WRB Design Enhancements Panel
Meeting #5– SYNOPSIS [DRAFT]
Wednesday, July 29, 2009
Midtown Arts Center
5:30 p.m. to 7:15 p.m.

Panel Attendees: Eric Gunderson, Bob Kline, Annie Loe, Vicky Mello, Randy Nishimura, John Rose, Scott Wylie
Absent: Charlotte Behm
Staff: Don Kahle, Facilitator; Megan Banks; Douglas Beauchamp; Larry Fox; Justin Lanphear

Bob shared that the panel meetings have been interesting with such diverse professions and styles of thinking/processing information. The panel has discussed most of the issues and understands it needs to get to decisions or assign people to make decisions.

Don stated that the goals for tonight's meeting included: 1) review the decision points to be made, beginning with the 33 items of the back page of the agenda; 2) determine what strategy to use for unmade decisions; and 3) leave the meeting with a decision or a strategy for every item. Don stressed that it was important that the panel be making these decisions.

The panel went through the list on the following page and noted whether an item was a yes, no or maybe. No's and maybe's, noted in bold, were then discussed, or will be discussed, by the panel. An answer is provided in brackets if appropriate. A couple more unanswered questions were brought up by Don along the way.

	Yes	No or Maybe (discuss)
1. Phased (two-part) contracting, OK?	✓	
2. Second phase not guaranteed, OK?	✓	
3. Will there be three bundles?	✓	
4. Do we know what will be included in each bundle?		✓
5. Do we know how money will be allocated between bundles?	✓	
6. Do we want to share budget priorities within each bundle? *REVISED TO YES AFTER PANEL DISCUSSION*	✓	✓
7. Will we have a plan if the budget numbers shift along the way? *REVISED TO YES AFTER PANEL DISCUSSION*	✓	✓
8. Will there be 3 RFPs issued (not one with 3 parts)? *REVISED TO READ: There will be one RFP with 3 parts.*	✓	
9. Will you consider a single respondent to do all 3 RFPs?	✓	
10. Have the lead discipline(s) for each been identified? *DECIDED: We won't state a lead discipline at all.*	✓	✓
11. Will we identify minimum discipline(s) for each team? *DECIDED: We won't require any but we'll state preferences.*	✓	✓
12. Have we identified those discipline(s)? *DECIDED: We will suggest an artist, landscape architect, and architect.*	✓	✓
13. Will we accept only responses from teams? *REVISED TO YES AFTER PANEL DISCUSSION*	✓	✓
14. Do we know when those teams must identify all team members? **[In proposal]**	✓	
15. Do we have a desire (and strategy) for "plugging in" individuals? *DECIDED: We'll encourage individuals to find a team or come to the pre-proposal meeting to try to get plugged in.*	✓	✓

16. Will the RFPs be longer than normal, and convey generative ideas? *REVISED TO READ: The RFP will convey generative ideas.*	✓	
17. Will an RFP with an artist as lead be configured differently? **[No]**	✓	
18. Will the RFPs each be public and distributed all the same? **[Yes]**	✓	
~~19. Will we invite all comers (and not favor locals)?~~ *#19 TEXT DELETED AND #20 BELOW REVISED*		
20. Will we invite all but include a scoring element that favors locals? *REVISED TO READ: We will invite all comers but limit advertising to Oregon include a scoring element that favors local leads.*	✓	✓
21. Do we know how (and who) will distribute the RFPs? **[OBEC]**	✓	
22. Have selection criteria been clearly defined?		✓
23. Has the scoring of RFP respondents been settled?		✓
24. Will you interview only finalists (not all, and not none)? *REVISED TO YES AFTER PANEL DISCUSSION*	✓	✓
25. Do we know who will write interview questions and by when?		✓
26. Do we know who will attend and ask questions at the interviews?		✓
27. Do we know who will plan pre-proposal meeting and by when? **[OBEC]**	✓	
28. Have you settled how you will be a resource to the chosen ADTs?		✓
29. Will the DEP as a resource be only as the group (not individuals)?		✓
30. Will the tribes be identified as resources to ADTs (not only stakeholders)? [STAFF WILL ASK THEIR PREFERENCE]		✓
31. Will Esther be identified as a resource specifically? David Lewis? [STAFF WILL ASK THEIR PREFERENCE]		✓
32. Will the Millrace historian be a resource – do we know when and how? *REVISED TO YES AFTER PANEL DISCUSSION*	✓	✓
33. Are we having fun yet?	☺	
34. Will it be called an RFP, RFQ or Invitation to Artists/Designers?		✓
35. Will the teams be called ADT or LDT?		✓

Don asked the panel to identify any "low hanging fruit" no's/maybe's that could be resolved quickly. #24, #15, #19, #20, #13, #6, and #7 were discussed and decided.

Vicky confirmed that the panel would see/review all the submissions.

Bob asked for clarification of what local meant—Oregon? John added that in his review of the minutes, he thought the panel had narrowed the eligibility to Oregon. Don added that advertising could be limited to Oregon but still could have scoring weighted to local teams. Vicky discussed keeping it as local as possible.

The panel confirmed that the Lead would need to be local but the team, however large, could be from other locations. Larry added that there really isn't enough budget for large teams.

Vicky noted that the pre-proposal meeting allows individuals to partner with teams. Scott responded that he doesn't want to shut the door on a visionary solo artist/designer.

Randy revisited the material reuse bundle element, proposing that it be at the discretion of the teams to decide where it goes; it should not be assigned a budget number. The panel concurred. Don proposed that the panel spend time refining and clarifying the language of the bundle elements. The panel agreed to meet and added this as an action item.

Eric stated that we could encourage multi-disciplinary teams but not specify. Larry added that the RFP could include language such as "it is anticipated that disciplines such as artists, architecture, landscape architecture, etc. will be needed." Justin added that if the spirit of the RFP is to have diversity and artists part of the team, low scores will reflect a lack of diversity.

Don confirmed that at the RFP level, team members and their qualifications need to be listed out. However, the panel agreed that the lead discipline and minimum disciplines do not have to be specifically identified or required.

Justin and Larry shared that a retired Army Corps of Engineers engineer will be writing a summary of the millrace that documents engineering and functional history of the millrace. This information will contribute to the interpretive signage. An initial report will be ready in late September, although there is also a public process where local history and information on the millrace is solicited from the community.

Don suggested that the team could draw from the millrace historian or Kalapuya resources that are available. Bob asked if Esther or David had anything written that might be usable. What about information on the early settlers? Justin offered that the UO and other local resources are available and it would be a good idea to include those with the RFP. Bob asked who might pull that list of resources together and the panel agreed staff should.

Don suggested that a subcommittee be formed to help Scott's effort to better answer #4 ("Do we know what will be included in each bundle?"). Randy and John agreed to help Scott by e-mail.

Don noted that addressing items #22-#23 and #25-#26 are interrelated. Bob volunteered for a subcommittee to go carefully through the suggested list of criteria and the scoring matrix. Charlotte and Eric were added. Annie also agreed to work on this.