



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 2, 2008.

1. Call to Order

Members present:

Stephen Sandland, Acting Chairman/Architect
Andy Bowden, Landscape Architect
Rush Hill, Architect
Walt Richardson, Architect

Staff present:

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

Members of the Public:

Katie Chiki
Bill Ficker
Kevin S. Fleming
Ron & Novell Hendrickson
Roberta Jorgensen
Jan Vandersloot

2. Approval of Past Meeting's Minutes

Regarding the minutes from the May 19, 2008, meeting Mr. Sandland pointed out typos in Mr. Hill's name throughout the document. With those corrections, the Committee approved the minutes. The Committee also re-approved the minutes from the April 21st and May 5th meetings.

3. Public Comments on Non Agenda Items

Mr. Ficker said he's concerned with the input this Committee might have overlooked in the program that is presented to the competitors. There are some very substantial elements of the site. When the competitors in this effort are designing they should be all looking at the same program that this community has been studying for the last couple years, both politically and practically. Mr. Ficker submitted a memo to the Committee for their information (attached).

Mr. Hendrickson said his message for the record to the Building Committee is that he feels the Design Committee should definitely be involved in the parameters of design. He also feels it would be a mistake to go with a set of *general* design parameters. He thinks this

Committee will probably receive additional comments and the Committee should augment the design parameters after that.

4. City Hall & Park Master Plan Project

- **Discussion of Responses Received to RFQ**

Acting Chairman Sandland said he was very impressed with the depth and breadth of the submittals received and the Committee agreed with him. He then asked each Committee member to describe their deliberations and the process they used when they reviewed the submittals.

Mr. Richardson said he felt the design was most important to him because he would like to see an exciting, world-class building, not just an ordinary piece of architecture.

Mr. Hill attempted to give nearly equal weight to the building and the park. Within his score sheet he established a breakdown of points he would award if certain elements were present in the presentation. For example, with regard to experience, he looked at their project types with respect to the scope of the project by the size and complexity. He also applied a point system for the rest of the ranking sheet items such as design, park, etc.

Mr. Bowden said he focused on the team's expertise by looking for civic center work or work closely related. He carefully graded the project approach and the design management approach because this Committee decided to grant 30% for the project approach statement. He also looked for specific references to the park component and was surprised how few respondents had much in regards to the park itself.

Chairman Sandland said he started to read about 20 submittals to get a calibration at which time he discovered one firm he considered to be the gold standard and gave it 100%. He then used that to gauge what the other firms didn't have. His key criteria was:

- the number of civic centers of similar size and scope, either built or just planned;
- diversity of the architectural styles;
- unique designs;
- the makeup of the team, their experience, whether the consultant's projects were included (especially the landscape and the park), and had they worked together before;
- clear lines of responsibility;
- principals involved in the project;
- philosophy on sustainability and LEEDs;
- references;
- cost and schedule;
- project approach (specifically community input);
- design management approach;
- sustainability; and
- BIM.

To aid in the process, Mr. Kiff presented a preliminary scatter chart showing each members' scores, summed, averaged and sorted. He asked the Committee to review the chart for errors as they go through the process. He then assisted the Committee by sorting each member's top 10 choices as follows:

Rush Hill –	38, 6, 15, 23, 11, 25, 51, 14, 18, 45
Andy Bowden –	23, 51, 30, 24, 44, 50, 45, 19, 9, 6, 18, 46, 27
Stephen Sandland –	51, 8, 50, 6, 42, 20, 24, 21, 18, 23
Walt Richardson –	(four-way tie between 31, 9, 30, 44), 51, 50, 20, 43, (five-way tie between 6, 42, 12, 1, 41)
Linda Taylor –	9, 51, 1, 27, 29, 44, 35, 50, 19, 16

Chairman Sandland said that all decisions made tonight are subject to a review to make sure all the numbers are correct. Mr. Hill added that the only decision tonight will be which firms to do reference checks on.

The Committee deliberated for the rest of the meeting and narrowed the firms down to their top 13 choices:

- 51 – LPA
- 6 – Gonzalez Goodale Architects
- 9 – Bohlin Cywinski Jackson
- 18 – Rosetti Architecture
- 23 – DMJM Design
- 50 – Dougherty and Dougherty
- 24 – NBBJ
- 27 – Bauer and Wiley
- 19 – Johson Fain
- 20 – Studios Architecture
- 42 – Arquitectonica
- 14 – Carrier Johnson
- 21 – Gensler

Chairman Sandland said for those Committee members who withheld points for the reference checks, they will need to recast those elements after the reference checks are completed.

Mr. Kiff said he needs the Committee's final recommendations by June 18th to prepare for the June 24th City Council meeting. The Committee agreed they would like to receive the feedback from the reference checks by June 13th in order to meet on June 16th at 6:00 p.m. to narrow it down to five firms.

Mr. Ficker requested the *City Hall Design and Park Master Plan* banner be changed to *City Hall in the Park Design Competition* because it might convey it better. Mr. Badum responded that it was the name the City Council decided on.

Chairman Sandland said he would like the Committee to think about whether they want the final five firms to meet with the Committee at the same time for a question and answer session.

Regarding the reference check questions, Mr. Hill said he'd like to know whether the buildings functioned, if the firms stayed on schedule, whether the clients would hire them again, were there any design or engineering team members they were not pleased with and whether they would recommend the City of Newport Beach consider this firm as their lead architectural firm. Chairman Sandland suggested asking if the proposed sustainability was achieved.

5. Adjourned to next meeting

The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

#