

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

Wednesday, September 24, 6:45 to 8:15 p.m.

EWEB Board Room

Present: Tom Hoyt, Patricia Johnston, Desiree Moore, Dean Pape', Mary Unruh, Anita Van Asperdt and Gary Wildish, members; Nan Laurence, Mike Logan, Mark Oberle, Jeannine Parisi and Carolyn Weiss, EWEB Core Team; Vicki Maxon, Recorder; Rajiv Batra, Bob Hart, Kevin Matthews, Bob Siegmund, Ellen Tennity and Christian Watchie, public.

Absent: Dave Hauser and Mark Johnson

1. Welcome, Introductions and Agenda Review

Mark Oberle welcomed everyone and briefly previewed the agenda for tonight's meeting. He apologized for the float trip being canceled due to weather, and noted that another way to view the riverfront from the east side of river would be from the portion of the bike path that runs through Alton Baker Park.

Tom Hoyt said that he will be volunteering to retrieve rubber ducks from the river after the Great Rotary Duck Race on Saturday, October 4, and that any team member who would like to assist in that effort would be able to see the riverfront.

Mark Oberle told the team that the greater portion of tonight's meeting will be spent going over the schedule and evaluation criteria for the RFQ, with the majority of that time spent on evaluation criteria. He added that after staff reworked the RFQ schedule which was discussed at the September 10 meeting, they realized it will not be possible to select the consultant by December 15.

Jeannine Parisi referred the team to the agenda planning handout and briefly went over the proposed schedule.

Pat Johnston asked if the millrace study to be presented at the October 22 meeting was based on the analysis conducted by the City of Eugene. Nan Laurence replied that it was a team effort that she and Carolyn Weiss, from Parks & Open Space, participated in along with Public Works Engineering staff. Carolyn Weiss commented that she would confirm that these aspects were covered, and Jeannine Parisi said that the team could always schedule a secondary, more detailed discussion on the Millrace if desired.

Pat Johnston asked if the EWEB property could be added to that presentation. Carolyn Weiss said she would feel more comfortable if it is.

Tom Hoyt voiced objection to changing the CAT meetings to the first Wednesday of the month because he has a conflict. Jeannine Parisi replied that staff is still reworking the November meeting schedule due to the Thanksgiving holiday. A brief discussion ensued, with members present suggesting the second and third Wednesdays for November meetings.

Pat Johnston asked about the closing date for the RFQ in relation to when the team would receive copies of the proposals. Jeannine Parisi replied that the closing is November 26 at 2:00 p.m., and that electronic copies of the proposals will be made available later that afternoon.

The team then discussed the timing for getting together to select applicants for interviews, noting that the proposed meeting date of Wednesday, December 3 poses a conflict for Tom Hoyt. Jeannine Parisi said that staff will provide an evaluation matrix for members to rank each proposal individually.

In regard to Section 1.04, Schedule of Events, the team briefly re-discussed the meeting schedule and how canceling the first December meeting will affect the rest of the schedule because of the week required to conduct interviews. Mark Oberle said it may be possible to delay the EWEB Board presentation until February 3, 2009.

Tom Hoyt noted that he prefers a tighter time frame in which to interview consultants so that he can better remember the details of each interview. Gary Wildish agreed and said that if it was necessary to adjust the schedule to accommodate a tighter time frame, he would be fine with that.

Jeannine Parisi asked if the team is comfortable with meeting within a week after receiving the electronic copies of the RFQ. The team said they were, and Gary Wildish noted that doing so would allow them to be completed with the evaluations on or before December 5. Jeannine Parisi replied that staff will schedule a meeting some time during the week of December 1.

Desiree Moore asked if staff has an idea of how many RFQs will be submitted. Nan Laurence said she estimates between 12-15. Mark Oberle commented that based on e-mail and phone contacts he has already received, it may be more like 20.

Pat Johnston said that she prefers to receive hard copies of proposals because they are easier to review. Gary Wildish agreed. Mark Oberle said he will make at least nine hard copies available for pick-up at EWEB in the late afternoon of November 26.

