

EWEB Riverfront Master Plan Community Advisory Team (CAT)

Wednesday, September 10, 5:30 - 7:30 p.m.

EWEB Board Room

MINUTES

Present: Dave Hauser, Mark Johnson, Patricia Johnston, Dean Pape', Mary Unruh and Gary Wildish, members; Nan Laurence, Mike Logan, Mark Oberle, Jeannine Parisi, EWEB Core Team; Debra Smith, EWEB Staff; Kathi Wiederhold, Facilitator; Vicki Maxon, Recorder; Rajiv Batra, Sid Crenwelge, David Dougherty, Julie Fischer, Eric Gunderson, Bob Hart and Kevin Matthews, public.

Absent: Tom Hoyt, Desiree Moore, Anita Van Asperdt

1. Welcome, Introductions and Agenda Review

Mark Oberle welcomed everyone and briefly previewed the agenda for tonight's meeting.

2. Comments from the Audience

There were no comments.

3. Approve August 13 and 27 Meeting Notes

Dean Pape' asked that the four items from the Downtown Plan that appear on the RFQ criteria brainstorming list (bullet #2) be listed out.

The meeting notes from August 13 and 27 were then approved.

4. Elect Officers

Kathi Wiederhold, Facilitator, opened the nominations for co-chairs for the CAT.

Mary Unruh nominated Pat Johnston and Gary Wildish. Mark Johnson seconded the nomination.

Gary Wildish nominated Dave Hauser. Dean Pape' seconded the nomination.

Gary Wildish said he appreciated the nomination but, due to the fact that he is volunteering on several committees, he declines.

A motion was made to approve the nomination of Pat Johnston and Dave Hauser as team co-chairs. Jeannine Parisi noted that since three members of the team are absent tonight, the team may want to defer approval of the nominations. Dean Pape', seconded by Gary Wildish, moved to defer approval of the nominations to the September 24 meeting.

5. Consultant Request for Qualifications (RFQ)

Mark Oberle explained to the team how he compiled the draft RFQ from a combination of team meeting notes, staff input, and existing EWEB boiler plate language. He added that if specific items that the team requested aren't included in the draft, that is because he attempted to get a sense of categories, not necessarily specific items, and that there is still time to add specific items.

Section 2.01.1 Experience

Pat Johnston said that she feels that there are some important concepts missing. For example, a transit-oriented piece as part of mixed use development. She feels that category is too broad and she would like to capture more specific details regarding transportation.

Pat also said that she feels the term "waterfront" in line one under Section 2.01.1, Experience, is too narrow, i.e., the consultant could possess experience in waterfront projects but not necessarily in developing the actual waterfront.

Mary Unruh said the term "waterfront" obviously applies to developing buildings next to water, but that a "waterfront" doesn't necessarily mean a riverfront. She requested the term "riverfront" to replace "waterfront." A brief discussion followed regarding consultant experience relating to riverfront projects.

Section 5.02.1 Public Process

Pat Johnston said she envisions the mention of design charrettes to expand to be more inclusive of innovative public involvement strategies, not limited to charrettes.

Several members commented that they prefer more general guidelines regarding the design charrette and then getting more specific about public process as part of consultant evaluations.

Pat Johnston asked why this section states that the team is not looking for a consultant to provide a vision for the riverfront site. Mark Oberle explained that the team will choose a consultant who will assist the team and the public in arriving at a vision, and that it will not be the consultant's vision, but a vision that is arrived at through community input. Pat reiterated that she feels that the vision needs to be articulated in both text and graphics.

Mark Oberle explained that he and Nan Laurence had met with representatives from the American Institute of Architects (AIA) and requested that, instead of the AIA embarking on its own visioning process, that it work with the consultant and the CAT to run one of several design charrettes.

Pat Johnston said she has a concern about stating that the AIA will “run” the design charrette process. She said she feels the team needs to have more control over that process. Dave Hauser asked if the intent is for the team to collaborate with AIA on the charrette design process.

Nan Laurence replied that the AIA has previous experience with design charrettes but that this one will be different because it is directed not just to the AIA but also the public, and that the public piece opens up the typical AIA process. Dean Pape’ said that he is concerned that if the charrette design process is opened up and the team gets an onslaught of architect and public input, it may result in a lack of consensus.

