

EWEB Riverfront Master Plan Community Advisory Team (CAT)

Wednesday, April 14, 5:30 – 7:30 p.m.

EWEB Board Room

Present: Dave Hauser, Desiree Moore, Dean Pape', Mary Unruh, Anita Van Asperdt and Gary Wildish, members; Bob Cassidy, EWEB Commissioner; Mark Oberle, EWEB staff; Greg Brokaw, Kaarin Knudson and John Rowell, Rowell Brokaw Architects; Tom Larsen and Nan Laurence, City of Eugene; Vicki Maxon, Recorder; Bob Hart, Mark Leake and Tom Snyder, public.

Absent: Tom Hoyt, Mark Johnson and Pat Johnston, members.

1. Welcome and Agenda Review

Dave Hauser welcomed the group and reviewed the agenda.

2. Minutes Approval

The March 24 minutes were approved.

3. Comments from Audience/CAT Comment

Tom Snyder said he attended the Oregon Museum Association meeting over the weekend at the University of Oregon, and he learned that the Linn/Benton County museum still owns property next to where the CAT stopped on their tour along the promenade in Corvallis. He added that some buildings facing vacant lots next to the promenade are also owned by the museum and that they are working to turn them into museum space. He sees this as an example of another community that sees the value of history and the riverfront coming together. He asked the CAT if they had seen his letter to the editor in the Register-Guard, and that it seems like a wise thing to open up the property once EWEB is done with it--with no fences, no walls, in order to let the public experience what the space is like and the wonderful vantage point it gives, and to think about it, and to be able to visualize the river from within the property. He said that no one has been able to walk the property that way for approximately 80 years. He closed by saying that he is still after the notion to that the property should be looked at in terms of historical problems and also what would bring people here to experience it. He added that the notion of looking at condos and boutiques on the EWEB property doesn't do much for him, but that the property has potential and they should be going after that.

Julie Fischer thanked Tom for his letter to editor and asked Tom to continue to put his opinions out there, as that is what needs to happen.

Mark Oberle said that when he thinks about what will happen after the EWEB Board approves the Master Plan, it could be a year before it goes before the Eugene City Council. Mark said he wants to think about ways to keep the project alive, and that one idea he has heard that he likes is that after EWEB moves off the site later this year, the 2011 Eugene Celebration could be located in the operations area, which would bring people down to the river.

4. Review MOU Road Map/Update on May 12 Open House

Kaarin Knudson said that as the design team moves toward the end of the project, the Master Plan document will become the focus of their work in the next month. She noted that the document will include a lot of research and information related to the cultural landscape and other research. She said that tonight's presentation includes slides related to Eugene's African-American history and the Ferry Street Bridge Community that was displaced from Alton Baker Park in 1949. The EWEB site offers a connection to this layer of local history in that Wiley Griffon, who is often referred to as Eugene's first African-American citizen, was located on what is now EWEB property, near the intersection of 4th and Mill Streets. She said this is just one opportunity to bring history into the master plan and connect to other efforts to memorialize the Ferry Street Community. As a whole, this relates to the idea of researching the history needed to program a cultural landscape and interpretive sites. Kaarin said there are several opportunities for interpretation on the riverfront property related to social history, ecology, EWEB history, and even the founding of Eugene.

Kaarin told the CAT that the MOU Road Map document is essentially the same as presented at an earlier meeting, and she thanked them for their efforts to get to this point. She said that tonight the group will be discussing design guidelines and recommendations, and that the April 28 meeting will be the final opportunity to discuss the MOU and request CAT consensus on the design's response to the nine required master plan elements. She added that Ellen Teninty will also talk about the Road Map at the April 28 meeting.

Julie Fischer said that in order to continue to honor the CAT process, preliminary consensus is needed on the design guidelines, specifically the height and mass portion that hasn't been considered. She said she will be asking for check-in tonight on that for alternative ideas before attempting to reach final consensus at the April 28 meeting. She added that she will be asking for proposals between this meeting and the April 28 meeting, and that Kaarin Knudson has a list that breaks out the design guidelines.

Ellen Teninty reminded the group that anyone who isn't in consensus by the end of tonight's meeting needs to prepare a viable alternative/revision that they feel the CAT could come to consensus around. The deadline for that alternative/revision is Monday, April 19 so that everyone has time to review it.

