

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

Wednesday, November 12, 5:30-7:30 p.m.

EWEB Board Room

Present: Dave Hauser, Tom Hoyt, Mark Johnson, Desiree Moore, Mary Unruh, Anita Van Asperdt and Gary Wildish, members; Nan Laurence, Mike Logan, Mark Oberle, Jeannine Parisi, and Kathi Wiederhold, EWEB Core Team; Gail Murray, EWEB staff, Vicki Maxon, Recorder; Tom Larsen, City of Eugene Traffic Engineer; Tim Shinabarger, Ellen Teninty and Christian Watchie, public.

Absent: Pat Johnston and Dean Pape'.

1. Welcome and Agenda/Material Review

Dave Hauser welcomed everyone and briefly went over the agenda.

2. Comments from the Audience

There were no comments.

3. Approve October 22 and 29, 2008 Minutes

The minutes were approved.

Dave Hauser commented that he is looking forward to viewing the architecture student presentations, as he was unable to attend the October 29 meeting. Mark Oberle said that the presentations were videotaped and that he also has the Powerpoint slides from the presentation. He added that an introduction for the video will be produced and when that is finished, he will get a copy of the DVD to the team members who were not able to attend the presentations.

Desiree Moore asked if the CAT can send an official thank you to the architecture students. She said she feels that their presentations were way beyond what the CAT expected and that they took a lot of care and time in preparation. Mark Oberle said he would follow up on this.

4. Transportation and Site Connectivity Overview

Nan Laurence gave a Powerpoint presentation regarding riverfront area transportation plans, including federal courthouse area improvements. The presentation will be posted on the EWEB website ([www.eweb.org](http://www.eweb.org)). A summary of the presentation and discussion points follows:

#### 8<sup>th</sup> & Mill Route:

- Recently opened (walkable route) to courthouse
- Does not go directly to river/re-routes around railroad tracks
- Hoping for funds to relocate railroad tracks

Desiree Moore asked why the City spent the money for this indirect route. Nan replied that it was too complicated and too costly to relocate the railroad tracks. She added that traffic backing up at this location could have placed cars on or too close to the railroad tracks at times. Mark Oberle added that the existing design was already open and available for the public to use.

Tom Larsen, City of Eugene Traffic Engineer, added that there were many issues related to the railroad tracks and the Hilyard Street relocation. He said it was originally an Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) road and its relocation required a band-aid for EWEB vehicle access to and from the EWEB property at its south gate. Nan Laurence added that improvements were made up to the railroad tracks and not beyond them.

Dave Hauser asked if the railroad crossing will be at grade. Nan Laurence replied that the crossing is currently at grade. Tom Larsen added that it is easier to get ODOT approval to relocate the existing crossing compared to the extremely difficult process of obtaining a new crossing. He noted that this route is compromised by the fact that there are currently about 24 train crossings per day on these tracks.

Nan reviewed other methods of access to the EWEB site:

#### 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue Route or Ferry Street Bridge:

- Best and easiest access, although still compromised
- No railroad crossing issue coming from Coburg Road, but difficult to return back to Coburg Road

#### Broadway Route:

- Same railroad crossing issue as for 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue

#### 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue Extension:

- Potential connection to the site north of the railroad tracks using existing north-south crossing at 5<sup>th</sup> & High

In discussing the possibilities for an under railroad crossing, Tom Hoyt noted that the same amount of land would be sacrificed as with the underpass at the end of Agate Street. Gary Wildish noted that the railroad is significantly higher than the road grade at Agate Street and the Ferry Street location. A brief discussion ensued regarding road gradient options, flood plain issues and elevation of the railroad tracks. Anita Van Asperdt recalled that this design could include the “one story down” option for daylighting the millrace but she wasn’t sure about the flood plain issues.

Desiree Moore asked for confirmation that the idea of this design was to allow vehicles and pedestrians from the downtown area to cross the railroad tracks without stopping. She also asked if the vehicle and pedestrian routes could be separate.

