Description: The Development Planning Workshop is an interdisciplinary and participatory course in development planning focused on a specific new or adaptive reuse development project of regional significance. Acting as a group development team, or in separate development teams, the class will produce a Development Plan or Plans intended to contribute realistic solutions to important issues of public policy as expressed through definable public-private development projects. The course is offered through the interdisciplinary Center for Real Estate based within the PSU School of Urban Studies & Planning and SBA in its effort to collaboratively join professional resources within the metropolitan urban community in urban, economic and sustainable development, urban design and architecture, market analysis, finance, brokerage, management and law. Students, professors and guest mentors will
be planners, developers, architects, contractors, economists, bankers, brokers, lawyers, public servants and journalists.

Each Development Plan will be complete including [1] an executive summary, [2] development concept, [3] development program, [4] market analysis and plan, [5] conceptual design, [6] public-private development agreement, [7] deal structure, [8] economic analysis and model, [9] capital and operations budgets and [10] a management plan. Where feasible, the design component may be done in cooperation with a design studio class from Portland State University and/or the University of Oregon Architecture Program in Portland. Visiting developers and architects and others will also assist and critique the class’s Development Plan(s). Unlike the first two terms in Real Estate Development Planning I and II, students will usually lead class working sessions, under guidance of Professor Macht and visiting architects and developers. Presentation and critique of the completed development plan in a presentation session or the competition will substitute for a final examination.

**Development Workshop History:** This is the 14th of the development planning workshops conceived as the capstone to the urban development curriculum and applying all of the skills learned, mixed with creativity and imagination, tempered by the need to produce feasible development plans.

**Coliseum:** The 1st development planning workshop in 2002 devised four different, feasible plans for adaptive re-use of the Coliseum, including [1] a 650-room convention Headquarters Hotel within the glass structure; [2] a 540,000-square-foot Sustainable Technology Center housing up to 2,000 jobs in energy and environmental technologies; [3] a retail Urban Home Center anchored by IKEA and EXPO Design Center or [4] a Memorial Arts Center housing Portland ballet, opera, symphony, drama and film institutions along with an 80,000 square-foot commercial broadcast center, 10-screen Cineplex, 10,000 square-foot arts and music bookstore and a 15,000 square-foot terrace restaurant overlooking the Willamette River and downtown Portland.

**Pioneeer Square Ice Rink:** The 2nd workshop produced several alternatives to the ice rink proposed for Pioneer Square. The team concluded that a seasonal ice rink was not economic and would not stimulate retail activity in the manner wished by its proponents. It offered more economic alternatives including more universal uniform evening and weekend operating hours and free or discounted parking at those hours as well as programming of other public spaces, such as the World Trade Center atrium.

**Seattle Boeing Plant:** In the 3rd workshop, students attacked the redevelopment of the 2 million SF Boeing plant in South Seattle with plans for boat production and storage, air taxi and other small aircraft design and manufacture, shipping container recycling as building blocks for modular multifamily housing, office and industrial uses and a regional federal center in the former office headquarters.

**Seattle King St. Station-Qwest Field North Lot:** The 4th workshop produced a transit-oriented redevelopment of the 6.5-acre parking lot between King St. Station and Qwest Field in Seattle with a plan for 1,100 workforce housing condominiums, 540,000 square feet of class A office space, a 200-room limited-service hotel, in a full service environment, 60,000 square feet of restaurant and retail space all surrounding a 5-acre urban park as an extension of 4th Avenue on top of a 2,400-space parking structure for it and Qwest Field.

**Columbia Crossing(s) & Quayside:** The 5th developed cost-effective approaches for bringing light rail and arterial traffic across the Columbia River and improving the existing I-5 Bridge while removing impediments to maritime shipping and rail transit. The workshop team also developed a gridded plan called Quayside for 50 acres of the downtown Vancouver waterfront, including redevelopment of a 26-
acre Boise Cascade paper mill, adding up to 4,800 middle income housing units and a half-million SF of waterfront retail and office space around a series of seven urban waterfront parks.

