

## **EWEB Riverfront Master Plan Community Advisory Team (CAT)**

Wednesday, August 27, 5:30 - 7:30 p.m.

EWEB Board Room

Present: Dave Hauser, Thomas Hoyt, Mark Johnson, Patricia Johnston, Desiree Moore, Dean Pape', Mary Unruh, Anita Van Asperdt and Gary Wildish, members; Bob Cassidy, EWEB Commissioner; Mike Logan, Mark Oberle, Jeannine Parisi, EWEB Core Team; Debra Smith, EWEB Staff; Kathi Wiederhold, Facilitator; Vicki Maxon, Recorder; Charles Biggs, David Dougherty, Julie Fischer, Deb Frisch, Bob Hart, Kevin Matthews, Whit Perkins and Bob Siegmund, public.

Absent: No members were absent.

### 1. Welcome, Introductions and Agenda Review

Mark Oberle welcomed everyone and acknowledged Bob Cassidy, EWEB Commissioner.

### 2. Comments from the Audience

Deb Frisch noted that tonight's meeting is poorly timed, as it conflicts with the Democratic Convention and was scheduled while the City Council was on break. She concluded that the CAT did not truly want public participation and commented that the membership reflected development interests only. She added that it is her opinion that the University of Oregon would continue to grow along the riverfront and thought it would save everyone a lot of time and money to just cede the property to the University now.

### 3. Approve August 13 Meeting Notes

Several team members said they did not receive their meeting notes. Therefore, approval was postponed until the September 10 meeting.

Jeannine Parisi handed out revised August 13 meeting notes that included a request for changes from Tom Hoyt regarding the public meetings law. A few members who did receive the notes requested some minor revisions. A brief discussion was held regarding concerns about CAT members' work e-mail addresses being used for team business, and EWEB staff agreed to come up with a solution to that issue.

It was requested that those members who did not receive the August 13 meeting notes bring their revisions to the September 10 meeting, and the notes will be approved at that time.

Pat Johnston reiterated that the event schedule on the EWEB website needs to be updated. She also requested that action items be added to the agenda at the end of each meeting. Gary Wildish agreed and noted that a reminder of assignments for the next meeting would be a good thing. Mark Oberle asked if the action items should be listed under the heading of “Closing Comments and Next Steps.” Pat Johnston said that either the existing heading or a new heading of “Assignments” would be fine with her.

Desiree Moore again requested that she would like to see the budget for the Riverfront Master Plan project in its entirety, including the amount budgeted for the consultant, discretionary funds and everything else, in itemized fashion., i.e., what funds are available to complete this project. Mark Oberle agreed to forward that information to the team.

#### 4. Team Process Discussion, Continued

Kathi Wiederhold, Facilitator, began the discussion by asking team members to set a date to elect team co-chairs. At the request of the team, Kathi then reviewed the duties of the co-chairs as listed in the ground rules.

Kathi Weiderhold asked Vicki Maxon, Recorder, to label all consensus decisions in the meeting notes from here on out.

#### **CONSENSUS DECISION:**

**The team agreed to nominate co-chairs at the September 10 meeting and elect them at the September 24 meeting.**

Kathi Wiederhold handed out a memo regarding back-up decision making and the method for triggering it, decision making when there are absent members, and optional ground rules. She briefly explained each section.

#### Back-Up Decision Making and Trigger

The team discussed the back-up decision making/trigger process. Kathi asked each member to briefly state their opinion regarding the process.

Gary Wildish said that he is concerned about a member using the back-up decision making process as a crutch and having a way out when there is a problem coming to consensus. He added that the team member who cannot reach consensus should be required to articulate their issue and the reason they are having trouble with it, and bring an alternative solution to the following meeting.

Desiree Moore said she feels that this process makes it sound like the team is preparing themselves for not being able to reach consensus.

Pat Johnston said she also is concerned about using the back-up decision making process as a crutch and that she believes the team should be committed to trying to reach consensus each and every time.

Dave Hauser said he would like a pre-agreed method of back-up decision making but isn't sure of which one yet. Mark Johnson concurred.

Tom Hoyt said he believes the team's only asset is to reach consensus. He added that he would recommend that a mediator be available and then if after that the team still can't reach consensus, the team should deal with that when it happens. He added that he thinks that is the only way the team's decisions will have merit.

