

## **EWEB Riverfront Master Plan Community Advisory Team (CAT)**

Wednesday, October 22, 5:30-7:30 p.m.

EWEB Board Room

Present: Dave Hauser, Tom Hoyt, Mark Johnson, Desiree Moore, Dean Pape', Mary Unruh, Anita Van Asperdt and Gary Wildish, members; Nan Laurence, Jeannine Parisi, Carolyn Weiss, and Kathi Wiederhold, EWEB Core Team; Gail Murray, EWEB staff, Vicki Maxon, Recorder; Bob Cassidy, EWEB Commissioner; Robin Hostick and Jenifer Willer, City of Eugene staff; Julie Fischer, Deb Frisch, Bob Hart, John Helmer, and Bob Siegmund, public.

Absent: Pat Johnston.

### 1. Welcome and Agenda/Material Review

Jeannine Parisi welcomed the group and briefly outlined the agenda.

### 2. Comments from the Audience

Jeannine Parisi read two e-mails that she received from Zachary Vishanoff, submitted electronically. The following is a synopsis:

- Provide the public with complete printed information regarding tours or class presentations, and put them on the City of Eugene calendar of public meetings. Please include any media coverage of the architecture students' presentation in the three-ring binder that is available for checkout. I hope the media will be invited the architecture students' presentation.
- Make sure the public knows at an early stage what tentative plans are for this process so they can raise issues early, resulting in fewer problems later.

Deb Frisch told the team that the September 24 raft trip (which was canceled due to weather) was self-serving and a way for the CAT to appear as scientists who are studying the riparian ecosystem. She noted that Lane County is in a public safety crisis, and has the lowest per capita policing in the nation. She expressed concern about the impact of the University of Oregon arena project on the Willamette River and cautioned about impacts to the ecosystem from development. She added that she is looking forward to seeing the excerpts from the DVD "Ed's Coed."

### 3. Approve October 8, 2008 Minutes

The minutes were approved, with one name correction.

#### 4. Consultation Request for Qualifications (RFQ)

Jeannine Parisi introduced Gail Murray, EWEB Purchasing Coordinator. Gail commended the CAT on their work on the RFQ and reiterated that additions were made to the rate structure and Deliverables sections when the CAT subcommittee met last week. Gail explained that vendors register through the EWEB website to download a copy of the RFQ, and said that the link was put in the Addendum section so that the general public or people who are not bidding on the RFQ can also look at it without registering as a vendor.

Gail Murray handed out a list of vendors who have downloaded the RFQ since its release on October 16. Nan Laurence asked if there has been any out of state interest in the project. Gail Murray replied that she has had inquiries from firms in Seattle, Washington; San Francisco, California, and Port Charlotte, Florida, but added that some of these vendors may be just looking at the project and may not necessarily submit a proposal. She also said that in some cases she has had phone calls from prospective vendors and has sent them the RFQ electronically.

Nan Laurence noted that the City of Eugene includes the American Association of Architects and other organizations of that type in their RFQ advertisements and wondered if EWEB can include those organizations in their list of prospective proposers. Gail Murray said that she could, and asked Nan to send her a list of e-mail addresses for those organizations.

Gail Murray reminded the team that the project site tour will be held tomorrow, October 23. She said any questions that are raised from proposers on the site tour will be recorded and the answers will be sent out in the form of an addendum that will be posted on the EWEB website.

Desiree Moore asked if another site tour is planned for those proposers who are not able to attend tomorrow's tour. Gail Murray replied that she received a phone call from one proposer in San Francisco, California who told her they could not get a flight into Eugene in order to attend. Desiree then asked what the time frame is for the RFQ. Gail said it was opened on Thursday, October 16 and closes on Wednesday, November 26.

A brief discussion ensued regarding the need for a second site tour. Jeannine Parisi noted that Mark Oberle had said that, depending on the turnout for tomorrow's site tour, it would then be decided whether an additional tour needs to be made available.

Gail Murray cautioned that since the site tour is a good way for proposers to get specific questions answered, it will be difficult if 150 vendors attend.

Tom Hoyt said it is his feeling that only seven days between the RFQ release and the site tour is not enough. He requested that an additional site tour be scheduled for approximately three weeks from now. Jeannine Parisi noted that since the RFQ closes on November 26, two weeks from now would be a better time interval.

Gail Murray said that there needs to be ample time allotted between site tours to answer the proposers' questions and post them on the EWEB website, and that, for example, a site tour three days prior to the RFQ closing date would not be enough time. Mark Johnson asked if a site tour two weeks from now would be acceptable. Tom Hoyt agreed and other CAT members voiced support for a second site tour.

