



CITY OF NEWPORT BEACH

City Hall Design Committee

Minutes of the City Hall Design Committee meeting held in the Friends Room, Newport Beach Central Library, City of Newport Beach, on June 16, 2008.

1. Call to Order

Members present:

Larry Tucker, Chairman
Andy Bowden, Landscape Architect
Rush Hill, Architect
Walt Richardson, Architect
Stephen Sandland, Architect
Linda Taylor, Architect

Staff present:

Dave Kiff, Assistant City Manager
Steven Badum, Public Works Director
Shirley Oborny, Administrative Assistant

Members of the Public:

Katie Chiki
Laura Dietz
Bill Ficker
Kevin S. Fleming
Ron Hendrickson
Jonathan Lopez
Roberta Jorgensen
Laura Rose
Bernie Svalstad
Richard Tait
Cris Trapp
Karen Tringali

2. Approval of Past Meeting's Minutes

Regarding the minutes from the June 2, 2009, meeting, Mr. Sandland asked that a typo on Page 2, Section 4, Paragraph 4 be corrected. Chairman Tucker abstained from approving the minutes because he was not in attendance at the meeting. The committee approved the minutes.

3. Public Comments on Non Agenda Items

No comments were offered.

4. City Hall & Park Master Plan Project

- **Selection/Recommendation of up to five firms/teams to the City Council for its June 24th 2008, meeting**

Chairman Tucker started the discussion by asking the committee to rank their top five firms. In response to Ms. Taylor, Mr. Badum updated the committee as to the status of the reference checks. The committee agreed that the top five firms chosen would be subject to any remaining reference checks.

After a lengthy discussion, the committee's top five firms were:

- LPA
- Gonzalez Goodale
- Bohlin Cywinski Jackson
- Rossetti
- Johnson Fain

Dougherty and Dougherty was chosen as an alternate.

Mr. Sandland moved to recommend those firms to the City Council with the understanding that because the background check of Bohlin Cywinski Jackson has not been completed, if it came back negative then Dougherty & Dougherty would step in. Mr. Bowden seconded the motion. The entire committee approved the motion.

Mr. Badum, in response to Mr. Hendrickson, said he was the one who updated the Needs Assessment. He said LPA was originally affiliated with it but the primary part of the work was done by Griffin Structures.

In response to an attendee who asked why an interview process wasn't scheduled to narrow the field down from 13 to 5 firms, Chairman Tucker said the committee had previously discussed doing that if needed but the committee so far hasn't expressed the need.

Mr. Hendrickson said a decision should be made to clarify in the Needs Assessment whether the building should be 72,000 sq. ft. or 79,000 sq. ft. because the difference in cost could be significant enough to choose one firm over another. Mr. Hill agreed. Mr. Kiff said he'd pass this information on to the Building Committee to see if they will clarify.

Mr. Hendrickson said that a traffic engineer should determine where the entrance to the City Hall facility should be. Discussion ensued. Mr. Kiff said a link to the City Council presentation about entrance options, including the Council's decision to rule out the Farallon Extension, could be created. He said the amended General Design Parameters are on the website and viewers can use webstreaming to link to the Council meeting at the point where it was discussed. Chairman Tucker felt the language in the Design Parameters was ambiguous pertaining to the Farallon entrance. Mr. Kiff said he would discuss it with the Building Committee. Chairman Tucker said if the Building Committee changes the language, the revised information needs to go to the firms with the other materials.

Mr. Sandland said there is no information on the webpage about the widening of San Miguel. Discussion ensued. Mr. Hill agreed that something should be mentioned about it.

A discussion ensued regarding the letter submitted by IBI asking for reconsideration. Mr. Hill then explained how he rated IBI.

Mr. Sandland said he thinks IBI is a good architect for a school but he didn't believe that school experience compared as well to the capabilities of other firms with city hall experience. They didn't state a firm they were in collaboration with so he took that to mean it wasn't their design. In the designs they mentioned, they didn't reference any discussion on meeting LEED or sustainability requirements. He graded them down on community involvement because they did not state how it was going to be done, whereas other firms provided more details.

Ms. Taylor said she didn't think the committee's overall ranking of IBI was high enough to pull them up into the top five but she thinks their work on campuses is of high quality and some of their project approach was interesting. Mr. Richardson said he had also ranked them high based on knowledge of their past work but he agrees with Ms. Taylor, that IBI's ranking could not overcome the other comments of the group.

Mr. Bowden said he ranked IBI as one of his top 10 firms but the other firms in the top five have outranked IBI. He said they are a high quality firm.

A member of the public said if a committee member has had an unfavorable experience with one member of a firm, she thinks that committee member should excuse himself or herself from making any judgment on that particular firm. Chairman Tucker said due to the nature of this process there will always be some subjectivity although they are trying to make the process as objective as possible.

A discussion ensued about whether there would be an ALTA for the firms. Mr. Badum said all the easements are on the 2007 parcel map. Chairman Tucker said he would be okay with not having an ALTA done if all the easements plotted on the parcel map have been confirmed. In response to Chairman Tucker, Mr. Kiff referenced the latest May 2008 title report on the webpage.

After some discussion, the committee decided they didn't want to relay to the City Council which of the five firms they thought might be more qualified. They felt all firms should now be on an equal playing field.

The committee asked staff to review the confidential financial status of the five firms as well as the alternate firm's.

Mr. Sandland asked whether there should be a kickoff meeting or a question and answer meeting. Chairman Tucker preferred a meeting for questions and answers with a timeline for submitting questions in writing. The committee agreed to meet on July 14th with the questions due on July 11th (NOTE: This meeting was held on July 28th, 2008).

Mr. Sandland asked what will be provided to the firms with respect to the library. A committee member suggested the site plan.

Chairman Tucker said he would send the five firms a letter congratulating them and relaying to them all the information that was talked about at this meeting including the mention of the park component being important. The committee members would receive a copy of the letters

Discussion ensued about what information should be made available to the firms with respect to Mr. Ficker's June 4th memo to the committee regarding design direction. Chairman Tucker felt it wasn't appropriate for this committee to get involved any further with the design parameters. He thinks a world class architect would probably figure out what the City and site are about.

The committee talked about the process of the design presentations. They agreed that all five firms would do their presentations on the same day. Mr. Bowden suggested starting in the morning with three in the a.m. and two in the p.m. followed by the committee's discussion of the presentations. They also felt the other firms should not be allowed to watch each others' presentation. In addition, the public could attend but would not be allowed to ask questions. Mr. Kiff agreed to ask the Building Committee whether the public could make comments after each presentation or at the end of all the presentations and whether they would view the presentations live or televised. Chairman Tucker said the City Council should be invited to attend the presentations, but not to speak about their opinions about each presentation. The committee suggested talking about who from the firms should be invited to attend the presentation, at the next meeting.

5. Adjourned to next meeting

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

#