**Seattle Waterfront Elliott Bay Lofts:** The 6th workshop developed 285 middle-income urban lofts for echo boomers and single baby boomers over 19,000 SF of restaurant and retail space on a waterfront block adjacent to the downtown Seattle retail, office and cultural core. By re-using an existing parking garage with an innovative strategy of long-term leasing, the team increased density to over 345 units per acre, doubled the value of the parking structure in a transit-friendly way, and produced the first LEED Gold-rated residential high-rise while returning over 19% return on cost and 35% on equity. The PSU team won the competition prevailing over the Universities of British Columbia, Washington and Washington State.

**Urban Center East:** The 7th workshop formulated a redevelopment plan for 7 of the 9 blocks between 3rd and 6th Avenues and Harrison and Market Streets. The workshop developed a plan to build 2.6 million SF including 1,850 housing units most of which were workforce housing and 47% of which were priced at under $250,000; a Montgomery Row centrally managed retail center of 280,000 SF; flex and condominium office space totaling 279,000 SF and a 133-room hotel in a mixed-use condominium, office and retail complex. The plan was supported by a 2,568-space underground shared parking facility under 4 city blocks to be built by the private sector and purchased by the PSU Foundation using tax-exempt parking revenue bonds. PSUF ownership and management, at the lowest capital costs and operating expenses, generated $1.6 million annually in net cash flow plus another $1.6 million annually in ground rents from leasing the parking structure roof for private development. The plan also developed a 413,000 SF Portland Center for Urban Technologies [PCUT] with 211 high-tech classrooms, a 600-seat circular auditorium divisible into four 150-seat lecture halls, a broadcast center, a 142,000 SF flex space incubator for companies started by creative class, urban professionals applying urban technologies in energy, transportation, parking, urban design, development, planning, health, security, justice, communications, privacy, governance, etc. The plan raised the tax base from $26 million to over $890 million producing tax revenues of over $18 million annually on a PDC investment of $13.5 million.

**Seattle Downtown King County Administration Building:** The 8th was the fourth NAIOP competition in which the team transformed a dated 6-story 220,000 King County Administration Building which housed 500 workers into an efficient 12-story 340,000 building that can house 1,800 employees in a naturally lighted, LEED Gold-rated structure. By choosing to rehabilitate rather than demolish, the team was able to save the County at least two years in time, more than $30 million in costs on an occupancy cost neutral basis compared to current outlays. This was achieved through space efficient modular office systems, leased space cost recovery, employee consolidation savings, sub-leased revenue, relocation cost savings, replacement cost and demolition savings and development cost savings using a special purpose 63-20 development entity.

**University Place:** The 9th workshop was a redevelopment of the 4-acre University Place hotel site owned by PSU. The workshop formulated a development plan that transformed the hotel into a 180-room extended-stay educational conference center more than doubling its conference space to 21,000 SF plus glazing its courtyard to create a 3-level atrium for conferences, theatrical performances, college convocations and an expanded jazz club/bistro. The plan also added 1200 units of innovative student housing built from shipping containers at a cost of $44,000 per unit each of which support over $100,000 of debt. Sustainable re-use of containers was also a focal point for forming an inter-collegiate and inter-disciplinary residential Federated College of Urban Sustainability (FOCUS) linking university programs of constituent parts of the Oregon University System (OUS), particularly PSU, OHSU, OSU and UO.
Seattle Lake Union Yale Blocks: The 10th workshop and fifth development competition was a site consisting of blocks 10 and 11 of the South Lake Union properties owned by Vulcan, Paul Allen’s development company. The team proposed the Yale Blocks including 679 housing modules based on Unico Development Company’s Inhabit modular apartments in which every unit has cross ventilation and natural light. The modules sat on top of 163,000 square feet of retail space and 732 underground shared parking spaces. The plan divided the blocks into eight quadrants, divided by pedestrian and vehicular alleys, allowing the greatest phasing opportunities. The team preserved the historic laundry building, leasing it to McMenamin’s for a brewpub and spa. The plan extended the retail vitality started by the REI flagship store and Alley 24 adjacent to the site and created a full-service community to house some of the 12,000 current and planned employees within walking distance of the site.

