

EWEB Riverfront Master Plan Community Advisory Team (CAT)

Wednesday, October 8, 5:30-7:30 p.m.

EWEB Board Room

Present: Dave Hauser, Tom Hoyt, Mark Johnson, Patricia Johnston, Desiree Moore, Dean Pape', Mary Unruh, Anita Van Asperdt and Gary Wildish, members; Mark Oberle, Jeannine Parisi, Carolyn Weiss, and Kathi Wiederhold, EWEB Core Team; Debra Smith, EWEB staff; Vicki Maxon, Recorder; Charles Biggs, Kevin Matthews, Whit Perkins, John Rowell, and Ellen Tenny, public.

1. Welcome, Introductions and Agenda Review

Mark Oberle welcomed the group and briefly outlined the agenda. He added that before tonight's meeting, staff had discussed that expected meeting outcomes would be reviewed at the beginning of tonight's meeting and at future meetings to help the group accomplish the expected meeting outcome while staying within time constraints. He then briefly reviewed the expecting meeting outcomes for tonight's meeting.

2. Comments from the Audience

There were none.

3. Approve September 24, 2008 Minutes

The minutes were approved.

4. Partnership with University of Oregon Architecture Class

Mark Oberle introduced John Rowell, Professor of Architecture at the University of Oregon. Professor Rowell handed out a list of case studies that his students are working on and briefly discussed each one. These case studies will be presented to the EWEB CAT on Wednesday, October 29.

Anita Van Asperdt said she is pleased that the students are also studying planning documents for the various case studies because it aids them in understanding public involvement, the leverage between public and private entities, and how the entire planning process plays out.

Professor Rowell noted that the various contacts the students have interacted with have been very generous and have allowed the students a great amount of access.

Anita Van Asperdt added that she is taking 24 students to the Ijburg (Amsterdam) residential project next summer. She noted that Ijburg is not along a river but is a former sea. She said she would e-mail Professor Rowell a list of planners in the Ijburg area whom the students can contact for additional information.

Dave Hauser said he has a conflict on October 29 and wondered how he or anyone else who can't attend the meeting can view the students' presentation. Professor Rowell replied that a Powerpoint presentation has been done and that there will also be a binder of information available for each project. He added that he plans to compile a list of relevant items that are discussed at the CAT presentation.

Dean Pape' commented that he will be interested in how the adjustment in the construction market has changed the Portland south waterfront project. He added that his company opened the Discovery Center and built two buildings there. Dean gave Professor Rowell his contact information and asked him to urge the students to contact him for more information.

Tom Hoyt thanked Professor Rowell for the upcoming case study presentation and added that it will be very helpful to the CAT.

Professor Rowell said that the presentation will also be a great opportunity for his students to get experience but reminded the CAT that they are still learning. He added that his graduate students are especially tenacious and are always looking for more research.

Tom Hoyt said that someone he had talked to had recommended going to Bend, Oregon to see what they have done along the Deschutes River. Professor Rowell said he was aware of that project and had a student who was interested in going there.

Mary Unruh asked if all of the students' case study sites have been completed. Professor Rowell replied that the Portland South Waterfront is a work in progress although the master plan has been completed. He added that his students are also going to research projects in Sacramento and Washington, D.C. He invited the CAT to a studio presentation that has been scheduled and noted that the student's mid-term review is on Monday, November 3. He added that he can schedule team members to attend the mid-term review if anyone is interested.

Dean Pape' asked if the students are interested in assisting the CAT with the riverfront master plan project. Professor Rowell replied that the students have already started that process and that they have each chosen a building or a block of EWEB property and will develop that next term.

5. Team Process Discussion (Continued)

Kathi Wiederhold, Facilitator, briefly reviewed what the CAT has agreed to so far regarding team process and asked if there are any questions about the previously discussed back-up decision making process. There were none.

CONSENSUS DECISION:

The team adopted the back-up decision making/trigger process previously discussed at the September 10 meeting.

