

EWEB Riverfront Master Plan Community Advisory Team (CAT)

Wednesday, February 11, 2009, 5:30 – 7:30 p.m.

EWEB Board Room

Present: Mark Johnson, Pat Johnston, Desiree Moore, Dean Pape', Mary Unruh, Anita Van Asperdt and Gary Wildish, members; Mark Oberle, Project Manager; Gail Murray and Jeannine Parisi, EWEB staff; John Rowell, Gregory Brokaw and Kaarin Knudson, Rowell Brokaw Architects; Ellen Teninty and Julie Fischer, TNT Consultants; John Brown and Rich Cunningham, EWEB Commissioners; Kathi Wiederhold, Facilitator; Vicki Maxon, Recorder; Tom Larsen, City of Eugene; George Braddock, Drix, Bob Hart, Brian McCarthy and Zachary Vishanoff, public.

Absent: Dave Hauser and Tom Hoyt.

1. Welcome and Agenda/Material Review

Mark Oberle, Project Manager, welcomed everyone. He noted that Dave Hauser is out of town, and that Pat Johnston will be leading tonight's meeting. He briefly previewed the agenda.

Jeannine Parisi handed out an invitation to the Walnut Station mixed use center open house to be held on Tuesday, February 24, which is another Master Plan that is taking shape adjacent to the Riverfront Research Park. She also handed out a flyer regarding the 2009 Neighborhood Summit to be held on Saturday, March 7 at the Lane County Fairgrounds. She noted that this year's theme is "Collaboration for a Livable Eugene" and that EWEB has registered for a table in order to talk about the Riverfront Master Plan and begin the public engagement process. She said the EWEB Board has also been invited to participate and that volunteers will do two-hour shifts. She asked any of the team who is interested in taking a shift, developing picture boards, etc. to e-mail her, and that she will send out a reminder e-mail.

Jeannine then read a letter that Dave Hauser received from former State Senator Edward Fadeley, which follows:

"Thank you for taking the job on the commission for the future of the EWEB property on the bank of the Willamette River. The Willamette Greenway principles require that a 50-foot corridor from the river's edge be kept clear and open. Of equal importance to honoring that State requirement is the opportunity to enhance and multiply the effect of that requirement by the land use adjacent to the Greenway strip, as a benefit to future generations that your group can promote."

2. Comments from the Audience

Zachary Vishanoff said that it was nice to see everyone. He said it is his belief that the CAT is not going to do public hearings, but public forums, and that those are opposite. He asked the team to do public hearings alongside public forums.

He noted that the Walnut Station project is proceeding full speed ahead in sideways fashion. He urged the CAT not to mirror this process or collaborate with it because he doesn't think it's going anywhere. He said the problem is that it is tied to the University of Oregon arena project and not a normal checks and balances system. He asked the CAT to consider Walnut Station as a dysfunctional planning process.

He added that he attended a City Council meeting last weekend and that City Councilman Mike Clark raised a good point that the EWEB property would be a good location for a future City Hall and that it would be something the voters would support through a bond process. He said that caused him to reflect back on the City Hall process, which involved expensive drawings and a public process that failed, with a huge price tag for the process and a new building. He said the Riverfront Master Plan process looks a bit similar, and he urged the architects to ask pertinent questions, for example, could the EWEB building be reused as a City Hall, to talk to the City Council about that possibility, and ask the public about their opinion on that fairly soon. He noted that he understands that a Master Plan takes empty land and often precludes uses already in existence. He used the example of a person asking a barber if they need a haircut, and of course the barber would say yes. In that vein, architects will always come up with more new architecture. He urged the CAT to reconsider having a couple of public hearings that parallel with community forums. He added that the Walnut Station project is using City of Eugene form-based codes, and that the CAT should preclude that from this project.

