisions to ensure synthesis and legibility. Charlotte elaborated on the goal to attain additional comments during the meeting, then reconvene and make a final draft that will be sent back out for review.

Greg Hyde suggested a quick review of DESC members and mission.

Vicky introduced the DESC members and staff: Bob Kline, Scott Wylie, Charlotte Behm, Vicky Mello, Jamie Damon and Douglas Beauchamp. The DESC goals are to move forward with design enhancement criteria in order to create an RFP for Bundle 1 above deck work, obtain proposals in response to the RFP, interview finalists, and select the design team, continually involving the CAG/PDT. The DESC would also like to have criteria applied to

both Bundles 2 and 3 with approval from the committees, and then get together with representatives of both bundles to review criteria and give ADTs a chance to rework any necessary items. Finally, the DESC would like to ensure the connection with stakeholders for each bundle.

Ann questioned why the criteria developed at previous meetings continues to be redeveloped, specifically in regard to accessibility of maintenance equipment.

Vicky, Bob and Charlotte reiterated that they've amended the criteria to consolidate criteria developed at previous meetings and to include feedback received.

Lauri Holts asked to review all criteria.

Jamie reiterated the first draft was sent via e-mail and was very similar to the revised handout. Jamie asked the committees for support to move forward with the revised criteria. Vicky added that comments made during the meeting will be included and a final version will be sent out within two weeks.

Bob Kline identified two things not included: 1) Not every element has to be representative of the Kalapuya Tribe and 2) Location of art – based on experience with Bundle 1, Bob suggested defining where art can be to avoid proposals with concepts and ideas that don't work, thus saving time. Dave Carvo agreed with Bob's notion to be specific early on in the process and recommended including the potential locations in the RFP.

Kent Howe questioned the determination for not allowing art on the bridge. Bob mentioned ODOT maintenance and their requirement that nothing be attached to the bridge. Larry Fox questioned if pylons are acceptable if not attached or between the bridge.

Greg reiterated the importance of ensuring clarity and as much detail as possible. Larry Fox agreed and suggested including pictures and diagrams. Scott added how notes, scales, measurements, etc. will be required in conjunction with a diagram or picture. He reminded that criteria formation is a major undertaking and this project is providing a valuable precedent for ODOT projects in the future.

Vicky asked if all members of the committees want involvement in creating the RFP or if people prefer the DESC to compose the RFP and present it to the committees. Jamie suggested sending out the schematic diagram to the committees for approval, then including it as a part of the RFP. Dave Carvo suggested the RFP be reviewed and approved by ODOT maintenance prior to CAG/PDT review. Chris Henry then asked whether or not there are elements that have the potential to end up being maintained by someone other than ODOT.

Charlotte questioned the proposed criteria of no art on the bridge; Bob, Ann, Dick and Jamie confirmed that ODOT maintenance had previously provided requirements surrounding the accessibility of the snooper crane. Dick reminded that snooper crane access is an absolute, a constraint that must be met. Greg suggested revising the way the criteria is worded rather than stating that nothing can be attached to the bridge.

Scott added that being aware of constraints is an artist's responsibility.

Douglas Beauchamp noted that the proposed Phase 2 process suggests three required meetings with ODOT maintenance; therefore the RFP does not have to include all criteria and constraints. Bob expressed the need to provide as much information as early as possible so proposers are informed ahead of time, in an effort to avoid going down the wrong path with designs and losing more time.

Ann asked about and suggested using the video of the snooper crane to avoid confusion. Drake concurred. Chris asked for clarification regarding surface treatments, reiterating the need to be specific, e.g. nothing attached to bridge versus nothing in-between that interferes with the snooper crane access.

Scott recalled Jiri Strasky of OBEC having voiced strong opinions about attachments to the bridge and noted he and his team seem to constitute ownership. He then questioned if it is realistic that proposals may still get shot down due to the interference. Larry Fox reiterated that, as the bridge designer, Jiri has a say. Jiri showed support of the original proposal, yet had concerns about long-term maintenance and safety. He agreed that Jiri should be considered a stakeholder. Larry warned that the southbound bridge is under construction, and re-launching Bundle 1 will take some time. He said that traffic is expected to move to the southbound bridge in August 2011. Schedule and requirements for reopening the roadway need to be considered as the enhancement project is now going to start running into schedule issues. Protective fencing must be installed over the railroad; ODOT only wants to maintain required fencing, which will end up being about 100 feet, no more or less. Larry clarified for Scott how it was decided that only required fencing will be a part of design enhancements and Scott expressed his confusion reiterating the need to ensure the criteria is 119% clear to anyone reading it.