Mary Unruh said she likes Gary Wildish's proposal, requiring the member to articulate why they are having trouble reaching consensus and what their issue is. She added that mediation could be an option for back-up decision making.

Dean Pape' agreed with Mary Unruh, but added that with a 7-1 vote, he is concerned that a lot of time and energy would be spent trying to get that person to consensus, thereby delaying other agenda items and prolonging meetings.

Kathi Wiederhold said she believes she heard that the team might want to add a step to the back-up decision making process wherein the member(s) who cannot agree to a decision would bring back an alternative solution. She added that where she hears differences between members is with the type of back-up decision making process to use (majority vote, mediation, or waiting to decide when to present an alternative).

Tom Hoyt said he believes that all team members are adults, and that bringing old information back to the team is redundant and a wasted effort.

Mark Oberle noted that the reason for the dissenting vote could boil down to a core value that member has and not necessarily a lack of information.

Gary Wildish said that he hopes the team can be broad-minded, willing to adjust, and unselfish when it comes to consensus, and that this needs to happen not just for the team but for the community as a whole. He added that he hopes that the team will not have to use the trigger alternative.

Anita Van Asperdt said she believes the main point of consensus is what Gary Wildish just stated—that only in severe circumstances would consensus not be reached but, if consensus can't be reached, she believes it is good to have a back-up decision making process in place.

## **CONSENSUS DECISION – 9-0**

**The team agreed to revisit the issue of back-up decision making and the trigger for using it at the September 10 meeting.**

Mark Oberle noted that when the ground rules were written, the core team didn't know who would be chosen for the team and that the back-up decision making process seemed more important at that time. He said that now that he is more familiar with how the team interacts and sees how well they communicate with each other, it is not as important to him.

### Decision Making When There Are Absent Members

Tom Hoyt asked about voting by proxy. Mark Johnson said he didn't feel that an absent member should hold up the decision making process. Dean Pape' agreed with Mark.

Jeannine Parisi noted that the team won't be voting very often and that this issue is covered in the ground rules. Kathi Wiederhold then read the section of the ground rules that prohibits sending an alternate or voting by proxy.

Mary Unruh said she is concerned that a proxy vote doesn't allow for discussion.

Tom Hoyt asked if the ground rules can be revised. Mark Oberle answered that some of the ground rules relate to core issues that the EWEB Board has asked to be addressed, but that he is not prepared to answer which relate and which do not, and that some ground rules have been added since then.

### **CONSENSUS DECISION:**

**The team agreed to add the following provision to the ground rules about decision making when there are absent members: “When one or more members are absent from a meeting, the members present will determine if they feel comfortable making a key decision or deferring it to a later date.”**

After a brief discussion about bullet #2 from the memo handed out at the meeting (members absent will have an opportunity to discuss the decision at the next meeting), Kathi noted that some groups she has facilitated allow revisiting of an issue, while others say that whether or not a member is there, the decision will be made.

Desiree Moore said she feels that if the issue being voted on is a key issue, the absent member should be able to discuss the decision at the next meeting.

Dave Hauser said it is his feeling that bullet #3 (members absent from a meeting in which a decision has been made are responsible for getting up to speed before the next meeting) can work in concert with bullet #1.

Anita Van Asperdt said she believes bullet #1 could be revised to mention the key decision issue that Desiree Moore brought up.

Mark Johnson said he believes that if three members are absent from a meeting, the decision should be deferred.

Tom Hoyt said this bullet point almost sounds like it is a motion to reconsider an issue at a followup meeting.

There was discussion about whether absent members could e-mail Kathi Wiederhold regarding a consensus decision.

**CONSENSUS DECISION:**

**The team agreed by consensus to add the following provision to the ground rules about decision making when there are absent members: “Members absent from a meeting in which a key consensus decision has been made are responsible for coming up to speed before the next meeting, such as by contacting one of the co-chairs or another member.”**

Desiree Moore asked if there will be an opportunity to modify the ground rules six months or so into the process. Kathi Wiederhold said there will be, if there is a ground rule that isn't working well.

Other Optional Ground Rules

Discussion on this section of the memo was deferred to the next meeting.

5. Riverfront Property/Site Tour Discussion

Jeannine Parisi handed out the list of site tour comments/questions. She noted that the project budget request will now be expanded based on Desiree Moore's request from earlier tonight. Jeannine also said she is working on site maps and looking for examples of other riverfront master plans. She asked for other background information requests either during tonight's meeting or by e-mail in the following week.