Nan Laurence explained that the conditional use permit for the Riverfront Research Park allowed a road along the property, but that development for the Park has been very slow because the occupants have to be research-oriented entities. She added that to plan for a road that connected the EWEB riverfront to the Riverfront Research Park road and the Agate underpass would be difficult because EWEB would not have control over the timing or the investment required to do it. She noted that these factors would put this design into the category of “uncertain.”

Desiree Moore asked if this design had been explored at all. Nan Laurence replied that the University of Oregon has participated in design discussions and feels that it is very important that the Riverfront Research Park be connected, and that access should be improved, but a whole another discussion revolves around how to finance access improvements and their timing. The CAT members requested that U of O Riverfront Research Park staff be included in the master planning discussion.

New on/off ramps from EWEB property to the viaduct:

- Expensive, but possible
- Ramps could potentially connect to parking garages under the viaduct.
- Jurisdiction for the road and bridge was transferred from State to City

Dave Hauser asked if widening the viaduct is subject to State jurisdiction. A brief discussion ensued regarding possible road widening and re-design of the 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue loop off of and onto Coburg Road.

Mary Unruh asked if there could be a spur road built off of one section of the loop to help traffic flow. Tom Larsen explained that the City has no intention of closing the loop but they are aware that it is a transportation-limited site, even though it is the only route to get to the riverfront from many arterials, including I-105. He added that merging traffic is a huge problem with only a 200-foot distance between the on ramp and Ferry Street Bridge.

Dave Hauser asked if the Riverfront Master Plan will speak to the developer or to the City of Eugene. Tom Larsen replied that he believes it will speak to both and that transportation issues need to be looked at in order to mitigate for the plan. He added that the City traffic engineers realize that the situation is currently marginal at best, and that any significant rise in traffic volume will crash the 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue access to northbound Coburg Road.

Nan Laurence noted new on/off ramps could mitigate the impact of the railroad and the viaduct but would raise the development cost. A big issue would be how to pay for it.

Tom Hoyt asked if the City is looking at two-way traffic on the ramps. Tom Larsen replied that early designs were looking more at the concept of connecting infrastructure that is 25 feet off the ground. Tom Hoyt then asked how traffic would get back on the ramp to go northbound. Tom Larsen noted that the photo did not show on-ramps, but they could be included. Nan Laurence noted that it might be possible to tie an on-ramp to a parking structure built alongside and/or under the overpass. Tom Larsen said he would guess that the highest-value property would not be located under the bridge, and a parking structure would come close to meeting the overpass at grade. Gary Wildish noted that a ramp could be built alongside and under. Nan Laurence replied that it is very difficult to get definitive on the cost of new on/off ramps.

Mark Oberle noted that California, because of greater density, is much further along building under overpasses than the State of Oregon is

Master Plan implications:

- Connection to 5<sup>th</sup> Street
- Core connection (easiest may be closer to 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue and closer to Midgley block)
- Access may determine location of activity
- Short-term vs. long-term strategies
- Spectrum of possibilities – 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue at one end, tunneling at the other
- Midgley block has potential for pulling from downtown more incidentally

Conclusion: Transportation parameters will have a major impact on site land use designations.

Tom Hoyt asked if the railroad tracks at 5<sup>th</sup> & High can be crossed diagonally or perpendicular. Nan Laurence replied that the tracks have to be crossed in a north/south direction, and that the existing grid is best for pedestrians and commercial access.

Gary Wildish said that, in his mind, access to the riverfront isn't the issue, as there are many ways to get to the riverfront, but traveling away from it isn't so easy. He added that, as everyone realizes, traveling away from the current EWEB property is a challenge even today. He added that he would like to talk more to Tom Larsen about possible opportunities.