Jamie summarized criteria discussed in the meeting: 1) Include direction in the format of a schematic diagram and video; 2) Schedule constraints; 3) Jiri a key stakeholder; 4) Required fencing only; and 5) Criteria is about exclusions.

Bob added that all design enhancements do not need to reflect the Kalapuya Tribe. Jamie referred to the handouts mention of this item, and asked for feedback reiterating that the main goal is to focus on stakeholder coordination and involvement. David Lewis suggested leaving the theme of the Whilamut Passage to interpretation. Conversation continued in regard to defining and illustrating what may be deemed disrespectful to the Tribe. Ann suggested that determination should happen at meetings during the process, while Charlotte suggested simply listening to the Tribe and incorporating their feedback through design, and emphasized the need to look at the project from a differing perspective. David Lewis suggested asking Kalapuya people when trying to determine if something is disrespectful to them or not. The idea cannot solely be a bulleted statement without including a discussion with a Kalapuya Tribe member. Jamie suggested listing a required meeting in the proposed criteria as a way to indicate and demonstrate that interaction. David encouraged ongoing meaningful dialogue rather than one meeting.

Chris Henry, Dave Carvo, Ann Sanders and others expressed concern that there are mixed messages surrounding the theme Whilamut Passage. It has been said that design enhancements do not have to represent the Kalapuya Tribe, while some of the criteria reads as though the focus is the Kalapuya Tribe. Scott noted his perception of the theme in relationship to ways of looking at the universe – connections of people and places in all

directions and all degrees. Passages are very representative of the universe if one is able to look at things a little bit differently than normal, it might become more obvious that many things are in fact *a part* of things.

David Lewis asked if there was a written theme for the Whilamut Passage to reference and advised there should be a statement that is referred to often and includes Kalapuya culture and the overall meaning of the passage. The Whilamut Passage is a passage historically and a passage for today's people. If all of the elements were written into a theme it will incorporate past and present at the same time. Douglas noted the intention to include a written theme in the new RFP.

Jamie explained the importance of including specifics related to the Kalapuya people by reminding the group of the tendency to gravitate to mainstream culture without realizing one is doing so. Therefore including specific topics in the criteria adds weight to the topic, rather than a focus. The criteria acts more as a balancing act with checks and balances rather than theme change or focus change.

Charlotte added her experience with the Springfield City Council meeting and the *Register-Guard* write up, and how the excitement she saw was surrounding a focus on the Kalapuya people. A city councilor encouraged the Kalapuya focus, asking for more of it. Charlotte feels the community is cheering on the focus and support of Kalapuya people.

David Lewis acknowledged a disagreement within the committees in regard to the focus of the Whilamut Passage theme and asked if agreement should be sought during the meeting, and if not, when. Douglas noted the theme was written and adopted in November 2008. Douglas then read the theme:

Though the bridge is the central feature, the I-5 Willamette River Bridge project (as it is now labeled) is larger than the bridge.

The project incorporates a place, or rather elements of many discrete places. It is an intersection in time, a confluence, a crossing. This *placeness* is represented most profoundly by the river and its natural features and native animal and plant communities. It is also represented significantly by the first peoples, the Kalapuya, followed by white explorers, settlers, with the millrace, earlier commerce and crossings, other bridges, later arrivals, and current commerce and movement.

Today, as part of a park area that includes about three miles of frontage along the north bank of the Willamette River, Whilamut Natural Area encompasses 237 acres of publicly owned open space, linking the neighboring cities of Springfield and Eugene, Oregon. The Whilamut Natural Area honors the Kalapuya people and their language. Whilamut (pronounced "wheel-a-moot") means, "*Where the river ripples and runs fast.*" Tribal members hunted, fished, and gathered camas bulbs on the land that is now the Whilamut Natural Area before being forced onto reservations outside their territory in the 1850s.

Hence: Whilamut.

Though the bridge is the central feature, the I-5 Willamette River Bridge project (as it is now labeled) is larger than bridge.

Though its primary impetus is to convey vehicles over the Willamette River as they travel North-South, the Willamette River Bridge project is an infrastructure that encourages a flow of people and goods beside, under and through in a variety of modes: trains, local cars and trucks, wheelchairs, bicyclers, walkers, boaters, and floaters. This is particularly marked on the south bank with the SP rail line, the Franklin Blvd / Hwy 99 corridor, and the bike and pedestrian paths. The north bank includes the canoe canal.

They pass through, they pass by... Passage \Pas"sage\, n. [F. passage.]

