

WRB Design Enhancements Panel
Meeting #3– SYNOPSIS [DRAFT]

Tuesday, July 7, 2009
Lane Council of Governments, Willamette Conference Room
4:55 p.m. to 6:30 p.m.

Panel Attendees: Charlotte Behm, Eric Gunderson, Bob Kline, Randy Nishimura, Vicky Mello

Absent: John Rose, Annie Loe, Scott Wylie

Staff: Don Kahle, Facilitator; Megan Banks; Douglas Beauchamp; Larry Fox; Justin Lanphear

Eric observed that the ideas are from February and we needed to hurry up then. The question at hand is do we need to go through significant refinement to issue RFPs? Bob echoed the sentiment. It may involve breaking into subcommittees. Randy also acknowledged that some of the listed deadlines have already passed. Don agreed that time was of the essence. He asked how the group wanted to proceed. Don added that: 1) the panel needs to decide whether one or more teams will be hired to do the whole project and that team will then refine the specifics about the bundles; and 2) whether the bundles need to be refined or they are okay to send out as is.

Bob added that he thought it was our responsibility to narrow and establish the top bundle priorities. If have sufficient money in the budget, can add non-priority items back in. Randy added that he thought we should keep as many items as possible on the list to strengthen and create a “place.”

Randy asked how a team would assemble itself if it doesn’t know the bundle elements. For example, would there be a sculptor? Eric added that these specialized skills are more relevant for artists than architects and landscape architects, who often pursue work without knowing project specifics.

Douglas added that we are still floating around. When he worked on the draft RFP in May, he came up with the idea of phasing. Phase 1 would include the design fee for the team, which could be determined by panel. For Phase 2, the design team would come back with implementation proposal and budget. This allows the design team time to talk to staff and stakeholders. The panel would then look at the proposal and make modifications as needed.

Don emphasized it does more of what the Construction Management/General Contracting (CM/GC) does—collaborative approach as the design team works with panel to refine bundle elements.

Charlotte championed Bob’s proposal of working in subgroups since it might be a good solution to meet diverse needs. Douglas said that OBEC was refining the RFP and that is would be a good idea to review the panel’s priorities from last week’s panel meeting. For example, 10 people mentioned budget.

Bob stated that the process needs to start and stay focused. Bob said he believed it was the panel’s obligation to give the design teams some clues about community priorities. Bob noted that the budget also dictates what can be done. Realistically, probably not able to do everything.

Larry suggested that the group not get hung up on budget numbers, especially for bundle 1. For example, for the sound wall, both sides are not being enhanced. Larry noted the concern about the division of money between the bundles.

Don acknowledged that artists do things differently and could possibly pull out certain items. For example, the median sculpture or bridge lighting could be pulled out from the bundles and separate contracts could be generated.

The group discussed where the tribes interpretive area might be located.

Don added that the model now is to interact now, identify constraints and respond to learn more with each iteration. Don asked the best way to talk about the iterations and to come Friday ready to discuss.

Vicky added that she would need to understand what/where better for the discussion Friday.
By clarifying the matrix, some of that background is provided.
The panel and staff gave their first iteration to Bob and he offered to compile the results.