In reference to the “jog” in the pedestrian path along 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue to the EWEB property, Desiree Moore noted that the photo shows a barrier there and asked how that came about. Nan Laurence explained that the intersection at Mill & 8<sup>th</sup> carried too much traffic for pedestrians to cross safely. To construct a pedestrian crossing at that location, northbound traffic moved behind the courthouse. This complicated the crossing at the end of 8<sup>th</sup> onto the EWEB property. The new design works but is not ideal. The eventual relocation of the railroad crossing slightly northwest will ease this crossing, so pedestrians will cross at the end of 8<sup>th</sup> onto the EWEB property between the Steam Plant and the substation.

Dave Hauser wrapped up the discussion because of time constraints. He noted that the CAT recognized early on that access to the riverfront is a key issue, and that this presentation will help to inform later discussions.

The group took a 10-minute break.

#### 5. Consultant Request for Qualifications (RFQ)

Mark Oberle told the team that EWEB staff met to discuss the specifics of the proposer evaluation process, especially whether evaluations and critical discussions related to the evaluations could be conducted in a public meeting. EWEB's legal counsel was involved in those discussions, and the decision was made that the entire proposer evaluation process needs to happen in executive session. This will maintain a level playing field for all applicants so that those people who are able to attend the CAT meetings are not privy to information that other applicants are not. The CAT also needs the ability to have frank discussions regarding the proposals and evaluations. He added that Oregon Revised Statutes states that if the need for frank discussion outweighs the need for public disclosure, the evaluation process can be held in Executive Session. Therefore, the proposer evaluation process will be conducted in Executive Session, but the CAT presentation to the EWEB Board regarding their final selection will be in public session.

Gary Wildish said that from a proposer point of view, he is happy with this decision, because the group's comments about firms and their proposals shouldn't be shared with the public before the selection is made. Mark Oberle noted that brief summary notes regarding the evaluations will be made public after the evaluation process has been completed. He added that he struggled with the decision at first because of the importance of public process but realized that in the long run, release of confidential proposer information might give one proposer an advantage or disadvantage over another.

Desiree Moore said she totally agrees with the decision but warned that the CAT needs to be prepared to explain to the public why the process will be closed in order to be fair to all proposers. She added that there is a fine line between sharing that information with the public or not, and that there will be questions as to why it is conducted in that manner.

Gail Murray, Purchasing Coordinator, explained that all of EWEB's RFQs are conducted this way, and that all public agencies are required by law to do this. Mary Unruh gave the analogy of an organization not airing personnel issues to the public.

Mark Oberle noted that the meetings in which the evaluations are conducted will be announced as closed Executive Sessions, but that they are available to the media and the media is allowed to monitor them. Any resulting decision from the executive session can also be announced.

Tom Hoyt asked if the CAT's notes regarding the selection and evaluation process are considered public record. Gail Murray replied that those notes aren't normally released, but if someone wanted that information, the Purchasing Department would handle it. She reminded the CAT that once the consultant is chosen, it is that individual who will be working with the public.

Tom Hoyt said that he feels that a private evaluation process is important in order to select the best qualified consultant and, if the evaluation process is publicized, the CAT won't get the best consultant. Gail Murray agreed, and reiterated the need for a level playing field for all proposers.

Gail Murray handed out the October 23 site tour attendance list and said that 30 proposers representing 21 different consulting firms attended. She noted that the second site tour is tomorrow, November 13, and that attendees of the first site tour are welcome to attend the second one. She added that questions and answers generated from the November 13 site tour will be posted on the EWEB website in the same way as the ones from the October 23 site tour.

Jeannine Parisi handed out the evaluation matrix and selection process schedule a contained in the RFQ. Dave Hauser noted that the core team met last week to review the schedule, and that he would like a commitment from the CAT on whether or not this schedule is workable. Gail Murray reminded the team that the Purchasing Department will do the first cut to make sure that all proposals meet the minimum requirements and that all forms are signed, etc. and that the packets will be ready for the CAT to pick up on Wednesday, November 26. She also reiterated to the team that there can be no public discussions of any proposer or the selection or evaluation process, and that even a seemingly innocent comment could result in a protest. She also briefly listed other guidelines and examples regarding preferential treatment of a proposer in any way, including conflict of interest or financial involvement.