Mark Oberle reiterated that the EWEB Board has made it clear that this will be an open process. He reminded the team that they aren’t chartered with the vision, but with the responsibility of crafting a comprehensive master plan.

Dave Hauser said it is important to him to have a well-thought-out public strategy and that he would like to see an innovative process regarding public engagement in the RFQ. Mark Oberle said that one of the consultant’s first assignments from the CAT will be to design the public process.

Dean Pape’ voiced concern about terminology that states collaboration only between AIA and the public. Jeannine Parisi stated that staff will rework that paragraph so as not to limit collaboration to a certain individual or group. Dean replied that he would like to make specific reference to the fact the AIA will be working with the CAT and that he doesn’t want to limit that collaboration to the public engagement process.

Nan Laurence explained that the team is committed to the entire design community and that the Memorandum of Understanding between EWEB and the City of Eugene talks about a minimum of four public input sessions, and that this element is part of that. She added that it was possible to have other design charrettes later in the process.

Dean Pape’ reiterated that the collaborated effort needs to be better stated, i.e., “a local design team.” Pat Johnston added that she wants to be careful about managing specific expectations, i.e., that this collaboration is almost a partnership, and that the team needs to make sure that the participation of the AIA or any other entity doesn’t obligate the team or tie the consultant’s hands in designing outreach activities. Debra Smith interjected that it is her feeling that the team doesn’t need to state any of those specifics in the RFQ, because the team’s task is to write an RFQ and the consultants’ task is to respond with their qualifications. She added that ultimately the team will be giving the chosen consultant direction on whom to include in the public process.

Dave Hauser said he would still like to see a statement that demonstrates the consultant’s capability, a general statement, but enough to specify that capability.

Pat Johnston noted that she would like the RFQ to somehow state that the team wants to be inspired by the consultant's creativity, that we are looking for above and beyond the norm, world class—that we want to be “wowed” by their expertise.

Pat Johnston also said that she feels that the RFQ needs to clearly state who owns the project deliverables. Mark Oberle replied that that is covered in the boiler plate language.

Pat Johnston requested that somewhere in the Deliverables section it needs to be stated that, as much as possible, items will be submitted electronically in addition to providing hard copies. She wondered if it is unreasonable to ask for an electronic and hard copy for each CAT member. Nan Laurence noted that an electronic version is much easier to distribute after the Purchasing Department is done with their piece and suggested asking for an electronic and hard copy for each CAT member plus six additional copies.

Mark Oberle noted that the U of O School of Architecture is going to tour the riverfront site and that students will be asked to take a piece of the redevelopment site for design. The results of their project will be displayed at a public meeting and the students will be invited to give a presentation regarding their project.

Pat Johnston added that she has also talked to John Rowell (professor of the School of Architecture) and that they discussed that the architecture students also have the capability to do some research for the team, i.e., the team could submit five or six questions to them and they could research the answers.

Mark Oberle added that John Rowell is interested in an opportunity for real world experience for the architecture students. Dean Pape' suggested that John be scheduled to make a presentation to the team at a future meeting. Mark said he will look into that possibility.

CONSENSUS DECISION:

The team agreed that the approach for the RFQ should be broad to document consultant capabilities, but with less detail that might limit the breadth of what the consultant might propose. Mark Oberle noted that the evaluation criteria would be an exception. The team concurred.

The team agreed to e-mail any further comments to Mark Oberle.

Dean Pape' noted that the RFQ schedule says that the contract lasts nine months and that the months don't add up correctly, according to the dates that are mentioned in the body of the RFQ.

Mark Oberle said that the boiler plate language is filled in by the EWEB Purchasing Department and that the draft RFQ includes relative time frames that aren't necessarily correct. He said the team needs to discuss how much time is appropriate and possible ways to shorten the time frame. He added that the schedule also states that that the consultant will be on board by the end of March 2009.

Dean Pape' said the months of December and January will be an issue because of the holidays. Mary Unruh said she feels that, based on tonight's discussion, e-mailing comments and/or suggestions to Mark Oberle is one way to assist with shortening the time frame.

Dave Hauser asked if there is any way the RFQ could be completed before the end of the year. Mark Johnson said he thought 45 days wouldn't be an unreasonable time frame for the proposers to respond to the RFQ.