Desiree Moore asked if it is possible to wait to schedule the first meeting in December until after the number of proposals is known. Mark Oberle said that it is, but that tentative meeting dates should be identified beforehand. Jeannine Parisi added that staff wants to give the applicants some certainty about the interview schedule, especially if they need to travel from out of state.

Anita Van Asperdt said that she would like to add a mandatory site visit to the RFQ because of the complexities of the property, and that it is her feeling that EWEB will receive many more responses if this is done. Tom Hoyt agreed.

Pat Johnston said that it is her feeling that the burden is on the applicant to make a site visit on their own without it being mandatory, and that making it mandatory may exclude some applicants, especially those from out of state.

Gary Wildish said that he feels the complexity of the site should be explained in the RFQ and that a site visit would be advantageous, but not necessarily mandatory.

Anita Van Asperdt reminded the team of when they took their first site tour and how much more complex the site was than it appeared in maps and photos.

The team agreed to revisit this discussion later in tonight's meeting, after Dean Pape' arrives.

Pat Johnston noted that she talked to John Rowell, professor of the University of Oregon School of Architecture, today about his students' upcoming presentation to the team. She said each team of students will visit a site similar to EWEB's and make an assessment, and then submit a list of questions to the CAT. There will be 14 students presenting seven case studies, which will take approximately 10 minutes each. Mark Oberle added that he has also talked to John Rowell and that the student presentations are tentatively scheduled for the October 22 meeting.

Mark Oberle then asked if the team would be willing to schedule a separate meeting solely for this presentation. After a brief discussion, the team agreed to schedule a meeting for Wednesday, October 29 solely for the School of Architecture presentation.

## 2. Comments from the Audience

There were no comments from the audience. The following is a synopsis of comments to the CAT from Zachary Vishanoff, submitted electronically.

- Please consider a slide show presentation by City of Eugene preservation expert Ken Guzowski regarding past happenings near the EWEB site.
- If the public is adequately involved in this process, most of the EWEB property will become a vast riverfront public park for all to enjoy.
- Place a three-ring binder (available for check-out) near the entry door at all CAT meetings containing everything the team has done so far
- Place a stack of handbills near the entry door, listing the dates of future CAT meetings.
- Create a seat on the CAT for a local citizen to demonstrate an inclusive culture honoring diversity and to enhance planning.

### 3. Approve September 10 Meeting Notes

Regarding the RFQ discussion described in the September 10 meeting notes, Desiree Moore asked how the EWEB Purchasing Department decides if the RFQs meet the minimum requirements. Mark Oberle replied that Purchasing staff insures that all elements of the RFQ meet the established evaluation criteria, but they do not perform any type of evaluation.

Desiree Moore then asked if any applicants for a RFQ who haven't met the minimum requirements have ever challenged the Purchasing Department's decision to eliminate them. Mark Oberle replied that it is rare that a proposal of this type is eliminated.

Jeannine Parisi added that it is possible for staff to ask the Purchasing Department for a list of the rejected proposals and the reason they were rejected, to share with the CAT.

Mary Unruh moved that the September 10 minutes be approved. Gary Wildish seconded the motion.

### 4. Debrief Float Trip

The float trip was canceled.

### 5. Consultant Request for Qualifications (RFP)

The team reviewed staff's most recent revision of the RFQ. Mark Oberle asked for further revisions and/or comments.

Anita Van Asperdt requested that a site visit be required as part of the RFQ. Mark Oberle replied that he would prefer to set up a single date for a site visit and that it should be very soon after the RFQ closes. There was some discussion on whether the site visit should be described as "mandatory" or "strongly recommended" in terms of the text within the RFQ.

Desiree Moore said she is concerned that proposers who do make a site visit will have an edge over those who do not when each proposer is evaluated. Gary Wildish commented that in his experience within his company, proposers will seek out what they need in terms of knowledge of a site. Desiree added that she is still concerned that proposers from out of state won't logistically be able (because of time constraints or scheduling) to do a site visit vs. proposers who are local, and that EWEB may end up with a large pool of proposers who have easier access to the site than others.