He closed by confirming that what he meant to say (which he felt was not accurately paraphrased) in his public comment at the January 9 meeting was that the former Agripac cannery could have been redeveloped and reused to be as successful as 5th Street Market is, because it was funky, old, and had a lot of character.

Dean Pape' told Zachary that he echoed his comments regarding reuse of the EWEB property as a future City Hall, that Master Plan review will accommodate that, and that he agrees that a future City Hall would be good use of the EWEB property.

3. Approval of December 10 and 17, 2008 Minutes

The minutes were approved.

3a. Approval of January 9, 2009 Minutes (sent by e-mail on 2/9/09)

The minutes were approved.

4. Historic Context of the Riverfront Site

Ken Guzowski, Historic Preservation Planner from the City of Eugene, said he was pleased to be with the group tonight. He passed out an information packet including a brochure regarding Eugene's Historic Preservation Program, a tabloid that was produced in 1979 regarding the history of the millrace, and a Statement of Significance from the Oregon Cultural Resources Inventory regarding the EWEB Steam Plant. A summary of his presentation follows:

The millrace dates back to 1851 as part of a donation land claim. At that time it exited through the central part of the EWEB property, probably underneath the current Water Operations building built in 1952, and was channelized for many years. Historically, this area was part of the industrial hub of Eugene, which included a sawmill, flour mill and a woolen mill. One issue to be aware of is that any redevelopment of this site will require archeological monitoring for historical artifacts. This State law applies to any archaeological resources over 75 years old.

A more recognizable building on the EWEB property is the EWEB steam plant, built in 1931. The City of Eugene developed a historical property ranking process in the mid-1980s, and the Steam Plant was ranked as a primary historical resource. It has the potential for eligibility as a City of Eugene historic landmark and/or to be listed on the National Register of Historic Places. No other buildings on the EWEB property are listed as City Landmarks or in the National Register, therefore none of the buildings on the EWEB property are subject to historic review under the Eugene Land Use Code.

Referring back to the Statement of Significance, Ken noted that in the 1920s, EWEB was beginning to be an independent entity, which included no longer buying power from other agencies. He then read an excerpt from the Eugene Modernism historic context statement describing EWEB's transition from dependence on private utilities for their power requirements. He added that in 1930, the Leaburg Power Plant was designed by Ellis Lawrence, the Dean of Architecture at the University of Oregon, and that completion of these two power plants allowed EWEB to move into a whole new era of power independence.

A number of years ago, the Historic Review Board saw changes in the timber industry within the Eugene community, including large lumber yards dismantling, which made the Board realize that modern era resources were being affected. A grant was written to help fund creation of Eugene Modernism 1935-1965. Within this document is a section regarding government entities, which identified EWEB's resource history, including construction of reservoirs.

After World War II, Eugene experienced phenomenal growth. Ken then read an excerpt from the above book regarding the Depression of the 1930s, etc. Many used appliances were donated to schools for use in home economics classes. EWEB became very important in this historical process, and they consciously developed a museum of historic electric appliances. Mark Oberle noted that a portion of that collection is displayed in EWEB's North Building hallway outside the meeting rooms, on the first floor. Ken replied that the entire collection is impressive.

In summary, Ken said that the City of Eugene has identified the Steam Plant as having historic significance, and that the Water Operations building and the taller portion of the vehicle repair shop (not the more recent addition) should be evaluated to determine their architectural significance. Mark Oberle identified these two buildings on a large map of the EWEB property. Ken reiterated that it would be his recommendation to evaluate the Water Operations building and the older portion of the vehicle repair shop for historic significance through the survey inventory methodology. He added that if the EWEB property becomes privately owned, there will be financial and tax benefits available for any portion of the property that are listed in the National Register of Historic Places. He then welcomed questions from the team.

Dean Pape' asked for a background on the different tiers of preservation, i.e., is there allowance for a historic building to be moved to a different location, etc.