Kathi Wiederhold then went over a handout on optional ground rules regarding the behavior and participation of members that was drawn up from other consensus groups she has participated in. She asked for comments or questions.

Desiree Moore commented that it seemed a bit late to be adopting these ground rules after almost two months of meetings.

CONSENSUS DECISION:

The team adopted the optional ground rules as listed on the handout.

Kathi said she would incorporate all the team process items that previously have been adopted into an updated version of the ground rules and distribute it in the next few weeks.

6. Consultant Request for Qualifications (RFQ)

Mark Oberle told the group that he met with the EWEB Purchasing Department earlier today and that they had told him that an RFQ serves to narrow the field for the consultants' qualifications, but that a Request for Proposal (RFP) will still need to be done. He explained that there are two ways this can be accomplished: 1) the RFQ document can be converted to an RFP by adding a few paragraphs that discuss specific proposal boiler plate language and more specific information deliverables; or 2) the existing RFQ can be retained and the bids evaluated, the field narrowed to a short list, and then an RFP is developed and sent to those finalists. He added that without a proposal, it is difficult to discuss contract specifications, because some of the pieces are missing.

A lengthy discussion ensued regarding how the RFQ schedule would be affected by either scenario and the required contents of each type of document.

Gary Wildish commented that it helps to understand the difference between the two documents. He explained that an RFQ isn't as detailed, where an RFP is more detailed regarding rates, the consultant's expectation, and a budget for what the consultant anticipates the project will cost. He added that the RFP process would add a bit of time to the schedule but would address additional dollars and cents issues.

Mark Oberle said that whether the RFQ and RFP are combined or not, both have to be completed before the contract is put together and presented to the EWEB Board for approval.

Pat Johnston said it is her feeling that it wouldn't take much more work to turn the RFQ into an RFP. She said she is concerned about adding a lot more time to the schedule and that she agrees with Gary Wildish.

Dean Pape' noted that an RFQ is usually just a blanket statement of qualifications but that he feels that the RFQ for this project is already a lot more detailed than usual. He added that he feels like some of the information normally contained in an RFP has already been included in this RFQ.

Dave Hauser said he is also concerned about the schedule being negatively affected and that, in his opinion, this RFQ is already very close to an RFP.

Gary Wildish reiterated his opinion that the existing RFQ could easily be turned into an RFP without much more work. Anita Van Asperdt agreed.

Mark Oberle noted that in his opinion, the Deliverables and Evaluation Criteria need some additional paragraphs, but that the EWEB Purchasing Department is very impressed with what the CAT has already written.

Mary Unruh commented that since the CAT has already done so much work on the RFQ, it would be her desire to extend the schedule a bit to accommodate the time it would take to add the necessary information to turn it into an RFP.

Mark Oberle asked if the team is willing to change the current schedule from 45 days to 60 days in order to allow time to develop the RFP. Pat Johnston said it is her feeling that the consultant presentations will take up most of that time. Mark agreed that an RFP creates more work for the proposers and is a big step on their part.

Gary Wildish commented that an RFP will also put more onus on the proposer to take the time for a site visit but that, from his experience, that can be done within the same time frame as currently scheduled.

Pat Johnston reiterated that she wants to make sure the RFP makes clear that the CAT needs input on the public process that the consultant is proposing.

Mark Oberle asked for consensus from the group to revise the current RFQ into an RFP.

CONSENSUS DECISION:

The team agreed to change the current RFQ to an RFP with additional work needed on the Deliverables and Evaluation Criteria sections.

Tom Hoyt said he is concerned about finding out what the EWEB Purchasing Department is going to propose before going any further in the revision process. Mark Oberle replied that the purchasing manager has agreed to work with staff and the CAT on this and that there will be no steps backward. Mark added that he will be on vacation for the next week and needs a couple of team members to work with the purchasing manager on the revision pieces.

Debra Smith, EWEB Employee, Customer and Community Services Division Manager, said that in light of the fact that she was previously the EWEB purchasing manager and is now the sponsor of this project, she will be happy to take this on while Mark is on vacation. She noted that the biggest differences will be in the boiler plate language. Dave Hauser and Pat Johnston volunteered to help Debra.