1. The act of passing; transit from one place to another; movement from point to point; a going by, over, across, or through; as, the passage of a man or a carriage; the passage of a ship or a bird; the passage of light; the passage of fluids...
2. Transit by means of conveyance; journey, as by water, carriage, car, or the like; travel; right, liberty, or means, of passing; conveyance.

Hence: Passage.

Jamie asked the committee if they felt the need to rewrite or refine the theme. David Sonnichsen was surprised that anyone felt a separation between the two, since Whilamut is a Kalapuya word. It is a synthesis and the hope is that artists will synthesize. Greg Hyde clarified that the criteria handout doesn't make that clear and suggested that it may be worth revisiting to clarify.

Jamie noted that the criteria are a checklist that will be used for RFP evaluation and are things we want the ADTs to speak to in their design. The purpose of the criteria needs to be clear enough for interpretation and for evaluation. Ann and Dave Carvo noted that they get the impression when reading the criteria that proposers without a Kalapuya theme will have points docked.

Vicky suggested providing the theme in conjunction with the criteria so designers have that clarification. Chris emphasized the importance of being clear about what is desired up front. Vicky added that if you look at each piece of criteria as an individual item, you can pick it apart and may feel unclear, but if you look at all of them together as a whole, they are complimentary.

Jamie referred to Rich Hazel's previous comments in his absence. Rich wants to reflect the range of ways the passage can be interpreted, e.g. the Millrace is a historical marker of white settlement, which could also be offensive to some. He feels it necessary to make sure the theme is broad enough for the range of possible interpretations.

In discussion about who has veto power over a proposal, Larry Fox noted that the key question whether a proposal with a Kalapuya theme will it get a higher score. If so, that needs to be very clearly stated in the RFP. David Lewis commented that someone who is

smart and reads the theme would pick up on the Kalapuya Tribe mention and therefore it should be left up to the selection process. Bob agreed and reiterated that most information is listed on the document, and then it's up to designers to tell us how they've interpreted the criteria.

Still sensing disagreement, Jamie asked to clarify the issue. Dave Carvo identified the disagreement as whether the Kalapuya Tribe is an overriding theme or part of the Whilamut Passage theme. David Lewis reminded the committee that not everybody is always thinking about the project in regard to Kalapuya people, suggesting that whichever proposal scores highest will determine the final design enhancements and the themes will all even out. Ann noted the importance of who will be evaluating proposals and the need to be clear if the evaluating party has a bias toward a Kalapuya theme. Jamie referred to the second item the DESC intended to discuss -- RFP selection process and their desire to make sure the selection group is unbiased.

Scott added that certain elements of each proposal may be very strong and powerful, but the proposed criteria are intended to provide clarity on what the proposals contain. Sometimes proposals are very directional, while some will be broad. There is an importance in saying that scoring will be based on the power of art that is presented.

Bob Kline proposed continuing the DESC, as well as calling back the DEP members because they've been through the selection process, which would expand the DESC to eight to 10 members. Bob also suggested adding someone from ODOT maintenance as well.

Jamie concluded the decisions that need to be made: 1) Criteria – revisions and refinement; 2) How the criteria will be used; 3) How to select a broadly representative group for the RFP evaluation process.

Vicky added the continuation of Bundles 2 and 3 to Jamie's list.

Lunch Break

Jamie captured updates that need to be made to the criteria with anticipation that the DESC will revise and resend the criteria within two weeks; that piece is done. The next item is to determine or agree that the DESC will proceed in their work. The committees were slightly hung up on how the DESC will work with the RFP screeners. Jamie suggested separating those two issues and deal with one at a time. Vicky added that the role of the DESC is a steering committee. The goal is to keep the enhancement portion of the project moving forward and at each stage (criteria, RFP development, etc.) obtain committee feedback. She reminded that the DESC is trying to adhere to timeframes and keep moving forward. Jamie added that it will be a similar situation with the RFP, and the CAG/PDT and DESC will probably get back together in September to review the RFP and stakeholder groups.

Vicky asked if her and Jamie's description is what the committees feel the DESC should be doing. Dave Carvo expressed his concern of the DESC group coming back in six months and presenting a final decision, adding that he feels more than four people should be a part of the decision.

Jamie asked the committees if the process the DESC used to get criteria feedback worked, because it would essentially be replicated for the RFP development, stakeholder

coordination and process moving forward. Lauri Holts agreed but suggested that handouts be presented prior to meetings for efficiency and time to review.

Bob conveyed the need to think about who will evaluate proposals in order to include that group during the development of the RFP. He also reminded the committee of the need to start moving toward a contract for Bundles 2 and 3. Both ADTs have received some information on the criteria during specific meetings with stakeholders, e.g. parks meetings.