Gary Wildish said he didn't feel the team should continue this discussion without input from the three absent members, and that he wants to give the consultants enough time to come back with an adequate proposal.

Nan Laurence replied that for some consultants, 45 days is enough, especially if EWEB publicizes it sufficiently. Mark Oberle noted that he has already received phone calls and e-mails from interested consultants from all over the nation.

The team asked several consultants who were in the audience if 45 days was enough time to respond to an RFQ, and they replied that it was.

Dave Hauser commented that it might be easier to work backward from the end of the year when trying to develop a sufficient time frame. Pat Johnston said she wasn't sure 30 days will be needed to evaluate consultant responses.

Mark Oberle said he would re-draft the RFQ, including the timeline, and send it out by e-mail in advance of the September 24 meeting. Kathi Wiederhold reminded the team to refrain from e-mail discussions between members and send their comments directly to Mark Oberle, in order to comply with the requirements of the Public Meetings Law.

Debra Smith stated that the EWEB Purchasing Department will look over each proposal and eliminate any that do not meet the minimum requirements, and that they can do this fairly quickly if they have enough advance notice. Nan Laurence said that she would not expect a substantial amount of proposals to be eliminated because most of the applicants are very familiar with the RFQ process and what the requirements are.

Dean Pape' asked if word tracking is the best way is to submit electronic revisions to Mark Oberle. Kathi Wiederhold said that the team's comments need to go to directly to Mark Oberle for compilation, and Jeannine Parisi suggested that team members save their originals.

Dave Hauser asked if the team co-chairs will be in place by then in order for them to work with staff and help shorten the time frame, if the rest of the team is comfortable with that.

After a brief discussion regarding turnaround time for RFQ revisions/comments regarding the next draft of the RFQ, the following schedule was decided on:

Mark Oberle sends out the next draft of the RFQ by end of day, Friday, September 12
CAT sends their comments back to Mark Oberle by end of day, Wednesday, September 17. Mark incorporates the September 17 revisions and sends them out to the CAT by end of day, Monday, September 22

Mark Johnson noted that he will be on vacation for the next two weeks but will have his comments to Mark Oberle by Monday, September 15.

Mary Unruh said she is concerned about establishing the above timeline without input from the three absent team members. Debra Smith said it might be helpful for the team to identify when the decision will be made and then cue all members ahead of time to try to attend the September 24 meeting.

Jeannine Parisi noted that the team hasn't yet discussed the evaluation criteria in a public meeting. It was her suggestion that the team make their decision at the October 8 meeting in order to allow more time to go through the evaluation criteria in a public setting.

Dave Hauser reiterated that he is okay with working from the possible December 15 deadline backward in order to establish a timeline. He wondered if the team could actually select by December 15 or just conduct interviews by then.

Debra Smith noted that the team could possibly shave 6-8 weeks off the schedule but that they need to decide if they want the schedule to be driven by ends or means and, if ends-based, it may result in less or different CAT involvement.

Pat Johnston noted that she believes that the CAT is willing to really dig in and do some work outside of scheduled meetings. Dave Hauser said that he is okay with the RFQ being ends-driven and that he is okay with compressing the time frame as long as it doesn't shorten discussion time.

Mark Oberle noted that he will include a quick look at the evaluation piece of the RFQ when he sends out the next draft.

Kathi Wiederhold asked the team if they wanted to defer agenda item #6 (team process discussion) until the September 24 meeting since three team members are absent. Pat Johnston replied that two members who are present tonight will not be able to attend the September 24 meeting, so she would prefer having the discussion tonight in order to get their input tonight.

Gary Wildish said that in view of the rich discussion that the team has had up to this point, it is his desire to take the scheduled 10-minute break now and then go ahead with the team process discussion.

The team then took a 10-minute break.

6. Team Process Discussion, Continued

The team agreed to contact the three absent members before the September 24 meeting to brief them on tonight's discussion.

Kathi Wiederhold, Facilitator, asked the team for their proposals for a back-up decision making process.

Gary Wildish reiterated his previous proposal, 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 next meeting.

Gary Wildish and Mark Johnson said they agree with the staff proposal included with the agenda materials.

Jeannine Parisi noted that it might be helpful for the team to know how staff wrote that proposal, and briefly explained that process.