Gary Wildish told the team that it is likely that he will be very familiar with some of the proposers because he is in the construction business. He added that familiarity with some proposers is the only issue, and that he is not financially involved with any of them. Gail Murray replied that there is a conflict of interest form that can be signed that will help to determine the type of relationship with a proposer. She added that if proposers would happen to ask a team member a specific question, and even if the team member knows the answer, the team member should direct the proposer to the EWEB website or to call her directly. Gail also said she will send the CAT a list of potential conflicts of interest.

Nan Laurence asked for confirmation that the CAT will be evaluating the proposals and then making a recommendation to the EWEB Board on selection of a consultant. Gail Murray replied that is correct, that the CAT will read through all the proposals and score them using the evaluation matrix provided, and then turn them in to the Purchasing Department. She reminded them that they can only score the proposers on the elements that are listed in the RFQ.

Jeannine Parisi handed out a revised evaluation matrix and explained that one side is the matrix design that she handed out previously and that the other side was designed by Dean Pape'. She asked the CAT to let her know what version they are more comfortable with and noted that Dean's matrix gets a little more specific regarding comments about each proposer. She added that once the CAT chooses their preferred matrix design, staff will fill in the name of each proposer before they are distributed, and that because they are Excel spreadsheets, they can be filled out electronically.

Gail Murray continued with the timeline, saying that the evaluation sheets will be turned in to Mark Oberle and then the CAT will tentatively meet on Thursday, December 4 (depending on the number of proposers) to discuss the evaluations and identify finalists. Jeannine Parisi added that the Friday, December 5 meeting was added as a cushion in case the CAT doesn't complete the discussion on December 4. She asked if there are any conflicts with those two meeting dates.

Anita Van Asperdt asked that the packets to be picked up on November 26 include all previous questions/answers, addendums, conflict of interest information, etc. so the CAT will have all the evaluation information they need in one packet. Gail Murray agreed.

Jeannine Parisi noted that the December 10 CAT meeting is a regularly scheduled meeting date and that the CAT will be developing interview questions at that time. While that piece will be held in Executive Session, the meeting can segue into a public session if necessary.

Gail Murray continued with her explanation of the evaluation process, saying that the December 15-19 interview dates include time allowed for clarification issues from proposers that may arise. These issues are required to be written "requests for clarification" and the response to those also needs to be written. After that, the interviews will then be scheduled, adjusted for the number of proposers, and the CAT will develop the list of questions. Each proposer will have 15 minutes at the beginning of each interview to tell the CAT about themselves, then the interview process will begin. Jeannine Parisi added that the CAT will regroup on a different day to select the finalists. Gail continued, saying that after the interviews are completed and the consultant is selected, the Notice of Intent to Award will be done, and a seven-day protest period will commence.

Dave Hauser thanked Gail Murray for her time and said that it was helpful to have her go over the timeline. He then asked for comments from the CAT.

Tom Hoyt said that he believes the schedule is a joke, and that to require CAT members to stay in town until 5:00 p.m. on the day before Thanksgiving in order to pick up the packets is unreasonable. He added that he believes the CAT has put themselves into a box with this schedule and that the timeline creates too much pressure. He noted that much progress has been made in the last three CAT meetings and that he is willing to make some personal sacrifices for this process, but that he also believes the CAT needs to create a schedule that is workable for all members.

Anita Van Asperdt said that if EWEB receives more than 10 proposals, the timeline won't work for her and that she feels this schedule would be "pushing it."

Gary Wildish proposed moving the Friday, December 5 meeting to Saturday, December 6. He wondered if the CAT will need a full five days to conduct the interviews if they are able to interview 2-3 proposers per day. He agreed that he wouldn't be able to do a decent evaluation by Wednesday, December 3.