Jamie recapped the meeting progress: agreement to continue with the DESC serving as a steering committee. The DESC will e-mail the committees with revised criteria, a proposed draft RFP for feedback, designs for Bundles 2 and 3, and proposed stakeholder groups.

After more discussion on the process and what the goal of the meeting was, the committees agreed and confirmed support for the DESC, Jamie, Dick and Douglas to develop a draft RFP and facilitate a preliminary assessment process. Jamie presented the idea that a proposal evaluation committee will select the top three designers for Bundle 1, who would then present their ideas and designs to the CAG/PDT.

Chris Henry reminded the committees that there is time to establish screeners for the RFP since it will be issued in September, therefore the screeners can be selected in the September CAG/PDT meeting. The topic of how exactly proposals will be scored was discussed. Larry Fox added that results should be scored and ranked based on scoring-criteria. Proposers have a right to see final scores and review other proposals, therefore criteria should be developed as a part of the RFP scoring so that initial screening can be used to justify why designers were ranked as finalists. Larry clarified that the previous process for selection included an initial scoring round, evaluation and discussion, then a chance to change scores based on the discussions. The process was not solely based on first impressions. It was decided that the DESC will draft the RFP, an evaluation and scoring section will be added as a part of the RFP. A smaller screening group will select the finalists and identifying this group can be done via e-mail or at the September CAG/PDT meeting, then finalists will be presented to ODOT to confirm that legal and maintenance issues are addressed prior to presenting to the CAG/PDT.

Jamie added that a lot is left to be defined, but less urgently. The September meeting is a good time to clarify the entire evaluation process. The most urgent element not discussed yet is the stakeholder coordination, which needs to happen as soon as possible. Jamie then suggested that the DESC send an e-mail to the CAG and PDT identifying stakeholders within the next month. Jamie and Vicky reiterated the need to identify stakeholders that should have more input and the need to get them involved. John Lively has suggested some related to Bundles 2 and 3.

Bob noted that general concepts for Bundles 2 and 3 have been agreed upon. The next step is to decide if Bundles 2 and 3 meet the new criteria in order to move into Phase 2. Bob also suggested that a group be identified to oversee the progress of Bundles 2 and 3.

Larry volunteered to compile a list of what stakeholders have met for both bundles and will distribute it to everyone. Bob added that he's not seen any summaries of previous stakeholder meetings (note: these are regular monthly meetings that the design team has held with park agencies about the overall project design) and would like minutes of meetings that

have happened. Larry agreed to put together a summary of conclusions related to design enhancements to help the committees get up to speed. Larry reiterated that Bundles 2 and 3 have had the right people talking, but for this design enhancement piece, it may be appropriate to get more people involved.

Ann posed the question of what stakeholders have pass or fail authority over the proposed designs and suggested that those be the only stakeholders involved. Jamie clarified the need to gain a larger public acceptance. Jamie and the DESC propose that the DESC and CAWOOD work together in order to ensure that.

Larry added that Bundles 2 and 3 will be subjected to the same criteria. ADTs will present progress to stakeholders, but Bundles 2 and 3 will only be refined based on criteria, not redefined or redesigned.

Greg asked that the e-mail regarding stakeholders include specifically what the stakeholders will be used for. Larry asked for clarification on the urgency if Bundle 1 hasn't been selected yet. Vicky responded with the need to get stakeholders identified and involved and to ensure the criteria and bundle designs match up.

NEXT STEPS

- DESC to revise criteria and send via e-mail to CAG/PDT for feedback.
- Larry Fox to provide a project update and summary of discussions at parks meetings.
- DESC and CAWOOD to evaluate and plan for more stakeholder involvement.
- DESC to develop draft RFP and send draft RFP via e-mail to CAG/PDT for feedback.
 - Include evaluation and scoring process.
 - Coordinate with ODOT legal and maintenance teams.
- CAG/PDT meeting in September.
 - Finalize RFP.
 - Finalize evaluation process.
 - Determine screening group.
 - Update Bundles 2 and 3.

1. CAG/PDT sanctions DESC existence + ~~to~~ advancing W/CAG/PDT Authority \rightarrow Will DO

2. DESC - final criteria applies to all three bundles

- establish group that does bundle 1 RFP selection process/selection \rightarrow DESC inform via email
 <re criteria> next 2+ weeks
- " " " " " design RFP will be emailed for comment
 2+3 review after ADT address criteria (opportunities for entities over and over and that)
- " " " " " 2+3 designs will be emailed for comment
- clarify stakeholders + their role <working of command + others> Stakeholders -
- communicate mostly through email <thanks for timely response> suggestions + review of final groups

TODAY - ideas for stakeholders
 - discuss + approve above