Anita Van Asperdt said that proposers from out of state will connect with a local company who does have knowledge of the site and that will serve both parties well.

A consultant in the audience commented that some companies conduct a pre-proposal conference to cover these types of things, or include wording in the RFQ that requires mentions experience with and understanding of the site.

Pat Johnston noted that most often consultants work within a team that is made up of different professions and that someone within that team will most likely be local and can attend the site visit.

Mary Unruh commented that if she were reading an RFQ and a site visit was termed “highly recommended,” she would make a point of doing a site visit. It was agreed to make a site visit available to proposers.

Nan Laurence asked if “development value of the property” was mentioned anywhere in the RFQ.

Mark Oberle asked for a quick straw poll on whether or not the team thought the draft RFQ was close to being final, with just minor revisions needed, or if the team needed substantive changes before approving the document.

A few team members responded that they thought it was very close to being final but that they had a few more minor revisions to make. Mark Oberle said he would do another revision and send it out to the team for electronic review. He added that maps and photos were going to be added to the final RFQ to make it a more attractive package.

Anita Van Asperdt asked that a list of website links and any other resources that would be helpful to the proposers be added.

Desiree Moore wondered if staff could add a page that describes the site in more detail along with a few photos, which may further encourage proposers to realize how important it is to do a site visit.

Bob Hart told the team that he had some historic photos of the millrace and could probably produce some digital photos from them.

### **Section 7.03 - Roles and Responsibilities:**

Pat Johnston asked if there is anything in this section regarding who the consultant will report to during the project, i.e., names of EWEB staff contacts, etc.

It was noted that the RFQ mentions that the final product will be approved by the EWEB Board, but the a team member wondered if City Council approval should also be mentioned. Mark Oberle explained that the Master Plan is not sent as a lone document, but packaged with many other sections, and that the entire package will be sent to the City Council at a somewhat later date.

Tom Hoyt noted that he likes to compartmentalize the 27 acres into various areas and asked if there was some way those areas could be identified by name, because it will be difficult to tell one area from another on a map. Mark Oberle replied that identification of the various areas will be done at some point, but reminded the team that the RFQ is not asking for proposals for the site, just qualifications.

Tom Hoyt added that it seems to him that, for example, RFQ language regarding riparian sections vs. language regarding the Midgley Building will have to at some point be defined.

### **Section 1.01 – Purpose:**

Mark Oberle said that this might be a section in which to talk about the role of the consultant. He wondered how specific the RFQ needs to be regarding an architect since building design is not part of the RFQ.

Pat Johnston read to the team her suggested revision that described seeking a “multidisciplinary team” as opposed to a firm, which members agreed is a good change.

Desiree Moore asked if this might be a good place to include the language regarding collaboration. Jeannine Parisi noted that she thought that the collaboration piece might belong as the fifth subsection under 2.01.1, Experience. Desiree said it is her desire for the collaboration piece to be included where it would get the strongest mention.

### **Section 2.01.1 – Experience:**

A discussion was held regarding the language in the first sentence of this section as it relates to experience with completion of a waterfront redevelopment plan. After verbage suggestions from several team members, it was decided that a subcommittee of Gary Wildish, Pat Johnston and Desiree Moore would meet with Mark Oberle to make further revisions to this section and the remainder of the draft RFQ.

### **Section 6 – Evaluation Criteria:**

Mark Oberle led a brief discussion regarding weighting of points and whether project experience should carry a higher amount of points. He added that his intent is to a) capture the right wording; and b) get the point value correct.

Pat Johnston wondered about 6.01.1 Project Experience and 6.01.2 Team Experience being so similar. She noted that nowhere in that section does it mention project staff, fees, or design excellence.

Mark Oberle suggested that the term “fees” be changed to “rates.” Gary Wildish agreed, noting that qualifications are not fee-based. Nan Laurence commented that she has not seen points associated with fees in previous RFQs she has been involved in.

Anita Van Asperdt suggested adding a criteria of Design Excellence.

Pat Johnston wondered if experience with sustainability should be put into the evaluation. Dean Pape' noted that the term "sustainability" has many different definitions. Pat Johnston added that she felt the definition of that term should be made clear in Section 2.01. Mark Oberle said it is his feeling that, for this project, sustainability means balancing economic, social and environmental issues.