Portland Post Office Blocks: The 11th workshop was the 13.4-acre Post Office Blocks site and the workshop plan would add over $1 billion dollars to the Portland tax base, provide four income streams to the PDC, foster economic opportunity and over 5,000 jobs, exclusive of construction jobs. Called ParkPlace, the plan transformed a 13.4-acre obsolete postal facility into a green, mixed-use urban center as the extension and terminus of the North Park Blocks. It was conceived as an economic development catalyst with space for over 5,000 jobs and a Sustainable Technology/Green Building products mart and incubator; a 2.5-acre rooftop Urban Greenhouse Farm; a diverse urban neighborhood with over 1,800 apartments, condominiums and hotel units housing the creative class workforce, young families, empty nesters, retirees and visitors, and a complete 270,000 SF urban retail center anchoring the NW Lovejoy retail corridor, larger than the Brewery Blocks. An efficient multi-block underground shared, smart parking structure supported the highest urban density at ParkPlace, Union Station & Old Town and incorporated a sustainable district-wide energy system.

Seattle Northgate Blocks: The 12th workshop and sixth development competition was another competition which the PSU team won prevailing over the Universities of British Columbia, Washington and Washington State. The site was an 8.4-acre site at just north of Northgate Mall in Seattle and east of I-5 that currently has 221 wood-framed apartments built in 1951. The team formulated a development plan to replace those units over a 5-year, 5-phase project with 683 workforce market-rate housing units affordable to renters earning up to 8% of area median income. In a very challenging market during the Great Recession, the plan was based on minimizing capital costs with modular housing units, reducing risk with 40-year, 90% non-recourse financing insured under the HUD 221(d)(4) program and minimizing cash equity through a participating ground lease with the owners of the existing complex. The design maximized density using concealed tuck-under parking while creating urban ambience with a central urban park balanced with private courtyards.

Lincoln High School Redevelopment: The 13th development planning workshop formulated a development plan for the 11-acre Lincoln High School site redevelopment including an innovative new year-round, 3-year high school integrated into a mixed-use plan with 1,680 units of workforce housing, 2,000 seat flexible meeting hall, 50,000 SF of retail space, 4 rooftop tennis courts, 2 indoor pools, 2 gymnasiums, a football/soccer field surrounded by a covered track on top of 1,682 parking space all based upon public private partnerships with surrounding downtown institutions. Here is a link to the plan: http://www.pdx.edu/realestate/news-research-real-estate Students then presented it to an audience.
of 150 members of the business community at a BOMA breakfast and a professional panel including developer Joe Weston, architect Richard Spies and broker Tom Shimota.

**Class Participation:** The development team method is used in the class and students are responsible for formulating the plan, under the guidance of Professor Macht. The emphasis on innovative solutions to actual public development problems and issues of regional significance requires active class participation from each student and collaborative work among students both inside and out of class. The interaction between professor and students and the stimulation of lively debate enriches the learning experience and makes it fun. Therefore, **class attendance is mandatory** and will be monitored. Guests and mentors who are development practitioners may be invited for specific topics and students must attend and should be prepared to present their research and ask intelligent questions.

**Development Team Member Responsibilities:** Each student will participate and collaborate as a development team in the formulation of the Development Plan. Each class, one student will be responsible to provide development team notes. To ensure accountability, development team members must assign these responsibilities to individual students on the development team in the first week:

1. **Market & Development Program**
2. **Planning & Zoning**
3. **Design & Drawings**
4. **Construction & Cost Estimates**
5. **Economic Analysis & Model**
6. **Deal Structure & Development Agreements**
7. **Publication Preparation**
8. **PowerPoint Preparation**

**Draft Schedule:** On the pages following there is an iterative draft schedule for the workshop. Performance inside and outside of class must reflect steady and dedicated progress towards our mutual objectives. **Deadlines must be met.** Unlike any other class, this requires maximum efforts earlier in the term because the quality of the written publication and PowerPoint presentations must be professional in character. That means that there will be much more review and editing of the written publication and much more rehearsal of the PowerPoint presentations than students expect. In previous years we have found that too much effort was deferred until the final weeks. That will **not** be acceptable this term and students will be held accountable for their own work as well as that of their team members.