Ken reiterated that none of the buildings are currently listed on either list mentioned, so are not regulated by the City of Eugene land use code. If the Steam Plant was listed on the National Register of Historic Places, and it was to be demolished or moved, a land use application would be required for approval by the Eugene Historic Review Board. He added that the National Register of Historic Places is a level of recognition higher than City Historic Landmark status, but both are regulated at the same level locally.

The question was asked if there had been any previous archaeological digs on the EWEB property. Mark Oberle replied that some were done when the Coburg Road viaduct was widened, and that a few industrial disposal site items were found. Ken Guzowski noted that when the Agripac cannery building was demolished and the location of the millrace was identified in preparation for building the new courthouse, there was quite a bit of information put together regarding the south portion of the EWEB property.

Desiree Moore asked about the cost and length of the evaluation process required to place a building in the National Register of Historic Places. Ken replied that the primary cost relates to the consulting fees required to do research, nominate the building for consideration, study archives, photos and maps, etc. He added that there is no fixed fee for application submittal to the State Historic Preservation Office or the City of Eugene.

Mark Oberle asked what would happen if, at the end of the Master Plan process, EWEB chooses not to list the Steam Plant in the National Register of Historic Places and the nicer portion is retained as, for example, a museum or art center, i.e., would the permit process be onerous or risky, and would there be a chance that alterations might not be granted?

Ken confirmed that the property is zoned public land with some industrial, and if a historic building is converted to a different use, it would be subject to historic alteration review to approve exterior changes related to that use.

Nan Laurence said that she believed the zoning issue should be ignored as that may change in the future.

Dean Pape' said it is the visual restrictions from the interior or exterior that he is interested in. Ken replied that when the elements are reviewed, some owners can choose to address interior issues. He used the example of the WOW Hall renovation, where those issues were regulated through design, and added that including interior design review is up to the property owner. He said that for purposes of this discussion, the City is focused on the exterior, and that the issue of use is a touchy one. He said that historic preservations believe the original use is typically best, however he used the example of the Pearl District buildings in Portland as originally being industrial buildings with 50% of them listed in the National Register, but having very large financial incentive to be outfitted for contemporary use, including residential, commercial, office, and active retail use, so there is some flexibility in usage.

Dean Pape' added that Eugene is the only city in Oregon that utilizes a historic zoning district with the ability to zone and craft specific uses allowed in a historic building or property. He used the example of the original Down to Earth/Allan Bros. Coffee building at 5th & Olive and said that both buildings are listed in the National Register but specific uses were crafted and are currently in place. He noted that the goal of Eugene's historic preservation program is to save the resource, find an appropriate use, and work with the property owner to preserve character-defining elements of the historic resource.

Desiree Moore asked how removal of a building could happen. Ken replied that EWEB would work with the State Historic Preservation Office, who makes a formal request for removal to the National Register of Historic Places. Desiree then asked if any City property is automatically part of the National Register. Ken said no, if it's only a City Historic Landmark and if the property owner wishes to remove this designation, staff meets and formalizes the request, and the request has to be granted within 45 days. He added that the City does not have the ability to deny demolition, but can delay the application up to 60 days so that discussion with the property owner can occur, but the City does have the ability to require that artifacts be preserved, photo documentation be made, etc. Desiree asked who has the ability to add a property to the historic register. Ken replied that this requires consent from the property owner.

Ken added that if a property is publicly owned, federal laws apply. He gave the example of Civic Stadium, which is owned by School District 4J, but because it is public property, it can be listed in the National Register without owner consent.

Dean Pape' asked for confirmation that the owner of a historic property can still apply for building demolition. Ken used the example of the Amazon family housing complex at 19th & Patterson. He explained that a student submitted the nomination for listing in the National Register, but the entire property was eventually demolished and four buildings were relocated after following the requirements of the land use code regarding moving and demolition.

The team thanked Ken for his presentation.

The team then took a 10-minute break.

