



Eugene City Council

125 E. 8th Ave., 2nd Floor
Eugene, OR 97401-2793
541-682-5010 • 541-682-5414 Fax
www.eugene-or.gov

EUGENE CITY COUNCIL AGENDA

October 26, 2016

12:00 p.m. CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION
Harris Hall
125 East 8th Avenue
Eugene, Oregon 97401

Meeting of October 26, 2016;
Her Honor Mayor Kitty Piercy Presiding

Councilors

Greg Evans, President
George Brown
George Poling
Claire Syrett

Alan Zelenka, Vice President
Mike Clark
Chris Pryor
Betty Taylor

12:00 p.m. CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION
Harris Hall, 125 East 8th Avenue

- 1. WORK SESSION**
Coordinated Downtown Development

The Eugene City Council welcomes your interest in these agenda items. This meeting location is wheelchair-accessible. For the hearing impaired, an interpreter can be provided with 48 hours' notice prior to the meeting. Spanish-language interpretation will also be provided with 48 hours' notice. To arrange for these services, contact the receptionist at 541-682-5010. City Council meetings are telecast live on Metro Television, Comcast channel 21, and rebroadcast later in the week.

El consejo de la Ciudad de Eugene agradece su interés en estos asuntos de la agenda. El lugar de la reunión tiene acceso para sillas de ruedas. Se puede proveer a un intérprete para las personas con discapacidad auditiva si avisa con 48 horas de anticipación. También se puede proveer interpretación para español si avisa con 48 horas de anticipación. Para reservar estos servicios llame al 541-682-5010. Las reuniones del consejo de la ciudad se transmiten en vivo por Metro Television, Canal 21 de Comcast y son retransmitidas durante la semana.

For more information, contact the Council Coordinator at 541-682-5010,
or visit us online at ***www.eugene-or.gov***.

EUGENE CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY



Work Session: Coordinated Downtown Development

Meeting Date: October 26, 2016
Department: Central Services
www.eugene-or.gov

Agenda Item Number: 1
Staff Contact: Kristie Hammitt
Contact Telephone Number: 541-682-5524

ISSUE STATEMENT

The purpose of this work session is for Council to continue discussing and providing feedback regarding the information that was presented at the October 19, 2016, Joint Elected Officials meeting regarding the work of the Joint Task Force on Coordinated Downtown Development. This work session is intended to afford City Council the opportunity to provide detailed feedback and specific direction to staff with regard to the work of the Joint Task Force.

BACKGROUND

On July 14, 2016, the Eugene City Council and the Board of County Commissioners held a joint session to provide an update on several planned projects in downtown Eugene and to discuss the potential for collaboration on the development of a renewed civic center.

On July 18, 2016, the Eugene City Council approved a motion to direct the City Manager to work with the County and the Court to investigate the following possibilities: (1) a new City Hall on the Butterfly Lot and a Courthouse on the full City Hall block; (2) Phase 1 of a new City Hall as currently planned and a wrap-around Courthouse; (3) other options that may arise. The motion also cited factors to consider including, but not limited to, parking, City Hall Phase 2 and farmer's market. Further, Council directed that the work with the County and Court shall be completed by November 15, 2016. Following this action by the Council, the Board of County Commissioners provided similar direction to the County Administrator in its July 19, 2016, meeting. To fulfill this charge, City and County staff met regularly through the month of August to charter the work and begin the collaborative effort necessary to fulfill the direction of each of the elected bodies.

On September 20, 2016, staff presented an update on these efforts to a joint session of the Eugene City Council and Board of County Commissioners. This update included a review of the Elected Representative Group (ERG) members and their role in the work, a review of the joint Staff Task Force (STF) members, and an introduction of the task force's independent facilitator, Cameron McCarthy. Additionally, Cameron McCarthy reviewed the planned scope of work of the task force, as well as the approach and methodology they will employ in order to meet the demanding schedule the work must be completed within.

On October 19, 2016, City and County staff, along with representatives from Cameron McCarthy, presented information on work completed since the previous joint elected officials meeting. This included an update on the project task/action list, a review of the space programs that have been

developed for each of the uses to be accommodated under each development scenario, a discussion on the task force's draft prerequisites and considerations document, and a presentation of preliminary development concept models.