Anita Van Asperdt asked if there have been any pollution studies done on the millrace. Dave Hauser asked staff to identify previously adopted plans and studies that the team should read over, i.e., the Eugene Downtown Plan, etc. Pat Johnston added that there is also an Alton Baker Park plan that the team should read.

Mark Oberle said the list of information requests will be posted on the EWEB website and will be expanded as items are added.

Mark Oberle then gave an update on the upcoming river tour. He said he has made arrangements for two rafts with guides. After some discussion regarding the length of the river tour and what route to take, the team decided it would be best to put in above Knickerbocker Bridge near Leo Harris Parkway (at approximately Autzen Stadium Gate 4) and take out at Valley River Center.

Desiree Moore requested that the team revisit doing the river tour as its own special meeting, aside from a regular meeting. After a brief discussion, Jeannine Parisi agreed to use Meeting Wizard (or something similar) to tally team members' availability.

The team then took a 15-minute break.

## 6. Consultant Requests for Qualifications (RFQ)

Mark Oberle briefly reviewed types of criteria he would like the team to consider when envisioning the RFQ process. He used the example of riparian edge as a category but that details or specifics within that category would not be itemized.

Jeannine Parisi handed out the list Pat Johnston had provided earlier by e-mail. She confirmed that the team's input would include both desired skills and experience for the consultant along with key concepts to address in the proposal, such as the example Mark just provided.

Kathi Wiederhold recorded the following brainstorming list on flip charts, to be typed for discussion at the September 10 meeting.

- Urban riparian edge
- Four items in Downtown Plan
- Transportation and understanding of nodal development, including parking, circulation, alternative modes of transportation
- Visually pleasing as well as environmental issues, educational and artistic. Art can embody other goals.
- Historical interpretation experience, e.g., interpretive center, signage
- Public process
  - See WEC doc – consensus building among diverse stakeholders
  - Exceptional ability
  - Design that is innovative and special
- WEC qualifications
- Experience is key, including what riverfront properties can look like, vast experience in dealing with all of the facets.
- Experience with measurable results
  - Be able to look at 2-3 projects that are successful and economically viable
- CAT developing its own evaluation and selection criteria
- Someone with a good idea of taking the general concept of a group and capturing it
- Be able to show through other projects that they can incorporate established uses of the site, e.g., the bike path
- Proven experience in blending artistic, historic, commercial and open space on the ground (not just on paper)
- Experience in redeveloping an industrial site into something different – success at it
- Investigate, to the extent possible, reuse options – working with extra buildings to re-use

- Proven experience in teamwork/collaboration, e.g., open to bringing in another consultant as needed for a specific item
- Be able to present a visual demonstration of what they have in mind
- Habitat development/restoration expertise
- Expertise in cleaning up waterways, e.g., the Millrace – environmental mitigation
- Deal with a variety of government bodies, e.g., in the clean-up
- Experience in developing projects that demonstrate energy efficiency and economic sustainability
- Public process is more of a challenge than we think – outreach – we go to the public, not just they come to us. Needs to be part of the public process plan – help CAT achieve effective public outreach.

Pat Johnston asked if the team will be developing their own evaluation criteria. Mark Oberle said they will and that, in his mind, the criteria for selection is more important than the experience and qualifications.

Desiree Moore asked if the schedule that appeared on the sample RFQ is correct. She said it is her feeling that 77 days wouldn't be long enough for this project. Mark Oberle said he will check on this and report back to the team.

In response to Gary Wildish's item regarding the consultant's ability to produce visual images/presentations, Pat Johnston asked if he meant physical models or computer models. Mark Oberle noted that the team should state that as a clear expectation in the RFQ.

Gary Wildish noted that while doing the brainstorming, he realized that the public process is much more of a process than he thought it would be initially. Desiree Moore asked how much of that public process is incumbent upon the consultant and how much is incumbent upon the team. Gary Wildish said he believes that the team should be involved but that it also needs to be a part of the consultant's expertise.

Mark Oberle asked the team to e-mail any additional criteria to him or Jeannine Parisi and the list will be e-mailed to the team for discussion at the September 10 meeting.

Anita Van Asperdt noted that she will be out of town for the September 10 meeting and will e-mail her comments before then.