The group then took a 15-minute break.

After the break, Mark Oberle asked for questions/comments regarding further revisions to the RFQ/RFP.

Sections 1-5:

Anita Van Asperdt wondered about a 30-page limit instead of 40. Pat Johnston added that the page limit doesn't include appendices, resumes, etc.

CONSENSUS DECISION:

The team agreed that Sections 1-5 are ready as is to be sent to the EWEB Purchasing Department, with the exception being the schedule portion.

Section 6:

Mark Oberle asked if the team is comfortable with the point allocation in Section 6 or if they want to reserve the right to allocate points later. He added that at the last meeting it seemed like the team was asking for more emphasis on Design Excellence and he revised that point total.

Gary Wildish wondered if the team feels that project management is less important than the other items listed. Dean Pape' said he believes project management is crucial to the entire project. Pat Johnston said she would be inclined to cut points around project and team experience.

Section 6.01.4:

A brief discussion was held regarding the definition of "mixed use" development and the different interpretations of that term. Anita Van Asperdt suggested changing the terminology to "mixed use buildings."

Mark Oberle replied that the EWEB Board had discussed that and their concern was that mixed use might mean that all uses have to occur in one building.

Section 6.01.6, Quality of Submission:

CONSENSUS DECISION: The team agreed to remove Section 6.01.6 and to revise the points for Project Management from 10 to 20 (because of the removal of Section 6.01.6).

Section 6.02, Interviews:

Dean Pape' asked if this section can be stripped from the RFQ and be sent only to those proposers who are invited to interview. Mark Oberle replied that the first two paragraphs of Section 6.02 are still required in the RFQ but that further breakdown of that section (i.e., the point allocation) may be given only to the proposers who are invited to interview.

Dave Hauser asked if the RFP requires that the points be published. Mark Oberle replied that the points can be eliminated from the initial RFQ, but the proposers who interview will need to see them.

CONSENSUS DECISION:

The team agreed to eliminate Sections 6.02.1 thru 6.02.4 and develop the interview topics and points later in the process, to be given only to the finalists.

Mark Oberle asked for any final concerns regarding revision of the RFQ/RFP.

Dave Hauser said that he and Pat Johnston will work with staff to revise the schedule and be the sounding board for comments or questions.

Pat Johnston reiterated that she feels more time is needed for the interviews, but wondered if it is possible to reduce the contract negotiation time.

Mark Oberle replied that it is possible, but noted that included in this time frame is staff time to develop the packet for the EWEB Board, which is due one week ahead of the Board meeting. He added that the Deliverables section is the one that needs more development.

Debra Smith said that she, Dave Hauser and Pat Johnston will meet with the purchasing manager on October 9 or 10 and make some decisions on schedule revision. Dave Hauser said he thought this would only require one more meeting, and Gary Wildish agreed that there wasn't much more to do.

Anita Van Asperdt reiterated that Section 6.01.3 needs to clearly state the CAT's involvement in the public process.

7. Calendar Update

Mark Oberle told the group that Pat Johnston, Dave Hauser and staff had met to look at the upcoming meeting schedules and agendas.

Dave Hauser said he is concerned about meeting time being spent watching the Ed's Coed DVD since it is 75 minutes long. He wondered if that could somehow be condensed to 10 or 15 minutes.

Vicki Maxon, Recorder, recalled from previous minutes that it might be possible to get copies of the DVD from Bob Hart so that each team member could watch it at home. Dean Pape' volunteered to contact Bob Hart to see if copies can be made and distributed. Dean also offered to edit a copy of the DVD to capture only the portions that show the millrace for viewing at a future meeting, if the team desires.

Carolyn Weiss asked the team what issues they would like her to include in a future CAT presentation relating to parks, the millrace and the river. She noted that she recently gave a general presentation to a studio group that lasted just short of one hour. She said her current plan is to give a tour, a brief history of the project from start to finish, and to review any planning work that has been done, whether or not it relates to the EWEB property.

