



Mirror Pond Siltation Project, Phase 1A
Bend, Oregon

Management Board Meeting

MB Meeting: 02

Meeting Date: 03.29.11 @3:30-5:00 PM

Bend Parks and Recreation Admin Conference Room

MEETING MINUTES

Attendees

- David Rosell
- Chuck Arnold
- Mel Oberst
- Ryan Houston
- Tom Greene
- Mike Olin
- Don Horton
- Bill Smith
- Angela Jacobson
- Leslie Olson
- Gina Dahl
- Michael McLandress

Welcome and Introductions

Progress Report

Outreach to federal agencies continues to take place to obtain expertise, support, and long-term funding moving forward

- Delegation-joint letters regarding Bureau of Reclamation support complete and sent by steering committee (add that the joint letters were completed to request Delegation's support in asking for Bureau's support in funding and research, etc...)
- Bureau of Reclamation contacted locally for support
 - Michael called Scott Bowman in the local Bureau office to start this process
 - Michael advised they have technical expertise and can hopefully help defray costs
 - Michael will arrange a meeting with Scott to discuss Mirror Pond interests
- Army Corp of Engineers-Water Resource Development Act of 2011 (WRDA) application submitted to get foot in the door for future ear marks that may be available
- Don discussed recent meetings with staff from Senator Wyden's and Merkley's offices
 - The staff supports the application process to the Army Corp and will also provide a staff person to be assigned to research possibilities
 - Don was very encouraged by the outcome of the meetings
- Ryan suggested taking up conversation with the Bureau of Rec's larger office in Boise

Scope of Services-Consultant for Alternative Analysis

- As part of his tasks, Michael (with the help of others) reviewed the Draft Scope of Services as part of the "Moving Forward" document completed in 2009 , and an outcome of doing this was the determination that by looking at alternatives, the budget of \$500,000 could possibly be reduced, but by very little
- Michael said it will be hard to reduce the budget when certain federal regulations still have to be met to obtain federal funding
- Reviewing the scope of services and hiring a consultant (via request for proposal) will lead to a better idea of what the project will really cost

Request for proposal

- RFP for Consultant is being drafted. Draft has been sent out for review to the steering committee and management board
- Ryan asked whose legal structure will be used to administer the consultant contract
 - Michael has asked all steering committees to take the RFP to their own legal counsel for review; therefore it could be a combination of legal structures
- Regarding the issuance of the RFP and the administration of the contract, the Steering Committee has all decision-making authority, and will manage the contract and the budget. Bend 2030 is just the fiscal agent and will issue the contract
- Michael sees the RFP going through a public RFP process since it is public money
- Who has liability? This should be developed in a memo of understanding (MOU) between Bend 2030 and the Steering Committee members
- Chuck asked if anything is driving a deadline to get started besides the deadlines Michael created, Michael advised no other major driving factors
- RFP schedule:
 - Consultant services for alternative analysis

- Phase 1 – baseline conditions determined and community engagement , 4-6 months
 - Hopefully the baseline conditions can be somewhat determined by evaluating historical documents online, which should be available soon
 - Phase 2-evaluating alternatives, 8-12 months
 - Phase 1 timeline (tentative):
 - Advertising-April 7th (this will be extended in order to review draft and put historical documents online)
 - Proposals due-May 19th
 - Proposals evaluated-May 20th through June 22nd
 - Award Phase 1-late July
 - Phase 1 completion-January 2012
 - Phase 2 to begin after Phase 1 is completed, contract modified for Phase 2, and when ready to move forward
- Don voiced concern regarding funds, advising they should be in place before moving forward
 - It was clarified that money would indeed need to be available for Phase 1 before it begins (the amount needed should be known once proposals are received)-Tom recommended having a budget number together by the end of May in order to give time for Council review before new budget cycle begins
 - If money not available for Phase 2, it will be delayed, which will be conveyed as a possibility in the RFP
 - It will also be conveyed in the RFP that there could be a significant delay between phases, and that if for some reason it is decided to not move forward, the contract can be cancelled
- Because of so many stipulations, it was suggested that a mandatory pre-proposal meeting take place with all consultants and the management board (and/or steering committee)
- The goal of phasing was to get started, that way Phase 1 can begin even if money is not yet available for Phase 2
- Mike Olin asked where money would come from for implementation of the project
 - There is federal funding available if the project qualifies, but those options will not be known until alternatives are determined

Outreach

- Once consultant is on board, more public meetings will take place
- Bend 2030 Website
 - Michael will be updating a website with information and links back to the City of Bend
 - Ryan asked about where people can go to obtain baseline conditions and such, since they will be asking for this info when developing their proposals (baseline conditions)
 - Michael and Ryan will get together to get data needed and make it available online, before the RFP goes out (hopefully a page could be attached to RFP with

this information). It would still up to the consultant to research what is available and provide additional studies if necessary to complete the baseline conditions

Next steps after RFP issuance

- Consultant review and selection
- Funding availability for Phase 1 scope of work to take place, PM tasks 5,6,7
- Consultant contract issued (pending funding)
- Start Phase 1 (pending funding)

Key Dates

- Next MB meeting June 28th (tentative)

Q & A and General Discussion

- Mike Olin asked what would happen if community wants to do nothing
 - Don explained that as part of the alternative analysis, one of the alternatives for review has to be do nothing, that way there is something to compare the other alternatives to and the community can see what doing nothing would mean
- It was asked who decides on selecting an alternative
 - This is not known yet, but there will be many aspects to consider when determining how it will be selected
 - Angela commented that the community wants to know that a process took place for this, and that nothing was decided on a whim
 - Ryan commented that sometimes the most expensive alternative could be more likely to obtain federal funds
- Bill Smith advised that money should be put aside for future sustainability of the pond, so that there is not a scramble to obtain funds when a need comes up again
- David asked the purpose of the management board
 - Bill Smith stated the management board is a standing focus group, providing feedback and suggestions for the project
 - Although steering committee makes decisions, consensus is needed from the management board

Adjourn

Submitted by:

Brightwater Collaborative, LLC

Michael McLandress

Project Manager

Mirror Pond Siltation Project