Dave Hauser asked if there are any costs associated with the site tour. Gail Murray said there are not, just the time that it takes to give the tour and address any questions that are raised by the vendors. Dave suggested scheduling a second site tour now and then canceling it if there is not enough interest. Gail said a second tour date can be posted under the Addendum section.

Gail Murray reminded the team that now that the RFQ has been released, she is the single point of contact, and that any sidebar conversations with community members, vendors or anyone else, unless submitted as a written addendum, are not allowed and may in some instances cause project delays.

The team thanked Gail Murray for her presentation.

Jeannine Parisi said that the process by which CAT members will evaluate the RFQs will be discussed in more detail at the November 12 meeting. As a starting point, she then handed out a sample evaluation matrix and briefly explained how she developed the format based on the RFQ evaluation criteria and point system, and asked the team to give her some feedback on whether the format will work for them. She explained that this spreadsheet will probably be sent out electronically as Excel spreadsheets with the proposer names already inserted in each one. Each team member can either insert their rankings and comments electronically or in hard copy. She also asked the team to send her any other evaluation matrices that they may have used on another project. Lastly, she reminded the team that any handwritten notes on the evaluations will be considered public information, and that Gail Murray will be available to talk more about the evaluation process at the November 12 meeting.

Tom Hoyt asked for confirmation on how the evaluation process will play out. Jeannine Parisi explained that each individual team member will rank the proposers, then the results will be compiled, and the team will decide as a group on who their top five choices are. She added that the group will need to discuss the process for choosing their top five proposers to interview.

## Final CAT Ground Rules

Kathi Wiederhold handed out the final CAT Ground Rules that she compiled from the previously approved back-up decision making/trigger process, the process around decision making when a member(s) is absent, and the ground rules for group behavior. She added that the latest addition was inclusion of a media spokesperson under the group co-chair section.

### 5. “Ed’s Coed”

Dean Pape’, who had previously viewed “Ed’s Coed,” a 1929 silent film, queued up excerpts that contain footage of the Eugene millrace. He noted that it was difficult to figure out the various scenes in relation to their current day location.

Bob Hart, Executive Director of the Lane County Historical Society, provided some current day landmarks in some of the scenes to help with identification of current day property locations.

The team then took a 10-minute break.

### 6. Eugene Millrace: Context and Overview

Dave Hauser introduced Carolyn Weiss, City of Eugene Metro and Community Planning Manager, who gave a slide presentation regarding the Eugene millrace, past to present. The presentation included a context overview of the Willamette River and riverfront park land, the millrace’s historical and current route, and design work that has been done for possible daylighting of the millrace in the future. Carolyn introduced two City staff members, Robin Hostick, Landscape Architect, and Jenifer Willer, a civil engineer, who assisted her in the presentation and helped answer questions from the team afterwards.

Carolyn Weiss noted that the upper portion of the millrace is under discussion as part of the Walnut Center mixed use master plan, and that there is a sense of uncertainty about the future of the millrace within that process also. One significant element of uncertainty is associated with whether or not the University of Oregon will continue to operate the pump station that pulls water from the Willamette River into the millrace. The University has water rights to use this water as part of its steam plant operations, but stricter water quality regulations and uncertainty about the future of the University steam plant create a lot of unknowns.

Tom Hoyt asked if easements exist along the parts of the millrace abutting private property, and whether the property owners are being taxed. Jenifer Willer replied that she is not sure if easements exist. Carolyn Weiss added that land ownership varies and, in looking at a tax lot map, some tax lots extend across the millrace, indicating private ownership of the millrace. Tom noted that it will be important to be sure there is legal right to improve the millrace before improvements are planned, and that working closely with property owners will be key.

After a brief discussion regarding water flow, runoff and pipe capacity, Gary Wildish asked what is the capacity of the pipe that the millrace feeds into. Jenifer Willer replied that it is a flat 30" pipe and that maximum capacity is in the 20-30 cfs range, depending on how high the water gets.

Robin Hostick shared information about the Courthouse district planning process that included concepts for daylighting the millrace. He explained the challenges and opportunities associated with the daylighting option, noting that the estimated cost several years back was over \$20 million.

Dave Hauser asked Carolyn Weiss what she felt was the most relevant millrace issue for the CAT to address in the master plan process. Carolyn reiterated what had previously been mentioned in her presentation, that the entire millrace has to be looked at, not just the sections that are near the EWEB property, in order to make a decision regarding leaving it as is or daylighting it. She added that it is her feeling that the main question is, what are our priorities as a community to spend environmental restoration and urban renewal dollars on?