5. Contract Negotiations Update

Mark Oberle introduced Gail Murray, Purchasing Manager. Mark noted that the previously scheduled February 17 EWEB Board approval of the contract with Rowell Brokaw has been postponed to a later date as the CAT is not yet ready to move forward. He noted two outcomes for tonight's discussion—an opportunity to inform the CAT team about the contract negotiation process, and to share information about the contract scope of work that has been developing over the last few weeks. He added that he is not pushing for agreement or decision, but merely wishing to educate.

Regarding process, Mark said that while the RFQ listed some deliverables and set some direction on what EWEB was looking for—design excellence, project approach, etc., it left room for some assumptions. The next step involved sitting down with the consultant and starting to talk about

scope of work in more detail. Over the course of about four meetings with the consultant, there were some shifts in thinking from what was submitted in the RFQ and the current proposal. He noted that the majority of the CAT has not had the opportunity to see those changes as the contract discussions involved only a few CAT members. In summary, he said Pat Johnston will talk about the role of the CAT in this process, then there will be an opportunity for other team members to comment.

5a. Scope of Work Discussion

Mark asked the CAT to share what they would like to hear tonight regarding the scope of work. He reminded the team that since this is a public session, there will be no discussion of dollar amounts or specific line items, just a focus on scope of work.

Gail Murray added that tonight would be more of a high-level summary and a way to gather questions for the next CAT meeting.

Pat Johnston restated what she had written in her e-mail to the team--that she feels it is important for the team to be involved in the Scope of Work development. She noted that planning a Scope of Work is very different than putting out an RFQ/RFP, which is very general. She added that she is pleased with the Scope of Work and the level of detail that has been reached, and that it sets expectations as the project moves forward. She then asked for comments from team members.

Gary Wildish said it is apparent that the rest of the team needs to hear what he has heard through his involvement in the process, and that he is anxious for tonight's opportunity for them to get up to speed.

Anita Van Asperdt agreed with Gary, adding that when everyone sees the line items, details, etc., they will further realize all that needs to be done.

Mary Unruh said it will be interesting to see how the scope gets expanded, from what was in mind when the team put it together down to what it involves, and all the other things that hinge on it. She added that the team deserved a pat on the back for their work on the RFP but now, with how much more work there really is to do, she realizes it is a pretty complicated process.

Dean Pape' noted that from his standpoint, since he recused himself from the consultant selection process and that the last meeting he participated in was on December 10 by conference call, he said everyone had done a magnificent job. He reiterated thanks from all of the members who were not involved, and added that he would have loved to have been a part of it.

Nan Laurence said that she has participated in many RFQ processes and that, as always, she is impatient for the work to begin. She added that she values that the group is going over the Scope of Work with more time spent at this stage, which will result in the process going more smoothly later on. She said it will be good to know what to look for and what may have to be given up, even if it sometimes feels frustrating.

Jeannine Parisi said she is looking forward to starting this relationship with Rowell Brokaw, and that she sees this conversation as an opportunity to launch a positive working relationship with the consulting team. She noted that there is a shared interest in the success of this project which, from a public standpoint, is contingent on many variables. The first step might be to pass the community “sniff test” and, if it doesn’t pass the test, to recalibrate and decide what the team is willing to give up in order to get to that point. She added that too many projects of this type have not succeeded, and she wants assure that the project moves forward in the right direction.

Pat thanked the consulting team for their efforts on the Scope of Work.

Mark Oberle introduced the members of the Rowell Brokaw (RB) design team present tonight—John Rowell, AIA, Principal-in-Charge; Kaarin Knudson, Associate AIA, and Gregory Brokaw, AIA; and Ellen Teninty and Julie Fischer from TNT Consulting. Mark then introduced two EWEB Commissioners who are present—John Brown and Rich Cunningham.

Kathi Wiederhold, Facilitator, asked for quick rounds from the team about what members would like RB to cover in the Scope of Work.

Anita Van Asperdt said that she would like to identify any changes which were added to or left out of the Scope of Work.

