

**Campus Land Use Committee
&
RFQ Review Meeting**

January 22, 2007

Attendees: Derek Lathrope, Paul Smith, Rich Davis, Ken Tabbutt, Robyn Herring, Azeem Hoosein, Terry Setter, John Lauer, Sharon Anthony, Kort Jungel, Tim Ernst, Mark Kormondy, and Steve Scheuerell.

Recorder: Rishel Gordham

Introductions

Paul introduced Steve Scheuerell, John Lauer, and Terry Setter as participants in the Campus Master Consultant committee.

Approval of Minutes

Minutes were approved with the change of “too” to “to”. Mark stated that they lowered the hazardous tree that was mentioned in the minutes.

Other items

Paul discussed with the committee the survey that will be completed by Jamie Glasgow of Washington Trout in regard to the proposal of the Snyder Cove Creek Fish Passage design alternatives. Paul stated that the impact is low and Jamie will be working with Rich Davis on this project.

RFQ Review

Each committee member relayed their scores for each firm with one being the highest and ten being the lowest. The scores are as follows:

	Rich	Robyn	Ken	john	Sharon	Steve	Derek	Tim	Mark	Kort	Paul
Opsis	5	4	6	2	5	1	1	2	2	1	5
NBJJ	5	7	8	8	6	8	3	7	7	3	8
ZGF	2	1	4	5	7	6	2	3	4	6	4
Perkin	7	6	5	7	3	4	4	3	1	5	6
SRG	4	2	1	2	2	3	7	1	6	4	2
Sasaki	2	5	3	1	4	2	6	5	5	7	3
EM&S	8	8	7	6	8	7	8	8	8	8	7
Mithun	1	3	2	4	1	5	5	6	3	2	1

	Terry	Totals
Opsis	3	37
NBJJ	7	77
ZGF	1	45

Perkin 5	56
SRG 3	37
Sasaki 2	45
EM&S 7	90 (Removed from discussion)
Mithun 7	40

The committee elected to talk about the firms if they received a score of a 4 or above. Comments were made in regard to eliminating NBBJ. The committee decided to discuss each firm.

Perkins & Will

It seemed they had a commitment to “Green”. They were dedicating two members from their team for 50% of the time. Paul stated that he worked with Perkins & Will on the CAB. He had a hard time working with them to get a final document out. Rich stated that there were some usage errors in the proposal. Ken stated that what their project manager Amanda has never done a Campus Master Plan.

Paul mentioned that no examples of master plans were included in the proposal, only building renovations. Paul stated that their schedule was too optimistic. Sharon stated that if the College has used them in the past and they haven’t worked out for us then we should look at another firm. Ken thought that the statement “one person to speak for Evergreen with executive power” was alarming.

The committee agreed to eliminate Perkins & Will from the list.

Opsis

Ken thought most of Opsis’ experience was with building remodels. All of their examples were of building renovations. He was also concerned that their proposal focused on the Facilities side and they didn’t speak about the campus in the future. A committee member stated that the process they went through in getting stakeholder and faculty involvement could have been done better.

Rich expressed that he hasn’t liked the way they handle meetings in the past. Ken thought that perhaps the scope of this project isn’t high enough to get them engaged. Ken posed the question; if they are doing other big projects does that mean that we will get put on the back burner?

ZGF

Terry felt that ZGF provided a different kind of energy. Terry enjoyed the layout of their proposal and the thought of “new blood”. He liked the idea of bringing in people who are new and excited to work with Evergreen.

Robyn mentioned that they also complete updates; which ultimately means that the campuses that worked with them enjoy and want them to come back. Rich stated that they were quick to point out that it is difficult to find Admissions and other locations on campus.

Paul stated that they have no prior experience with Evergreen and that was the only reason why he didn't score them with a "1". Derek mentioned that ZGF's employees come from diverse backgrounds. Steve stated that their only landscape architect was strongly urban.

Ken pointed out that ZGF's Project Manager, Don Miles, mentioned that he worked with faculty and students at Drake University when completing their campus master plan. Robyn stated that she felt they did a good job and that they came to campus for to walk around and take pictures. Paul mentioned that they were the only firm that reference Evergreen when speaking of the relevance of the other work on other campus master plans.

Sasaki

John Lauer was impressed with what he read within Sasaki's proposal. He thought they have a lot of experience in campus master plans. Paul stated that his concern was; how are they going to serve the campus?

Ken liked that they really looked at the un-built campus educational space planning. It is something that the campus really needs to have done. Paul thought that their consultants looked really strong.

The committee agreed to review and discuss the top four of the five firms.

Mithun

Steve thought that it was interesting that Mithun indicated the concrete buildings are okay and should not be changed. Derek stated that he has experience and they have a strong focus in making everything look really modern.

Ken thought that they had the most campus master planning experience. Ken stated that the thing that concerned him was the in-house environmental planner; Martha Drill seemed to have the least experience.

The committee decided to rank the four highest firms in order of preference. The committee's scores are as follows:

Rich:

- 1 ZGF
- 2 Mithun
- 3 Sasaki
- 4 SRG
- 5 Opsi

Robyn:

- 1 ZGF

2 SRG
3 Mithun
4 Sasaki
5 Opsis

John:

1 Sasaki
2 SRG
3 Mithum
4 ZGF
5 Opsis

Sharon:

1 SRG
2 Sasaki
3 Mithum
4 ZGF
5 Opsis

Steve:

1 Sasaki
2 SRG
3 Mithum
4 ZGF
5 Opis

Ken:

1 SRG
2 Sasaki
3 Mithum
4 ZGF
5 Opsis

Derek:

1 ZGF
2 SRG
3 Sasaki
4 Opsis
5 Mithum

Tim:

1 ZGF
2 SRG
3 Sasaki
4 Opsis
5 Mithum

Mark:

- 1 Mithum
- 2 ZGF
- 3 Sasaki
- 4 SRG
- 5 Opsis

Kort:

- 1 SRG
- 2 Sasaki
- 3 ZGL
- 4 Mathum
- 5 Opsis

Terry:

- 1 Saaki
- 2 SRG
- 3 ZFGF
- 4 Mathum
- 5 Opsis

Paul:

- 1 Sasaki
- 2 Mitum
- 3 SRG
- 4 ZGF
- 5 Opsis

Totals:

Opsis	55
ZGF	32
SRG	26
Sasaki	27
Mithum	40

Paul indicated that he was going to meet with the John Hurley tomorrow to discuss reserves. Paul is hesitant to bring a firm to campus if he doesn't think that they could be a key player. The committee selected the top three firms to interview; SRG, Sasaki, and ZGF.

Paul will try to have the firms come next week. Sharon stated that this time from 3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Wednesday afternoon. The committee agreed on the following times for the interviews: Monday from 3:00 p.m. to 5:30 p.m. and Wednesday from 3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. The committee agreed to develop interview questions via email.

Rishel will locate a larger room and Paul will create score sheets for the interviews.

Smoking Shelter (Rich Davis)

Rich passed around information on smoking shelters. He stated the College has recognized the need for shelters has already designated smoking sights on campus. The shelter that was previously proposed was too expensive. It was \$60,000 per shelter with the design. The same architect came up with the prefabricated shelter which is 16 feet from post to post. The roof cover would be cooper and the beams would be the color “brilliant blue”.

Committee approved the update design of the smoking shelter.

***Next Campus Land Use Committee meeting will be on Monday, February 26, 2007
from 3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. in the Facilities Services conference room.***