Mary Unruh noted that the design that features a riverfront area one story below street level presents a tremendous flood risk. Carolyn Weiss replied that flood capacity for that design could be addressed if necessary, and that the EWEB site is high enough on the riverbank that it shouldn't be a flood risk.

Gary Wildish asked where the 100-year flood plain is. Jenifer Willer replied that the majority of the millrace is outside the 100-year flood plain and that the 100-year flood plain runs along the railroad tracks. Gary Wildish noted that, for comparison, the Moshofsky Center which is located adjacent to Autzen Stadium is one foot above the flood plain.

In relation to a drawing showing the pipe's location along 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Tom Hoyt asked for confirmation that the new location will be different than where it is currently. Robin Hostick replied that it will be. Tom asked, if the luxury of re-designing flow is possible, if the millrace could be brought from the canoe shack up toward the river (on City/University property). He added that maybe something similar could be re-created in an area where there is public ownership, i.e., on the east side of the Riverfront Research Park.

Nan Laurence noted that the millrace actually runs along Mill Street, not 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue, and that there are so many different images, locations, and such a wide range of options that, again, one has to know what's going on with the entire millrace and the river in order to make a decision on whether or not to reopen the millrace.

A round robin session followed where team members voiced questions/issues for later discussion regarding the millrace as a part of the Riverfront Master Plan. These are listed below:

- The possibility of creating a channel from the University of Oregon steam plant toward the EWEB steam plant – a new arm
- What is the value to the community of maintaining the millrace?
- Insight from the courthouse project: what is the viability of moving the millrace?
- What is the value for the community for the millrace to go through the EWEB site?
- How would we maintain water quality to get to an acceptable level?
- A question of balance—are the economics and aesthetic benefits worth the expenditure of taxpayer money?
- Looking at other models, what has been the upside to the community?
- Is the property that would be needed to daylight the millrace a more valuable use for something else?
- Historically, was there a water wheel? Could one be incorporated into the millrace design?
- Transferability of water rights
- Should the millrace issue have a greater part in the RFQ?
- Collaborate with the University of Oregon regarding management and possible changes to the millrace
- Collaborate with the City of Springfield on its experience in redeveloping its millrace

Carolyn Weiss noted that a community-wide discussion may be necessary for answers to some of these questions and that her primary goal this evening was to share the complexity of millrace issues with the team.

The team thanked Carolyn for a great presentation.

A brief discussion ensued regarding whether the millrace issue should be covered more in-depth in the RFQ. Dave Hauser said it is his feeling that it can be discussed during interviews with the proposers.

Jeannine Parisi added that a link to Carolyn Weiss' presentation and the Riverfront Research Park can be placed on the EWEB website. Tom Hoyt said he would encourage that, along with a chronological history and how creativity will be key when changes in millrace location are discussed. He added that the millrace presentation fueled his fire and that he feels like tonight's meeting was a significant piece of the master plan process.

Tom Hoyt noted that he isn't able to attend the October 29 meeting and wondered if the University of Oregon architecture student presentations can be videotaped. Jeannine Parisi noted that this meeting may be moved to a larger EWEB meeting room and the location is TBA. Nan Laurence said she would look into having Metro TV videotape it, and Kathi Wiederhold said she also has a videographer contact she will check on.

Jeannine Parisi added that another possibility would be to take digital photos of, at minimum, the presentation boards, and send JPEG images out electronically.

Dean Pape' said he has already met with a couple of the students who will be presenting on October 29, as they wanted to ask him questions about riverfront projects he has worked on in Portland, Oregon. He said their plan is to compare their presentations to the EWEB project, then pick one portion of the EWEB project that they like, and do blocks within that one portion. He added that they asked very good questions and are doing excellent research in preparation for their presentations.

#### 7. Closing Comments and Next Steps

Dave Hauser asked for some final thoughts on the millrace presentation.

Mark Johnson said he believes the team has to be open to all options, including abandoning the millrace project completely.

Gary Wildish said that the millrace redesign could be designed in such a way as to control flood issues, i.e., with a bypass structure to take in the excess of stormwater. He said he believes a redesign is do-able, but also a matter of dollars and cents.

Mary Unruh said she believes that many options will come out of the presentations from the proposers, and whether they feel it is worth the expense, but that hearing tonight's background information will be very helpful in that process.

#### **Follow-Up Items:**

(CAT) Research millrace questions/comments (long-term)  
(Kathi/Jeannine) Videotape October 29 student presentations – Metro TV or, at minimum, photos of presentation boards

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

**Next Meeting:            Wednesday, October 29, 5:30 to 7:30 p.m.  
                                  University of Oregon Architecture Student Presentations  
                                  EWEB meeting room TBA**