**Professor & Mentor:**

**Will Macht** is President of the development firm Macht & Company which completed Officers' Row as developer for the Vancouver Area Development Authority. Officers' Row is a 21-acre mixed-use downtown historic project implemented through a public-private partnership. Macht & Company, in a joint venture with OTAK, Inc, was selected as one of two finalists, from a field of six developers, to plan, design, finance and construct a new Vancouver City Hall and downtown central Library and headquarters for the 3-county Fort Vancouver Library District. Mr. Macht is also a development consultant whose clients include Transpacific Development Company, Norris, Beggs & Simpson, Riverview Properties Company, Landsing Property Corporation, Smith-Ritchie Development Company, American Property Management, ROSE Community Development Corporation, D.M. Stevenson Ranch, Inc. and Multnomah County. As a Commissioner, he organized development efforts for the Port of Hood River, redeveloping a 750,000 SF downtown mixed-use project and urban waterfront development projects. He was appointed to the founding board of the Hood River Urban Renewal Agency.

Mr. Macht was formerly a Development Director of the Rouse Company [developer of mixed-use urban centers, festival marketplaces, and the new city of Columbia, Maryland]. He was an aide to Senator Javits working on the Atlantic Community Development Group for Latin America (ADELA) and an aide to Senator Robert Kennedy working on the Appalachian Regional Development
Commission. He was an attorney drafting the Caribbean Development Bank charter for the U.S. Treasury. He was also International Counsel for the Gates Rubber Company and Gates Land Company.

Mr. Macht is a graduate of the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs at Princeton University, holds a J.D. degree from the University of Virginia Law School and is admitted to the Washington D.C. bar. He has taught courses on Small Cities, Planning Law and Development Planning at the School of Urban and Public Affairs for the past 28 years. He has lectured at the Urban Land Institute [ULI], the University of Washington Cascade Center for Public Service, the National Association of Housing & Redevelopment Officials [NAHRO] and the Oregon Community Development Training Institute. He writes and edits the Solution File column for Urban Land magazine, the national publication of the Urban Land Institute. He has published law review articles in the field of development, written three chapters in a ULI book “Remaking The Urban Waterfront” and is the author of a proposal for a Columbia Gorge Development Bank supported by both Oregon and Washington Governors and Senators. He was appointed by Governor Roberts to the Oregon Investment Board. He was also appointed to be a founding board member of GorgeTrust, a bi-state non-profit corporation supporting sustainable development, and has served as its President. He is also an Adjunct Professor of Architecture at the University of Oregon School of Architecture, Portland Center.

## Development Planning Workshop – SW 14th & Burnside Site

### Review Attached Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Iterative Cooperative Research</th>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Guests &amp; Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan 4</td>
<td>Organize Development Team&lt;br&gt;Assign Functional Responsibilities&lt;br&gt;Review Materials</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Property Owner: Steve Roselli, Harsch Investments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 6</td>
<td>Report on Research&lt;br&gt;Site &amp; Market Reports&lt;br&gt;Brainstorm Uses &amp; Concepts&lt;br&gt;Building Uses, Functions &amp; Needs</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Guests:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 11</td>
<td>Draft Development Concepts&lt;br&gt;Team Market Analyses&lt;br&gt;Team Use Mixes&lt;br&gt;Team Development Programming</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Guests:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 13</td>
<td>Draft Development Concepts&lt;br&gt;Team Market Analyses&lt;br&gt;Team Use Mixes&lt;br&gt;Team Development Programming</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 18</td>
<td>Team Economic Model&lt;br&gt;Team Operating Budgets&lt;br&gt;Team Capital Budgets&lt;br&gt;Industry Leader Reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 20</td>
<td>Team Economic Model&lt;br&gt;Team Operating Budgets&lt;br&gt;Team Capital Budgets&lt;br&gt;Industry Leader Reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td>Guests:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 25</td>
<td>Team Schematic Designs&lt;br&gt;Team Financing Plans&lt;br&gt;Team Initial Deal Structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 27</td>
<td>Team Design Development&lt;br&gt;Team Deal Structures&lt;br&gt;Public-Private Partnerships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 1</td>
<td>1st Draft Written Presentation Due&lt;br&gt;Industry Leader Reviews</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Guests:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 3</td>
<td>First Draft Written Presentation&lt;br&gt;Industry Leader Reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td>Guests:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 8</td>
<td>Refine Written Presentation</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 10</td>
<td>Refine Written Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 15</td>
<td>Submit Team-Edited Publication 1st Draft PowerPoint Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 17</td>
<td>1st Draft PowerPoint Presentation Due</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 22</td>
<td>Final Written Presentation Due Refine PowerPoint Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 24</td>
<td>Refine PowerPoint Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 1</td>
<td>Submit Final Book To Printer Rehearse PowerPoint Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 3</td>
<td>Rehearse PowerPoint Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 8</td>
<td>Rehearse PowerPoint Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 10</td>
<td>Take Publication To Printer Rehearse PowerPoint Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 15</td>
<td>Review Publication; Prepare Posters Rehearse PowerPoint Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 17</td>
<td>Rehearse PowerPoint Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 22</td>
<td>Rehearse PowerPoint Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 7</td>
<td>Presentation at MAC Club Breakfast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Written Presentation Evaluation – NAIOP Competition**

