

**WRB Design Enhancements Panel**  
**Meeting #7 – SYNOPSIS**  
Thursday, August 27, 2009  
Midtown Arts Center  
5:15 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.

**Panel Attendees:** Charlotte Behm, Eric Gunderson, Bob Kline, Annie Loe, Vicky Mello, Randy Nishimura, John Rose, Scott Wylie  
**Absent:** None

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

**Observer:** David Sonnichsen

**Minutes:** Pam Swenson

Don reviewed the goals set out in the Meeting Agenda.

**Recap of Pre-proposal Meeting**

Randy thought that the meeting went well and that there was a good turnout. He added that the nature of project, economic times, and the obvious interest was evident by the diversity of all disciplines that attended: artists, architects, landscape architects, and engineers. He thought that the questions raised were all very good, and that everyone seemed to understand the intent of the RFS and what is to be achieved. The more technical questions were asked by those who would be most eligible to be a lead. Randy said he saw the recap of questions that Don sent out, and they are all there; although we may get more. He thought it was good that Annie and Bob were present as observers. Randy added that he believes the meeting was consistent with other RFP pre-proposal meetings he has attended; and that it was professionally handled, as would be expected. He is hoping that the level of interest will be reflected in the proposals.

Larry said that couldn't add much to what Randy said, except that he was overwhelmed by the turnout and noted that many stayed after the meeting to network and discuss teaming. He thought the meeting was helpful; it did repeat some of the things from the RFS but gave the attendees an understanding of how they would fit into design team and with stakeholders, etc. It provided an opportunity to explain how design teams are going to be cohesive and how they will work together. Randy brought up a question that had come up in the meeting as to whether members could be added to the design team after the design process is underway. Larry answered that it is certainly something that may happen, especially with artists. Larry also indicated that this process has given him an appreciation of the public agencies and what they go through and how difficult it is to host an RFP process. He appreciates everyone on the panel and what they will be dealing with; and that they are doing a good job, especially since this is new to many.

Bob thought that Larry and Randy did a great job with the Powerpoint presentation. All points were covered well as were the questions and answers. It was all done very

professionally and the response was overwhelming, but that those in the room were not daunted.

It was noted that the question/answer period was fluid. Larry said that was because they don't have all the answers and that things develop as the process proceeds. Putting artists and designers in a situation of working together as a team is a new thing and not quite done this way before.

Annie agreed that Larry and Randy provided a great summary of the RFS, and that she thought the attendees were comfortable with the information provided and were eager. She thought that the diversity of the people at the meeting and the questions they brought up was an indication of how the process will function and how people will come together.

Douglas wondered if the Powerpoint presentation could be made available to all those on the RFS holders list. Larry thought that should be a DEP decision. The DEP agreed it should be sent.

Don wondered if there was a resource to make available to potential leads that provided a list of artists who may have not yet responded to the RFS or ad. John added that he did not know of any such resource. Douglas indicated that it may be problematic to an artist if they have nothing to do until phase 2 of the design; after the design teams do their work, reach a design solution.

Larry wondered if there was something missing, something that could be added. Randy said at the meeting it was made clear about the difficulty of knowing artists and who to put on the team. He doesn't believe that a team would be successful in phase 1 without an artist. It was learned during the design workshop that having artists involved changes the design concepts; and that the marriage of designers and artists is important.

Currently, most artists will learn of the project via word-of-mouth. However, Bob believes that the designers/leads should utilize the web to find lists of artists they might be able to bring on board their teams. Douglas indicated that Artists NW is a resource that could be used to identify qualified artists who have been through this type of process before and could refer the designers to appropriate artists.

Vicky wanted to know if the DEP was going to get a copy of the questions/answers from the pre-proposal meeting. Larry and Randy both indicated that they wanted the DEP to understand the questions; and after the DEP reviews them, it would be determined whether or not an addendum to the RFS would be needed. Larry said from what he heard/read, he does not believe an addendum will be warranted.

Bob wants to be proactive to be sure people are given leads as to whom they should contact, if possible. The group is reminded by Don that the time frame for this RFS is super compressed and the best way to help interested parties is to flood them with all resources possible that might otherwise take them days to gather. This would show that the DEP is willing to help them succeed. Don wants to get together with Douglas to send out information.

Scott brought up that the group has talked about teams a lot and sizes of teams and wondered if there was any underlying standard that relates how closely knit or loosely

bound a team is to be. He notes that many artists see themselves as loners, so he wondered if there is any value for them to say what a team is to them or just leave it as an open-ended question. Since the DEP is not going to get involved with the internal dynamics of a team, it would probably be best to leave this issue alone. It might be that the notion/word "team" may be somewhat alien to artists that might be wonderfully involved but not into teaming. He believes they should be advised to just "go with it as their baby" and include as part of a proposal, or some teams might be working side-by-side daily. The DEP needs to make sure all the elements for artists or artists types are as encouraging as possible to make sure that there isn't anything that is terribly intimidating to their creative process.

Larry spoke up and said that the group has deliberately not been highly prescriptive of a team or how their team members are involved. There should be an expectation that they could be led by a landscape architect, an engineer, or even an artist. The group is looking for creative responsiveness.