Julie Fischer said that preliminary consensus has already been received on the general framework of the plan (open space, building blocks and streets). She asked the CAT to identify any design elements they feel are missing, but that it is her sense that the CAT is generally comfortable with the MOU elements other than final design guidelines and phasing.

Dave Hauser asked for confirmation that everyone is comfortable with the April 19 deadline for alternatives/revisions, and asked if that can be done by e-mail. Ellen Teninty said it can. Dave said that the CAT members who aren't present tonight will be informed of that process and asked the CAT to test the assumption that those members present tonight are in agreement to this point. The CAT members present said they were in agreement.

Kaarin Knudson presented the design guidelines, and asked the CAT if there were any questions or requests for clarification. She added that Bart Johnson's Ecological Report is now complete and that Bart's team is willing to make corrections if the CAT requests any clarifications or notes inconsistencies they did not catch.

Open House Update

Ellen Teninty said that the summary report from the March 3 public meeting will go out to the interested parties list, which is now just short of 1,000 people. She thanked the CAT for their participation in the public meeting. She added that an invitation to the May 12 Open House from 5:00 to 7:00 p.m. will also go out to the interested parties list, and that the open house will be a celebration with music and food. It will be held on the EWEB site in a tented area and will include site tours at various time intervals. She said it is important for all CAT members to arrive prior to 5:45 p.m. and stay until approximately 6:15 p.m., as they will be introduced. She urged the CAT to forward the invitation to all of their contacts and not to be concerned about how many they send out. She noted that she will be working with Joe Harwood, EWEB's public information representative, regarding media outreach, and that CAT members may be called upon for a television interview or to write an article. She said this will be a great opportunity to tell the public much more about the Master Plan and that the design team will also be involved in that presentation.

Ellen also told the CAT that there are two upcoming neighborhood meetings, one on April 15 and one on April 29. The April 15 meeting will be for the Skinner's Butte neighbors who are directly adjacent to the EWEB property, including the small businesses in that area, to make sure that they have an opportunity to ask questions or state concerns before the master plan goes to the EWEB Board. The April 29 meeting from 5:00 to 6:30 p.m. will be focused on ecology and sustainability in order to make sure participants are grounded in fact regarding what the master plan is and what it is based on, and an opportunity for them to ask questions and receive information.

Anita Van Asperdt asked Ellen to e-mail the dates of the above two meetings to the CAT.

Ellen continued, saying that she and her staff have gone door to door speaking with office managers and extending courtesy to the neighbors in the EWEB site area and giving them business cards, etc. She added that Mark Oberle and Julie Fischer attended a recent Harlow Neighbors meeting and that Kaarin Knudson will be attending the Chamber Greeters meeting on May 7. Ellen said she herself attended the Petersen Barn family night recently and also a Native American night. She closed by saying that the draft of the final public involvement report will be a part of the final Master Plan document.

Dean Pape' asked if adjoining property owners (other than the adjacent businesses) were included in that group. Ellen Teninty replied that Mark Oberle and Debra Smith were asked to contact those property owners, and that they have been told they have access at any time to EWEB staff or the design team. She added that they were in on the original development plans. She added that this particular door to door contact was for people who were running their businesses daily who may not have had time to contact EWEB staff or the design team.

Dean Pape' said that he is actually referring to future businesses who are looking to build on property they own. Julie Fischer replied that they have an opportunity to contact the larger property owners and they can do so. Ellen added that those property owners' ideas can be referred to Mark Oberle.

5. Comments on Ecological Report

The following comments and/or suggestions were made regarding the ecological report:

- I don't see the 100-year flood plain listed – that might be helpful
- Have we contacted the folks who are in charge of riprap to reinforce the bank as to the permit requirements necessary to do so?

Kaarin Knudson replied that Interfluve has said that the main area of concern with regard to permitting the manipulation of the riverbank is the Ordinary High Water Mark, and that the regulatory permits have not yet been pursued. She reiterated that the master plan's bank manipulation is a conceptual proposal that the design team has researched, but additional investigation and engineering will be required. The recommended regulatory process and steps toward implementation will be noted in the final document.