**Financial Analysis** - (Do students articulate the available financing options? Is the recommended financing feasible? Are the projected returns adequate? Is the development pro forma realistic?)

**Property and Market Analysis** - (Do they understand the existing improvements and their uses? Do they demonstrate an understanding of relevant economic and market conditions and trends? Do they address neighborhood, transportation and governmental issues? Are their proposed land uses supported by the data?)

**Development Strategy** - (Given financing options, market conditions, location, physical issues, and projected returns, does the development strategy make sense? Is the solution a creative relevant response to these issues?)

**Zoning, Entitlements, Environmental** - (Do they demonstrate an understanding of the applicable zoning, regulatory, entitlement and environmental issues? Is the solution feasible given these forces?)

**Support for Assumptions and Conclusions** - (Is their research adequate? Do they cite all sources? Are their conclusions logical?)

**Adequacy of Written Report** - (Is the report organized? Professional? Readable? State of the art? Does the Executive Summary provide a clear and concise recap of their principal conclusions and strategies?)

**Oral Presentation Evaluation**

**Organization** - (Did they provide an effective summary discussion of the essential information contained in their written report? Did they emphasize their main themes to provide a clear vision for their recommended strategy?)

**Discussion Style** - (Did they adequately and effectively utilize each of their members in the discussion of their written report?)

**Knowledge of Topic** - (Did the team effectively explain/defend their primary conclusions? Were their conclusions logical and defensible? Did they reference detail in their written material when necessary?)

**Use of Discussion Time** - (Did they spend adequate time on their important issues and conclusions?)

**Persuasiveness** - (Was the team engaging and persuasive in their conclusions and recommendations? Were the members of the team well prepared and confident in their answers?)
Responses to Questions - (Did they carefully listen to questions and clarify when necessary? Did they effectively answer all questions?)

Student Observations on the NAIOP Challenge 2008

Written Report: Begin writing early – follow Will’s schedule. It is critically important to get your ideas down on paper quickly. While each team member wrote his/her own section, at some point (when content was 90+% complete) the writing was centralized with one team member to keep a consistent voice and style. The final document was produced in Adobe InDesign. It is important to find a team member or resource who is an expert in this software, as the learning curve is steep. You want to be 96-98% complete with text and graphics before dropping the Word document into InDesign. We did this a little late in the process, as it would have been nice to have had a couple of more days to proof our document.

Mentors and Guests: Our mentors were very engaged and gave us amazing feedback. Make sure you use your time with the mentors very wisely. Prepare well for every mentor visit.

Class Preparation: Class hours are limited and extremely valuable, so agendas are critical. There were several classes in which we did not have an agenda. This is OK at the beginning of the course, which is about brainstorming, but not in the middle of the course, which is about execution and fine-tuning.

Evidence: You are making a persuasive argument. As such, make sure you have ample, yet targeted evidence – both primary (conversations with brokers, leasing agents, etc) and secondary (market research reports, etc.). Your goal is to pre-empt questions by providing the answers; Erase any doubt in the judges’ minds.