Desiree Moore said she had only received one e-mail from Pat Johnston regarding a subcommittee meeting, and that she had been in Washington, D.C. for the inauguration for part of that time. She said she didn’t realize that there had been more than one subcommittee meeting with other members of the team, and that she would pass on making comment since she was not present at those meetings.

Dean Pape’ said he would like an understanding of the group’s goal of how much detail and specificity RB is going to provide in the Master Plan. Greg Brokaw said the economic development consultant will weigh in, projecting specific values, etc., but cautioned against being too specific, adding that there needs to be a balance between giving potential developers room to move and the community something to react to.

Gary Wildish reiterated that he is anxious to hear the answers to the team’s questions so other members can get up to speed, nothing that he has been involved in the process all along.

Mark Johnson said his #1 priority is confirmation of any changes to the Scope of Work.

Mary Unruh said she feels up to speed. Pat Johnston said she also does.

John Rowell said his team focused more on what the outcome is in the Scope of Work, the end result. He said he feels he has a fantastic team that possesses an amazing combination of qualifications, design excellence and urban experience, and that they are excited that the CAT chose them. He said his sub-consultants are very focused on the project and were all directly involved in the Scope of Work. He noted that it was recognized that capability of the consultants was a big issue for the team, and that they heard from the CAT during the interview that the team

of John Ellis, Margot Long and Chris Zahas was impressive and that the CAT realizes their value.

John gave an overview of the original proposed framework. He said the deliverables asked for were public engagement, schematic urban design, sustainable strategies, and the ultimate Master Plan document. He said that one major shift from the RFP to the scope of work is that the sub-consultants will be a big part of the focus group/charrettes instead of just coming on afterwards for the design phase.

Dean Pape' asked if they originally assumed that they would not be part of the focus group/charrettes. Greg Brokaw said that they had originally been considered in more of an advisory than an involvement role, but that they agree that being involved in a design role is much better for this particular project. He noted that they heard from the small group discussions that Ellis, Long and Zahas were the three key people in the project, so their hours were increased. He also reiterated that this is a draft scope and can still be adjusted.

John Rowell said another assumption is that the technical consultants (civil engineers, historic preservationists, etc.) will be limited. He suggested using their time as contingency only if needed, as a way to allow for some technical studies. He noted that the team may want more time for the traffic consultant, which is seen as a critical part of the feasibility analysis, so that was also modified.

Another assumption was that the CAT and consultant team would jointly define the process of how we go from research to focus groups to charrette to design cycle. He said that they're still close to that but there are refinements that have been done. The big refinements reflect the degree of involvement by the consultants.

Pat Johnston asked RB to talk about the approach to the millrace issue and having that value be neutral, taking the hot spots and addressing them a bit differently.

John referred the team to page 3 of the Work Plan & Scope, Planning Assumptions, and briefly reviewed each one.

- Might get to the end of 12 months and still not know if daylighting of millrace is feasible
- Ecological potential is interesting
- Assumption is that it's not necessary to make major decisions up front
- Recommend solutions that are millrace-neutral, i.e., with or without it, otherwise there are costly technical issues

Greg Brokaw added that they don't want to develop a Master Plan that is dependent upon the millrace in order to work; this would be folly, but they need to be open to the possibility for the millrace to become feasible at some point, and shape the direction early.

Anita Van Asperdt noted that it might be wise to include a scenario that concludes that daylighting of the millrace is not possible. John Rowell agreed, and said that having the initial direction be that the Master Plan is millrace-neutral has obvious benefits.

Nan Laurence noted that if a proactive millrace scheme depends on properties other than EWEB's, it won't work and that, at best, it should be millrace-neutral. Anita Van Asperdt agreed.

Pat Johnston said that in response to previous subgroup discussions, RB has added more public engagement sessions than what was originally proposed. She said that in thinking about that issue and adding additional meetings, you not only add the cost of conducting the meetings but also the cost of bringing in additional consultants. This adds exponentially to the cost of the public engagement portion and was the biggest difference that she saw in the scope of work.