Anita Van Asperdt said she is interested in any connections between the courthouse neighborhood and the millrace. She said the current courthouse configuration doesn't show much evidence of any connection.

Pat Johnston said she had spoken to Terry Colvin at the City of Eugene, and that he said they have put some thought into making that connection but that it is not a viable project yet. Pat added that it would be nice to hear from any engineers or landscape architects who have done that work, but that that may be premature because the design team hasn't been chosen yet.

Mark Oberle noted that he views this type of information as background information which increases the CAT's education about possible issues that could come up during the process.

Dean Pape' said that he is honestly more concerned about utilities and easements on the property than the millrace.

Dave Hauser said he realizes that there are volumes of information out there that would be nice to hear about, but he feels that the CAT needs to spend their time on issues that are relevant to their work.

Desiree Moore noted that the CAT has brought up the millrace at every meeting, so obviously there is an interest in that topic and a need for more information. She thought an overview would be helpful.

Gary Wildish said that the millrace might be a problem if it's open, i.e. any odors that may be present, but that it would be nice to know what contributes to the flow of the millrace, i.e., whether it is possible to adjust the flow. He said that the original intake was upriver but is probably not there now. He added that if the flow can be controlled, it might be more useful for the public to enjoy, but if flow is stagnant with street runoff, he would think differently. He wondered if that information was available.

Anita Van Asperdt asked if that would be something the design consultant could figure out.

Mark Oberle said that a lot of detail wouldn't be needed but there is value in getting background information on all of these points. Pat Johnson reiterated that the millrace could be a major element and she would like to have that information.

Mark Johnson wondered if the millrace will be part of the master plan requirements. A general discussion ensued. Dave Hauser asked the team if there would be value in a 30-minute overview of the millrace for the October 22 meeting, and there was general agreement with the suggestion.

Mark Oberle noted that there is very brief mention of the millrace in the Background and Deliverables sections of the RFQ/RFP, as suggested by Desiree Moore.

Dean Pape' commented that it might be too early in the process to go into detail about the millrace, and that possibly it should wait until the consultant is on board.

Anita Van Asperdt said she feels strongly that the consultant needs to know up front that the millrace has been referred to as "technically and financially impossible" to manage.

Gary Wildish agreed that it has been mentioned enough that any consultants who are not local need to realize its dimension.

Mark Oberle guided the team back to the calendar discussion. He reminded them that the University of Oregon School of Architecture students will be presenting their case studies on October 29. The presentation will be at EWEB, room and time TBA.

The team briefly discussed developing the consultant selection process at the October 22 meeting instead of finalizing it, and finalizing the selection process at the November 12 meeting.

Mark Oberle noted the November 19 joint meeting at 12:00 noon with the EWEB Board and City Council and asked if Dave Hauser or Pat Johnston could attend.

Finally, the November 19 CAT meeting will feature a presentation of the EWEB property title report by Boyd Steele at Cascade Title, who is very aware of encumbrances on the site. Mark Oberle added that there are many interesting historical references on the title report.

8. Closing Comments and Next Steps

Tom Hoyt asked if he could have 10 copies of the 11x17 aerial photograph that appears in the RFQ/RFP so he can share it with people in the community when he asks them for input. Dean Pape' said he would like an electronic copy. Jeannine Parisi said that an electronic copy will be e-mailed to each team member and that additional hard copies will be made for Tom Hoyt.

Dean Pape' told the team that he was recently in Burlington, Vermont and viewed a waterfront redevelopment project that was done in 1991 and added to in 1998. He said Burlington is smaller than Eugene but that it is a university town. He added that he has brochures and photos that he will share with the team.

Mary Unruh thanked Dave Hauser and Pat Johnston for their wordsmithing work on the RFQ/RFP. Vicki Maxon, Recorder, added that she will spell check, format check, and read over the final version of the RFQ/RFP before it goes to the EWEB Purchasing Department.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

Next Meeting: Wednesday, October 22, 5:30 to 7:30 p.m.
EWEB Board Room