Kaarin also explained that the 100-year flood plain isn't shown on the conceptual sections that Rowell Brokaw Architects provided to Bart Johnson's team, but the report does discuss the 100-year-flood elevation, related research by Bart's team, and FEMA map elevations.

Gary Wildish asked if the FEMA map is the one that is usually used in that regard. Kaarin replied that it is.

Dave Hauser asked Kaarin what value the design team has received from the ecological report.

Kaarin Knudson replied that it was valuable to see how a landscape ecology perspective interprets opportunities and challenges of the site and that the report is largely consistent with the design proposal and offers specific recommendations to improve it. She said that the recommendations related to establishing and maintaining a native landscape were incredibly valuable, and that Rowell Brokaw has used Aryana Ferguson's plant community recommendations to generate a "visual spreadsheet" of the proposed plant communities. Kaarin said she thinks that will make this information more accessible to a wider variety of people. John Rowell added that one critical landscape proposal in the master plan—the riverfront open space in front of Restaurant Row—would be changed based on input from the ecological report.

Kaarin Knudson also added that the ecological report offers refinements and recommendations to ensure that the design proposals function as expected, and that eight of the report's key recommendations were previously proposed by the design. She said this is very good news, and that it underscores the fact that the design team has been diligent and thoughtful in its consideration of ecological issues.

6. Discussion of Design Guidelines and Phasing

Julie Fischer explained tonight's process for review of the Master Plan outline—the presentation, then questions from CAT members, a listing of the questions, and then grouping and discussion of each, with ample time for discussion after the presentation.

Kaarin Knudson noted that the master plan document does not require the CAT's official consensus, but it is expected that the CAT will review and comment on the document draft. She said the MOU requirements are what the design team will ask for consensus on, and that these provide the structure to develop the master plan document.

Kaarin Knudson then gave a Powerpoint presentation, which included an outline of the Master Plan and an overview of the proposed Urban Design Guidelines. The basic master plan document outline includes:

1. Vision and Context

– Vision / Background / Project Context / Criteria & Principles / Process

2. Master Plan Framework

– Overall Design Concept / Illustrative Plan / Circulation / Open Space / Design Districts / Blocks / Land Use / Sustainability / Future Decisions

3. Design Guidelines / Form-based Code

– Overview / Urban Design / Streets & Paths / Open Space

4. Infrastructure

– Preliminary Grading Plan / Site Improvements / Utilities

5. Implementation

– Regulatory Process / Development Process / Scenarios / Phasing / Parking Strategies / Site Costs / Funding Sources / Next Steps

6. Appendix – Many Memos / Reports / Summaries / Foundation Documents / Etc.

Dean Pape' voiced concern about the FAR restriction and said he believes one can get a better viewpoint from skinnier towers than blocks.

John Rowell replied that there is no FAR restriction in the proposal and that the form-based standards allow for use flexibility and that the urban design strategy is to reinforce that to a certain extent. He added that in regard to 5th Avenue, there is a build-to line.

Desiree Moore asked if there is an opportunity for a mixture of standards. Dean Pape' replied that that is what FAR represents—building up to a roadway or building a skinnier tower.

In regard to a question regarding the proposed 38' maximum height for Restaurant Row, the CAT decided to delay that discussion until later in the meeting.

Julie Fischer asked the CAT for questions or comment regarding the height limits, in order to prepare for consensus. The following comments were made:

- 120' height is hard to grasp proportionately – to be able to see what it would look like straight on or from the side would be helpful
- Towers need to be depicted on the maps and drawings – maybe the footbridge would be more desirable to the public if it were shown
- There is a value to density
- Re: the street right of way – it seems like the alternate streets serve a significant benefit to the City, as the City may participate in the private streets (possible partnership?)

John Rowell noted that the master plan may not require private streets because of the need for flexibility.

Anita Van Asperdt reminded the CAT of an e-mail the CAT received from Hugh Pritchard regarding considering the west side of the viaduct to be at 60', and the possibility that one or two floors above the viaduct could be residential use. She commented that now would be the easiest time to ask for that leeway rather than after design approval. She noted that she believes 60' feet is on the low side and that it should be higher, especially along the viaduct, because it would be a real challenge to have everything below viaduct elevation for viable space. She asked why 60' had been recommended.

