

WRB Design Enhancements Panel

Meeting #8 – SYNOPSIS

Wednesday, September 9, 2009

Midtown Arts Center

7:35 a.m. to 9:00 a.m.

Panel Attendees: Charlotte Behm, Bob Kline, Annie Loe, Vicky Mello, Randy Nishimura, John Rose, Scott Wylie

Absent: Eric Gunderson

Staff: Don Kahle, Facilitator; Megan Banks; Douglas Beauchamp

Absent: Larry Fox; Justin Lanphear

Don introduced the meeting and asked if there were any changes to the agenda. There were none.

Proposals

Don stated ten respondents submitted proposals: Seven want to be considered for all three bundles; two want to focus on Bundle 1. One wants to focus on Bundle 3 and none submitted for Bundle 2 only.

He added that after his quick review of the cover letters, five respondents said they would take any or all bundles; one didn't address it and one would prefer all the bundles.

He noted that the panel would be able to review them after they finalize the scoring criteria.

Don added that the proposals were very impressive—great artists, diverse disciplines as leads, and overall variety. He gave kudos to Randy for strongly encouraging artist participation at the pre-proposal meeting since the proposals reflected this.

Don asked that panel members not overinvest in the specificity of a proposal but instead think about “what could this team do?” Randy reiterating that a respondent who prejudged how the project/process may work/proceed could work against them. Don added that some provided resumes while others started to solve problems. The panel's goal should be to figure out who the respondents are and how they could work together. He reminded the panel to be aware of their own perceptions—the panel has been charged with the whole of design and the whole of community.

Don added that the exception to the above was that all stakeholders are not created equally. Many care “about” (stakeholders) while others care “for” (caretakers.) Charlotte and Vicky have been conveying this to Don. ODOT maintenance is another example of a caretaker.

Don asked for a straw poll of panel members as to how many teams they think would be ideal to engage. The results were one vote for one team, three votes for two teams, three votes for three teams and one question mark.

Bundle Three

Don stated that one element of Bundle 3—the Camas field—could potentially be a stand alone design element. Depending on how respondents address it, this could be an opportunity to pull it out as an adjunct. The panel would still review that element but could be more of a community project.

Scoring Criteria

Don distributed scoring criteria for people to review. Don asked if the synthesis fairly reflected the input from Charlotte and Vicky. Charlotte responded that she thought he had done a good job. Don asked that no scoring be in half points.

Charlotte stated that she thought it was important for Scott to pre-read the proposals as the Bundle 2 champion. She added that those elements that are important to the park such as vandalism, dark park, existing plans, etc. have been listed. She noted this because even though something in the proposals may be very beautiful, it may not be fit within the existing plans.

Score Card

Don explained the score card. He added that with the “rounds” approach allows influences during each review cycle to be tracked.

Don clarified that round 1 begins as individual to each panel member and round 2 is for scoring after panel members have reviewed bundle champions’ input. Some panel members may prefer to skip round 1 and wait until they receive bundle champion input. Round 3 will be completed after the panel meets and discusses the proposals Monday evening (if necessary). Don added that round 4 allows a week of “due diligence” before scoring again.

Don handed out a sheet on Edward DeBono’s “PMI.” When reviewing proposals, the panel can note +/-/interesting. Double +/- should be used sparingly. This allows further narrative and discussion for panel members that might not have been captured with scoring number.

Next Steps

Don said the goal for Monday, September 14 is a short list of finalists. Rounds 3 & 4 will be available if needed.

Don reminded the panel that their first round of scoring is due Sunday, September 13, 5 p.m. and should be e-mailed to Don. Panel members may also call him directly.

Charlotte confirmed she and Vicky will send something to Don and Megan by 9 a.m. Friday although they are not sure what form it will take yet.

Don will revise and send the scoring criteria and score card to the panel, along with the RFS, Q&A, Addendum and Clarification.

Interview Questions

Don observed the questions were very close to where they needed to be.

September 14 Meeting

The meeting start time was moved to 4:45 p.m., LCOG.

Next meeting time and place: September 14, 4:45 p.m., LCOG

Follow-up and Action Items

- Don to revise scoring criteria and score card and e-mail to panel, along with items noted above.
- Bundle champions to send input to Don and Megan by 9 a.m. Friday, September 11.
Don and Megan to send this information out by noon Friday, September 11.
- Panel to review proposals and send scores to Don by 5 p.m. Sunday

September 9, 2009 Handouts:

- *Draft Scoring Criteria (two sheets Don)*
- *Draft Score Card (Don)*
- *Edward DeBono +/- interesting sheet (Don)*
- *Evaluation Criteria and Interview Questions for Bundle 3 (Vicky and Charlotte)*

LCOG: C:\DOCUMENTS AND SETTINGS\CLPL023\LOCAL SETTINGS\TEMPORARY INTERNET FILES\OLK53\DEP MEETING #8 SYNOPSIS 090909 FINAL.DOC Last
Saved: October 13, 2009