Q&A Session: Have one point-person who answers questions succinctly, and then hands off to the appropriate team member(s) for more detail. This person should also take notes during the session, making sure that every point questioned is answered. There was one moment in our Q&A session, when one of the judges, instead of asking a simple question, gave us a list of eight “potential problems” with our development proposal. Time was running out, and our team was not aggressive enough in addressing each one of his issues individually. Try not to let this happen. Practice Q&A. Make a list of all the questions you can think of – mentors can be very helpful here. Practice answering these questions, especially on the ride up.

Questions: Challenge each other’s assumptions and conclusions throughout the entire course. The more questions you ask continually, the clearer your logic will become. Chances are, if you are thinking a certain question, the judges will be thinking it as well.

Presentation: Give yourself at least 3 weeks to prepare this. Rehearse at least ten times with the clock. Write scripts out highlighting exactly when you will advance slides. Make sure you adequately address financial issues in presentation. Judges love financial graphics – pie charts, bar charts.

Information Flow: Find a way to collaborate. Yahoo Groups, Google Documents, and Microsoft Live Workspace work well. We compiled files, websites, team member contact info, mentors and other contacts, an assumptions database. Flickr works well for compiling pictures. Better to centralize these things. You will be thankful, especially when report writing begins.
Contacts: Contact individuals (brokers, contractors, engineers, financiers…) early and often.

Student Observations on NAIOP Challenge 2006:

The presentation of the project is just as important as the project. The judges will have 4 projects to read in less than one week. They will not be able to read every detail. The information they receive should be clear and concise. Show them what you want them to see. The judges commented that our assumptions page was the best thing about our written presentation. Other teams showed way too much financial risk analysis, which is common for MBA students. For instance, one team went into great detail about how they could make their condos apartments in a down cycle. Every developer knows this trick, it’s a worst case stop loss, not ground breaking financial analysis.

Assumptions: It is important to maintain a spreadsheet with assumptions and sources. All of the market research will boil down to numbers that get inputted into a spreadsheet. Start an assumptions page on day 1 that can be easy referenced by all team members. Once you are satisfied with an assumption, move on.

Written Portion: Keep it concise. 20 written pages should be enough to present any idea. Use graphs, spreadsheets, and charts to supplement the written portion. The judges will have difficulty reading 50 pages of prose. Also, start it early. Once you do site analysis and market analysis, put it on paper to edit in the final draft. We rewrote everything too many times to count, and since we were so close to deadline we did not have time to edit properly. It was the weakest part of our presentation. I suggest one person who is a good writer be assigned to write the narrative. This job is part writer part editor, but with too many writers it will sound choppy. Give yourself at least week to edit.

Design: Work in sketch form for the early stages. The early design will change often do to market conditions/ site constraints, etc. This an exciting portion of the process. We spent too much time trying to make a final drawing and wasting days when a 5 minute sketch would have been sufficient.

Parking: It is crucial to every project. We went out on a limb on our parking concept and the judges liked it. We could have lost on it just as easily. What we did better than the other teams is analyze it from all angles. The other teams did not say how much it would cost or how it would work. We really understood all aspects of it so even if the judges did not like it they could not fault us for not doing our homework.

Mentors: Use them. They are enjoy the process and want to be helpful. Also call on people outside the mentor program. We received invaluable information from Mark Edlen and Debbie Thomas who are not on the list.

Cross Train: Don’t focus on just one aspect. Read each others work and ask questions that you don’t understand. If you don’t get it, there is a good chance the judge won’t either. A fresh pair of eyes will help the presentation.

Presentation: Remember is it fun, it is not a job interview. Don’t get nervous. In Q and A have the team leader delegate the questions and clarify anything that is unclear. This will keep everyone focused and concise. Practice the Q and A as well as the Power point, its 40 minutes and the last chance the judges get to see the team.
Help each other out. Each team member will have their time to shine. Use everyone’s skills when the time comes. When you are working on a specific portion of the project, run with it as though you are the boss. Don’t look for someone to give you direction.