Jeannine Parisi suggested renaming Section 6.01.3 Project Understanding rather than Project Approach, and possibly including the collaboration piece in this section, so that this section would contain three subsections—public engagement, sustainability and collaboration. Nan Laurence suggested wording to the effect that the consultant shall have experience working in a collaborative setting and have the ability to involve the community in a collaborative approach.

Jeannine Parisi asked for consensus regarding adding a criteria called Design Excellence, structured similar to the language in the sample RFP that Pat Johnston had provided. She suggested that Section 4 be renamed to Project Management and that a new section with a small number of points for "Rates" be added. The team concurred.

Dean Pape' asked if the points for Team Experience can be used to better understand who will actually be managing the project and working on the team.

Gary Wildish said it is his feeling that the consultants who interview should be the people who are actually going to be working on the project, and not someone from, for instance, a corporate office that is out of state. A brief discussion ensued regarding the definition of experience (both individually and collaboratively). Anita Van Asperdt added that the team can ask for a list of specific team members and what their roles are.

Jeannine Parisi asked if the group had decided to retain Project Experience and Team Experience as separate categories that would indicate past project experience and design/technical expertise and the ability to collaborate with others as the main criteria. The team agreed.

A brief discussion ensued regarding the criteria "location of firm" and assigning points for physical location of the consulting firm (i.e. local or out of state). It was decided to use the term "Local Familiarity" and not assign points based on geographic location.

Mary Unruh asked about incorporating a piece regarding experience with designing a project incorporating visual arts and historic, interpretive signage. Dean Pape' asked what the code regulation is for incorporating public art into a project. Nan Laurence replied that 1% must go to public art and that she would like to include both visual arts AND public arts in the RFQ. Mark Oberle said it is his feeling that Section 2 would be the appropriate section for that piece.

Tom Hoyt concurred with adding experience in visual and artistic design, i.e., experience with displays and also with proposing recreational opportunities. Dean Pape' wondered how that would be implemented into the Master Plan since architects may not have experience with that. Mark reminded the team that it would not be the actual design piece, but the space reserved for that design. Pat Johnston noted that Tom's point was a good one and that the consultant will need to consider the best places in which to tell the story.

Desiree Moore added that all the design points should be included in that piece—educational, historical, etc.

Due to time constraints and remaining agenda items, a subcommittee of Mark Oberle, Gary Wildish, Pat Johnston and Desiree Moore agreed to meet on Friday, September 26 from 2:00 to 4:00 p.m. to further revise the RFQ to incorporate the above discussions. Anita Van Asperdt added that she had some additional revisions and would e-mail them to Mark Oberle.

#### 6. Team Process Discussion, continued

This discussion was postponed until the October 8 meeting due to time constraints.

#### 7. Elect Officers

In light of three team members being absent at the September 10 meeting, Mark Oberle reminded the team that Pat Johnston and Dave Hauser were nominated as co-chairs.

Desiree Moore wondered if the team should establish a term limit in case of an elected officer's need to step down for any reason or to establish an opportunity for interim check-in. Jeannine Parisi suggested a 5-6 month interim check-in, possibly after the consultant is hired. The team agreed to a six-month interim check-in for the two elected officers.

Dean Pape' moved that Pat Johnston and Dave Hauser be elected co-chairs. Desiree Moore seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

## 8. Closing Comments and Next Steps

A brief discussion was held regarding the process for handling e-mail messages from the public to the CAT and how to share those messages with the general public. Dean Pape' said he was concerned that some public comments would not become part of the record if distributed electronically and, for purposes of transparency, suggested that the EWEB website have a section for people to add comments. Jeannine Parisi said that this would cause staffing problems, as someone would have to monitor content. She instead suggested that staff could print any e-mail messages received from the public and distribute them at the meeting. Further discussion regarding this process was postponed until the October 8 meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

**Next Meeting:            Wednesday, October 8, 5:30 to 7:30 p.m.**  
**EWEB Board Room**