Dave Hauser noted that the CAT had previously discussed revisiting the schedule after the number of proposers is known. Gail Murray noted that the interview dates have already been provided to the proposers.

Desiree Moore wondered if a tentative schedule could be agreed on until the number of proposers is known, and then adjusted after that.

Mary Unruh said she feels this schedule is ambitious, especially based on the number of people who attended the first site tour. Gail Murray noted that the number of proposers can't really be judged from the number who attend the site tour, because all who attended may not actually submit a proposal. Mary replied that she doesn't want to rush through the evaluations because, after more than 2-3 applications in a row, it's hard to remember all the details to evaluate, and she feels the proposers deserve better than that.

Mark Johnson said he feels the schedule is do-able but that he won't be available on either December 4 or 5, so Saturday, December 6 would be a better meeting date for him.

Anita Van Asperdt suggested moving the meeting to Saturday, December 6 if 10 or less proposals are submitted and, if more than 10 proposals are submitted, revising the schedule to accommodate.

Desiree Moore asked if there is any way to predict how many will attend tomorrow's second site tour. Gary Wildish said that he feels there will be some repeat attendees because, in his experience, after the first site tour is taken, one typically digests the information and then wants to take a second look. Desiree Moore recalled how impressed she was with the site on the CAT's site tour, and agreed with Gary.

Tom Hoyt noted that if he is the only CAT member who is leaving town for the Thanksgiving weekend, he can cope with the timeline for individual evaluation/ranking of the RFQs.

A discussion ensued regarding how best to revise the timeline in order to allow CAT members to make thorough evaluations. Desiree Moore noted that she is committed to the process, but excused herself due to the discussion extending past the allotted meeting time. Jeannine Parisi suggested that it might be easier for the proposers to have a date certain, even if it is delayed, as soon as possible, rather than base the schedule on the number of proposals received. She also suggested that there will most likely be more than 10 proposals, so it seems more likely that the schedule will slip.

At the conclusion of the discussion, Dave Hauser said that the timeline will be extended beyond the holidays but noted that this may delay the CAT process somewhat. Gail Murray said she will prepare an addendum to be posted on the EWEB website.

Mark Oberle said that he will try to send out a revised timeline by Friday afternoon, November 15. Dave Hauser wondered, since there were two absentees at tonight's meeting and since Desiree Moore had already left, if they should go ahead and make the decision to extend time frame for interviews. Kathi Wiederhold, Facilitator, suggested that the team go ahead and make the decision tonight.

Dave Hauser reiterated that the final decision is to extend the time frame for interviews to after the first of the year, date TBA. Mark Oberle noted that the best way to revise the timeline is to set the dates for interviews and then work backward from there.

Gary Wildish noted that the closing date/time of Wednesday, November 26 could be retained but that CAT members could instead pick up packets on Monday, December 1, which would give Purchasing more time to prepare them.

Jeannine Parisi noted that the December CAT meeting dates still need to be confirmed but that the December 10 meeting will probably stand, and that the interview questions will need to be worked on. Tom Hoyt reiterated that he thinks a Saturday work session would be a positive.

#### 6. Closing Comments and Next Steps

(Mark O) Set regular meeting dates for December (December 10 will most likely remain)

(Mark O) Send an official thank you to architecture student presenters

(CAT) Collaborate with U of O regarding Riverfront Research Park access to riverfront

(Mark O) Present contextual info to consultant re: millrace, transportation issues, etc.

(Gail M) Send conflict of interest info to CAT and include with RFQ copies

(Gail M) Provide complete copies of all RFQs to CAT with addenda, etc.

(Staff/Co-Chairs) Rework evaluation/interview/selection schedule to allow more time; extend beyond the holidays.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:40 p.m.

**Next Meeting:            Wednesday, November 19, 5:30 to 7:30 p.m.  
                                  EWEB Board Room**