Dean Pape' asked what constitutes a super majority. Jeannine Parisi replied that a super majority is a minimum of six members.

CONSENSUS DECISION:

The team agreed with the staff proposal for back-up decision making as presented and that the decision would be finalized at the following meeting when the three other team members were in attendance.

7. Closing Comments and Next Steps

Three members of the team volunteered to update tonight's three absent members regarding the timeline for RFQ review and tonight's back-up decision making discussion.

Dean Pape' will update Tom Hoyt

Dave Hauser will update Desiree Moore

Mark Johnson will update Anita Van Asperdt

Dave Hauser and Mark Johnson requested that the team proceed with electing co-chairs in their absence, at the September 24 meeting.

Gary Wildish asked one of the consultants in the audience if stating a page count limit for the RFQ is reasonable, and what that limit would be. The consultant replied that a page count is actually helpful, and that a common page count is 30-40 pages. Another consultant said that sometimes the size of the RFQ depends on the content of the RFQ, but that 30 pages is a common size. Another consultant said he has seen more compressed versions than that, and that the more specific expectations that are listed, the better it is for the consultant.

Nan Laurence asked the consultants who were present if it is okay to specify paper size (i.e., 8-1/2 x 11”) and number of pages. One of the consultants said that is fine, and that it is helpful if the client is as specific as possible. Pat Johnston also requested that font size be specified for ease of reading.

Mark Oberle said that the details for the September 24 float trip are still being worked out, but that the float trip would happen before the regular meeting, and that the team would meet at EWEB earlier than the usual meeting time, and travel by van to the beginning point and be shuttled back after completion of the trip.

Dave Hauser wondered if the time spent on the float trip might be better spent working on the RFQ process. He said he hopes that there will be sufficient time on September 24 for both the float trip and to accomplish what needs to be done during the regular meeting that will follow.

Jeannine Parisi said that staff continues to compile a list of completed Master Plans from various areas of the U.S. for the team to look over, and encouraged team members to continue to send her any links they may come across. She added that those plans may be placed on line for easier viewing.

Dave Hauser asked if there is a time frame for the University of Oregon architecture professor to speak to the team. Pat Johnston said it is her feeling that this presentation should happen soon in order for the team to come up with questions for the students. Nan Laurence added that the professor would also like the team to produce some other riverfront plans for the students to study. Mark Oberle reiterated that he will contact John Rowell.

Debra Smith confirmed that staff has been given an assignment to try to set the deadline for consultant evaluations to December 15 rather than December 31. Mark Oberle confirmed this. Debra said that in her mind, it might be possible to shave four weeks off the schedule, but not eight weeks.

Mark Oberle added that he and Debra Smith will lead a future discussion regarding team/Board communication, among other items.

Debra Smith mentioned a joint meeting between the EWEB Board and the Eugene City Council scheduled for 12:00 noon on November 19, and said that one of the items for discussion was the master planning process. Jeannine Parisi said it might be helpful for a representative from the CAT to attend that meeting (preferably one of the co-chairs).

Jeannine Parisi said that staff is updating the upcoming meeting schedule and Mark Oberle added that it is his intention to preview three meetings per schedule.

Action Items for Next Meeting:

- (Jeannine Parisi) Compile list of Master Plan examples
 - (Mark Oberle) Re-draft RFQ, including evaluation, for CAT review by Friday, September 12
 - (CAT) Review RFQ draft #2 by Wednesday, September 17
 - (Mark Oberle) Send out RFQ draft #3 by Monday, September 22
 - (CAT) Contact absent members regarding timeline for RFQ review and back-up decision making discussion
 - (Mark Oberle/Jeannine) Confirm float trip information by e-mail
 - (Mark Oberle) Schedule U of O Architecture professor for one of next two meetings
 - (Mark Oberle) Develop RFQ schedule with December 15 deadline (by September 22)
 - (Core Team) Update CAT meeting schedule
- Next Meeting (approx. 5:00 to 8:30 p.m.)
- Float Trip preceding meeting
 - RFQ Draft #3/talk about evaluation criteria
 - Back-Up Decision Making (quick revisit of consensus decision)

The meeting was adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

Next Meeting: Wednesday, September 24
River float/site tour – 5:00 p.m. (meet at EWEB to load vans)
Regular meeting to follow river float – time TBA