Charlotte agreed with Scott in that it appears that something beside the artists is in a team. She thinks that the DEP needs to be careful what message they are putting out, to be proactive in stating/recognizing that an artist can be a team. She believes things are moving very quickly and this may not be understood. Charlotte is also concerned that artists may believe they cannot be a lead because they don't have the proper insurance, etc.

Don asked the DEP if they would like a statement sent to RFS holders directed specifically at artists reminding them a team could be a team of 1, and that there was no reason a team couldn't be an artist. Randy added that it is more about the process than the qualifications.

Scott brought up the fact that everyone has an internal model of what they believe a team really is. Some like a "Wal-Mart" model or others do not like working together. There should not be any fixed idea of what a team is or how the people work together in/on the teams. As long as that is clear, it makes it more open to people who are more accustomed to working by themselves to actually be able to work with people and still come up with something themselves. In today's language usage, a "team" is a charged word, it is a "bunch of people."

Don asked that Charlotte and Scott work on something together that could be sent out to people to explain that concept. Scott and Charlotte agreed to work on this. Douglas reminded all that it needs to be kept simple and to stand by what is said in the RFS. Any sharp lead is going to know how to find artists, and interested artists will know how to find the leads. You have to give them the benefit of the doubt. However, Larry felt that anything the group can do to get out additional material – web links, resources – would be beneficial since they (especially artists) are being asked to do something unusual.

Don requested that Scott, Charlotte and Douglas self-organize and create something to be sent out in a package to the RFS holders (particularly artists). They agreed to do that.

### **Operating Agreements**

Don opened this topic by asking if there was anything in the Operating Agreements that anyone wanted to revisit or refine. No one responded that there was anything specific

that needed to be addressed. Don reiterated that all must feel safe within the group, but that as a staff member he felt it was up to the panel to contain inappropriate communications within the panel. Don acknowledged that this was an awkward situation, but important, and why diversity within a group can be difficult.

Scott believes the group should be in tune and be able to recognize the first point when something is uncomfortable, and that the environment should be such that the issue could be brought up right away. Vicky added that everyone on the panel needs to be respectful of others' points of view and try to understand that we all come from different perspectives or fields of expertise. Don offered to be a resource if anyone wants to discuss something that didn't set right with them; he could help to discuss and correct the problem.

Charlotte believes people are missing the point and she feels it would be more productive to discuss if Jamie was present to facilitate. Don said that he will contact Jamie, and check with Larry and Dick Upton to see if they could meet off line about the problems.

Larry believes that there is just confusion about the process of the DEP. At this stage of the RFS, no one is being asked to design anything. The DEP is only looking at qualifications of teams/leads. This project is still going to be designed by the "village." The DEP is not taking away control from anyone/group. The teams will work with all stakeholders regarding the design.

Don will contact Jamie about this and believes there is sufficient time to get this resolved before the RFS responses are evaluated.

### **Interview Strategies and Questions**

Don and Larry both indicated to the DEP that the scoring process can be very time consuming, but that the group was bound by scheduling and must commit to the time involved to do a good job scoring. They are also bound by the wording within the RFS as they develop the final scoring criteria. Bob added that the scoring will become public records once the selections are made and teams are under contract.

Don added that his proposal was a first draft and that development was not final. Input from others is important, and reminded that there are differences in interpretations and understanding although most of things are put under the project understanding and approach categories. What is important is that there is a clear understanding of what the words mean, so that the RFS language is used for the coding and scoring. It should be a fairly "sanitary" matrix. Larry reminded the group that teams may be proposing on only one bundle, so that it was important that scoring was based only on what bundle is applicable. Douglas wanted clarification that if a team proposed for all bundles, whether each bundle was scored individually or if they were scored for everything at one time. It was determined that the scoring would be by bundle.

Charlotte brought up the interview process and questions, and whether they will be required, especially since it is not known in advance what will be submitted. Don thought it would be most fair to develop the questions and guidelines for the potential interviews ahead of time for fear that they would otherwise be customized to those responding. He added that all interviews do not have to be identical or run the same way, but that there

should be a general outline to use so that the DEP operates at a high level of fairness. Larry promotes the DEP developing a laundry list of potential questions, which will enable them to work from a middle-ground perspective, but adds that in cases where two teams are close in the competition it is helpful to ask questions that may be specific to the individual teams because you may get a different perspective and/or answers that would help in the decision process. Plus, he adds, each of you may have questions that you would like to ask, and that meeting people face to face can give a better idea of how people will work together.

Don again addressed the scoring matrix. He said he will continue to help developing the questions and scoring matrix. He believes it is the staff's role to facilitate the development of the scoring matrix and to provide as much information as possible for the panel to use to move forward with the process. The staff does not want to control, but to give means for panel to finalize the matrix. Larry reiterated that the process is time consuming and that not knowing how many proposals are expected makes it difficult to set aside appropriate time, remembering that each interview would take about 1 hour and that there may be 2 to 3 interviews per bundle. The panel needs to understand the time they will be obligated to for this process – reading each proposal, scoring, interviewing. That time has to be built in to meet the deadline.

Other ideas regarding scoring process continued to be discussed by group, but will be ongoing. Don will continue to put together a time line for the process.

Don recapped that Scott, Charlotte, and Douglas will get together to develop a statement to help artists understand their potential roles in the teaming process.

The meeting adjourned at 7:03.