Kaarin Knudson replied that height was recommended in relationship to the surrounding neighborhood scale and based on known construction types and building types.

Gary Wildish asked if, on all elevations shown, the heights might be squeezed a bit, and a little tight from floor to floor. He said the CAT might look at the 10' floor elevation and see if it should be more like 12-13' (more viable for the developer). He then asked how many square feet of development is in the plan. He also commented that for the steam plant, maybe a penthouse or vertical addition should be allowed. He noted that Tom Snyder's model depicted a place that he himself would want to go for a totally unobstructed view upriver.

Kaarin Knudson said the design team could run some maximum development area numbers. Gary replied that would give a basis on which to make a calculation of about ½ of 1% or whatever figure works.

Anita Van Asperdt asked what percentage of screened/structured parking is taken up by street parking (i.e., 4th and 5th Avenues). Kaarin Knudson replied that the opportunity for required parking for a building could eliminate the need for surface parking.

Anita asked why that is a guideline since that requirement could happen everywhere, and that she feels the worst case scenario should be tested in the guidelines, as well as for flexibility.

Speaking for a member of the public who had to leave tonight's meeting early, Desiree Moore asked about retaining parking near the steam plant. Kaarin Knudson responded that there was space allocated for parking around the steam plant building.

Kaarin then reviewed the USGBC's LEED certification program and why the design team was recommending that the base level of LEED certification be a requirement for new construction on the property.

Desiree Moore asked if it would be possible to float the draft design past a local developer for their perusal and possible revisions or recommendations. Kaarin Knudson replied that it would be possible, but that it could be difficult to get that type of specific feedback from individuals who might be considering the property. Kaarin added that the design team had spoken at length with development interests during the first and second phase of the project, when community research and input was being gathered. She added that Leland Consulting also continues to advise the design team and offer their input to ensure the plan is feasible and not burdensome to private or public development that might occur on the property.

Dean Pape' voiced the following concerns:

- Continues to have questions about the flexibility of private and secondary roadways
- Concern re: single vs. double loading of 5th Avenue for various reasons
- Concern about residential restrictions
- Confused about setbacks regarding build-to lines and having no curb cuts (seems like a hard restriction)
- Questions the meaning of 60' height and 10' setback
- Steam plant/penthouse with higher height of buildings next to it
- Restrictions on surface parking on where it CANNOT be instead of where it CAN be
- Disagree with the definition of the roadway setup because of conversations with other developers

John Rowell commented that the setup provides for a substantial amount of surface parking. He added that regarding building height, the idea is to allow for a tower along the properties adjacent to the viaduct, which need to contend with a limited viewshed until the fourth story.

Kaarin Knudson then commented on proposed bulk standards as they relate to the height limits. The proposal is to limit any building tall building to an 8,000-square-foot floorplate, with no dimension greater than 110', and a maximum diagonal of 140'. This type of bulk restriction to a tall building envelope works to protect view corridors.

A discussion then ensued regarding the above concerns.

Julie Fischer reviewed the consensus items for tonight's meeting and asked the CAT what would affect their ability to reach consensus on these items. The following items were voiced:

- Height limits in specific areas, i.e., the steam plant
- Active frontage – what does it mean?
- Access/loading
- Wonder if we have the maximum amount of building space in Restaurant Row

- Height concerns near the viaduct – has to have build-to lines to be pedestrian-friendly
- Questions about uses
- Would like more height limit discussion in general
- Some missing information regarding bulk standards

Gary Wildish commented that he is 98-99% at consensus but that he feels there are just some minor considerations that need to be made.

Nan Laurence asked the CAT to think about what items might require a change in code, i.e., would the 60' height issue cause the code to be changed.

Julie Fischer said that the design team will send out a list of options and alternatives regarding the above concerns. She then asked the CAT how close they are to consensus. Two CAT members said they are not close and four members said they are close.

A discussion ensued regarding how to get more complete information on the above concerns to the CAT, especially considering tonight's absentees.

As a result of this discussion, the CAT decided to add an additional meeting on Wednesday, April 21 in order to discuss the above concerns further and attempt consensus at that meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:35 p.m.

**Next Meeting: Wednesday, April 21
 4:00 to 6:00 p.m.
 EWEB Board Room**