Dean Pape' said he doesn't need to see line by line, but value engineering from the scope of work back, noting that some EWEB work is out of the CAT's control.

Gary Wildish asked RB about their assumptions regarding CAT involvement—what their expectations are of the CAT individually and as a group.

John Rowell replied that #1 on the process assumptions list is that CAT meetings would be a venue for public interaction, and expressed his hope for full involvement from the CAT. He asked Ellen Teninty to expand on the CAT's role.

Ellen Teninty explained that she is not sure what the relationship will be because they haven't had an opportunity for that conversation yet. She suggested a full discussion regarding public engagement challenges, opportunities, how to dovetail other EWEB public engagement roles, etc. A specific assumption is that the CAT goes out to the people, not that the CAT expects the people to come to them--educating people about the process and inviting them to meetings, devising a way to record that input while you're out there. Another piece that needs to occur is strategic thinking about who we're hearing from and who we're not hearing from, how to construct a site display, a description of where we are in the planning process, etc. Another example is the CAT playing a primary role in the four public meetings, explaining where the CAT is in the process and speaking about it to the community. She said there is that potential but we haven't had that conversation yet.

Jeannine Parisi noted that the public sessions are an opportunity to leverage resources and use the CAT as mechanism to make the project more accessible to people outside the design community. She added that the CAT is a valuable resource, as they can tap multiple audiences through their individual networks.

Ellen Teninty said she would want to analyze what networks and skills are represented within the CAT, i.e., media relations experience, etc. She said she realizes that EWEB staff already has that in place, but she wants to figure out what is the best combination of people and resources, and RB does not know that yet.

John Rowell again referred to the Work Plan and Scope document and noted that there were six major sections—Research/Interviews, Focus Groups, Visioning, Design Phases, Master Plan Development, and Final Plan Development/Approval. He said there are no big surprises in

Section 1, and added that the interview stage includes very high-value information on who to interview and how to make the interview process effective.

Referring to Section 2.0, Focus Groups, he noted that this section lists the focus group topics (with some restructure from the original), and briefly went over each section. Greg Brokaw added that these topics were those that RB feels would do well in a focus group setting.

John Rowell then referred to Section 3.0, Visioning Charette, Analysis and Base Materials, and briefly went over each section. He noted that the kickoff is a public event, with a shift to the design phase occurring at the public level. He said it is RB's vision that the kickoff would be held on a Thursday with a sign-up list for the charrette which would occur on a Saturday. He also briefly explained the design process within this section. John then briefly went over Sections 4.0, 5.0 and 6.0.

Ellen Teninty asked RB to talk about working with the CAT during the design cycle portion. Greg Brokaw explained design cycle #1, which will include smaller groups, possibly taking different points of view and turning them into different approaches. John Rowell added that that process repeats and is cyclical throughout. Greg Brokaw added that they want to find a balance between the CAT engaging in more than just the formal meetings, and that they think the CAT should guide the process and be as big a part of it as they can.

Kaarin Knudson said she would like to reiterate what John Rowell had said, that she is excited to get started on the project. She said it is her feeling that the time and effort it took to conduct the subcommittee meetings shows how much care is going into the process, and that she is looking forward to feedback from the CAT and to getting to the heart of the matter—to build value and minimize risk for EWEB, the community, and interested parties, and to bring more people to the table at every step.

The team thanked RB for their presentation.

6. Closing Comments and Next Steps

Mark Oberle asked the team to review their calendars and watch for an e-mail in order to schedule an Executive Session in order to review the Work Plan and Scope line by line, possibly the first part of next week.

Pat Johnston said it was good to see everyone again.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

Next Meeting: **Wednesday, February 25 – 5:30 to 7:30 p.m.**
 EWEB Board Room, North Building