

**EWEB Riverfront Master Plan Community Advisory Team (CAT)**  
**MINUTES - Friday, January 9, 2009**  
EWEB Board Room, 5:00 p.m.

Present: Dave Hauser, Tom Hoyt, Mark Johnson, Pat Johnston, Desiree Moore, Mary Unruh, Anita Van Asperdt and Gary Wildish, members; Mark Oberle, Project Manager; Gail Murray and Jeannine Parisi, EWEB staff; Kathi Wiederhold, Facilitator; Vicki Maxon, Recorder; Monica Anderson, Julie Fischer, Eric Gunderson, Bob Hart, Peter King, Karrin Knudson, Lorri Nelson, Rick Satre, Ellen Teninty, and Zachary Vishanoff, public.

Absent: Dean Pape'.

Dave Hauser, Project Co-Chair, welcomed everyone.

Public Comment

Zachary Vishanoff noted that the last local public process project in 2001 resulted in the Eugene Cannery being wiped out and 5<sup>th</sup> Street Market taking over the area. He added that the City of Eugene sometimes fails in their planning efforts. He voiced his concern that the recent \$300,000 donation to EWEB from a customer has strings attached and could cause EWEB to lean toward a particular design consultant. He said he is concerned about choosing a consultant that welcomes design input from the public, and suggested public forums that parallel the public hearings. He urged the team to keep thinking about designing a public involvement process that is a two-track system containing learning summaries, grounding input with public comment, and consideration of retail or mixed use. He said he looks forward to a renovated steam plant, not with the usual suspects, but resulting in a grass roots site that doesn't encourage flooding or construction of a parking garage.

Jeannine Parisi replied that the \$300,000 donation was from an anonymous donor and was earmarked specifically for the EWEB low-income energy assistance program.

Selection of Riverfront Master Plan Design Consultant

Dave asked the CAT members to introduce themselves and noted that today they finished the lengthy process of interviewing the consultant finalists. He asked each team member to comment briefly on their observations of the selection and interview process. He added that following that, Pat Johnston will explain the process that was used to evaluate the proposals and how the final decision was reached.

Tom Hoyt said he would like to address Zachary Vishanoff's comments regarding the public process for this project. He said he didn't get the impression from any of the consultants who were interviewed that they had their own agenda, or that they were going to clamp down on the team's ideas, or those of the citizens of Eugene. He said his impression was just the opposite—that the consultants would take their lead from the community's ideas and input.

He added that the CAT represents a wide variety of citizens and that every member of the team is going to reach out and get input from citizens who don't normally come to these meetings. He assured Zachary that the team will honor input from the citizens of Eugene.

Pat Johnston said that the five finalists who were interviewed were incredibly talented and qualified. She added that she was impressed with everything that the consultants presented, and that she felt it was very valuable to evaluate both written and oral presentations.

Desiree Moore said this was the first time she had participated in a process like this, and that she felt her lack of experience had some benefits. She said what impressed her most was that her initial mindset at the start of the selection process changed by the end of it. She commented that all of the finalists did a good job of answering the team's questions, and also addressed some issues that the team didn't originally anticipate. She said she appreciated the fair, balanced and open process with equal opportunity for all, and that she is more of a straight shooter than a politician. In closing, she said she wonders if she would do it again as it was a challenge, but that it was an excellent process and she is very happy with the outcome.

Mary Unruh said it was a tough and deliberative process to evaluate five extremely qualified teams who were interested in developing this plan with the CAT, and that she is pleased with the result. She added that the CAT has a wide range of experience and community viewpoints, and that she has been impressed while working with them and also with the result of the selection process.

Mark Johnson said that the team couldn't have made a bad choice with any of the five finalists but, in some ways, that made it harder to decide. He added that every finalist had great strengths and that it was difficult to whittle the process down to one selection, as any one of them would have been a great choice.

Gary Wildish said that working with the other team members to select the finalist has been great. He added that it is really exciting to see the level of talent that was available for this project, which is almost beyond comprehension. He said parts of the evaluation process became difficult but yet exciting, and that he felt it was a great process.

Dave Hauser said he agreed with the above comments, and that the finalists were both individually and collectively impressive, and that made the decision difficult. He said the team has spent a lot of time together doing a lot of process work. He added that talking to each finalist was invigorating, along with starting to talk about the process of engaging the community and getting support for the Master Plan process, which will result in a product that we are all proud of.

Pat Johnston explained the selection process. She said that each team member rated the written proposals and that, based on those scores, the five finalists were selected. Each team member then scored the interviews, which were added to the scores for the written proposals, with the highest total scoring team being awarded the contract. The first portion of the interview process consisted of four prepared questions that the finalists were given before the interviews--questions that the CAT calibrated themselves, both qualitative and quantitative.

The second portion of each interview consisted of three questions posed to the finalists to see how the teams responded spur of the moment. Lastly, the team evaluated responses to any clarifying questions asked of the finalists and some discretionary points about how the consulting teams “fit” for the project. The most points were given for the presentations and the consultant’s qualifications, and then those were added to the evaluation scores.

Dave Hauser noted that two of the team members recused themselves from the selection process due to potential conflicts of interest, so that only seven team members made the final decision.

Kathi Wiederhold, CAT facilitator, introduced herself and said that she helped the team come to consensus around who to interview and how to select the finalist. She explained that she confirmed consensus on each recommendation with a “thumbs up” or “thumbs down” indicator. With that said, Kathi asked for consensus on support of the team’s recommendation for the finalist.

**CONSENSUS DECISION: The team agreed on the finalist selected as the design consultant for the Riverfront Master Plan.**

Dave Hauser announced that, based on the above evaluation process, Rowell Brokaw is the design consultant chosen for the Riverfront Master Plan. He reiterated that it was a difficult process but he is excited about the team’s consensus on the decision and is ready to take the next step.

Gail Murray, Purchasing Manager, said that official notice will be given on Monday, January 12, and that contract negotiations will begin after that.

Dave Hauser asked if there was anything else that needed to be covered tonight. Mark Oberle, Project Manager, reiterated that the Notice of Intent to Award will be given on Monday, January 12, and contract negotiations will begin after that. He added that the EWEB Purchasing Department plans to have the contract ready to present to the EWEB Board, tentatively scheduled for Tuesday, February 17. He noted that even though consensus was reached tonight on selection of the design consultant, the EWEB Board will give final approval at their February 17 meeting.

Dave Hauser reminded the group that, given the earlier discussion regarding contract negotiations and future Board approval of the chosen consultant, the team will not meet again until February 11. He asked the team members if they had anything else to discuss; they did not. He thanked the team for their time and energy, and thanked the finalists for the great job on their presentations.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

**Next Meeting:           Wednesday, February 11 – 5:30 to 7:30 p.m.  
                                  EWEB Board Room**