This Council work session is intended to serve as an opportunity for the City Council to review and comment on the material that was presented and discussed at the October 19, 2016, Joint Elected Officials meeting. This work session is scheduled to provide City Council with an opportunity to provide detailed feedback and specific direction to City staff with regard to the work of the Joint Task Force.

RELATED CITY POLICIES

The Coordinated Downtown Development planning process relates to the council goals of an effective, accountable municipal government, a safe community, and sustainable community growth and change.

CITY MANAGER'S RECOMMENDATION

Staff requests that the City Council provide direction on the following draft work products the Joint Task Force presented at the October 19, 2016, Joint Elected Officials Meeting:

1. Draft Prerequisites and Considerations Document – Any additions, deletions, or revisions
2. Preliminary development scenarios – Provide direction that narrows the six preliminary scenarios to three by eliminating or combining portions of the two options for each of the three scenarios.

SUGGESTED MOTION

Specific motions are not suggested at this time. Council answers to the questions outlined in the options above will determine necessary motions.

ATTACHMENTS

- A. October 19, 2016, Joint Elected Officials Meeting Materials

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Staff Contact: Kristie Hammitt
Telephone: 541-682-5524
Staff E-Mail: kristie.a.hammitt@ci.eugene.or.us



AGENDA ITEM SUMMARY

City of Eugene and Lane County Joint Work Session

Meeting Date: October 19, 2016

ISSUE STATEMENT

The purpose of this work session is to present an update on the work of the Joint Task Force on Coordinated Downtown Development.

BACKGROUND

On July 14, 2016, the Board of County Commissioners and Eugene City Council held a joint session to provide an update on several planned projects in downtown Eugene and to discuss the potential for collaboration on the development of a renewed civic center.

On July 18, 2016, the Eugene City Council approved a motion to direct the City Manager to work with the County and the Court to investigate the following possibilities: (1) a new City Hall on the Butterfly Lot and a Courthouse on the full City Hall block; (2) Phase 1 of a new City Hall as currently planned and a wrap-around Courthouse; (3) other options that may arise. The motion also cited factors to consider including, but not limited to, parking, City Hall Phase 2 and farmer's market. Further, Council directed that the work with the County and Court shall be completed by November 15, 2016. Following this action by the Council, the Board of County Commissioners provided similar direction to the County Administrator in its July 19, 2016 meeting. To fulfill this charge, City and County staff met regularly through the month of August to charter the work and begin the collaborative effort necessary to fulfill the direction of each of the elected bodies.

On September 20, 2016, staff presented an update on these efforts to a joint session of the Board of County Commissioners and Eugene City Council. This update included a review of the Elected Representative Group (ERG) members and their role in the work, a review of the joint Staff Task Force (STF) members, and an introduction of the task force's independent facilitator, Cameron McCarthy. Additionally, Cameron McCarthy reviewed the planned scope of work of the task force, as well as the approach and methodology they will employ in order to meet the demanding schedule the work must be completed within.

In this session, City and County staff, along with representatives from Cameron McCarthy, will present information on work completed since the last joint elected officials meeting. This includes an update on the project task/action list (Attachment A), a review of the space programs that have been developed for each of the uses to be accommodated under each development scenario (Attachment B), a discussion on the task force's draft prerequisites and considerations document (Attachment C), and a presentation of preliminary development concept models.

RECOMMENDATION

There are no specific recommendations at this time.

ATTACHMENTS

- A. Coordinated Downtown Development Task/Action List, dated 10/12/17
- B. Coordinated Downtown Development, Draft Program Summaries
- C. Coordinated Downtown Development, Draft Prerequisites and Considerations

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Staff Contact: Kristie Hammitt, City of Eugene Central Service Director
Telephone: 541-682-5524
Staff E-Mail: kristie.a.hammitt@ci.eugene.or.us

Staff Contact: Greg Rikhoff, Lane County Operations Director
Telephone: 541-682-6262
Staff E-Mail: greg.rikhoff@co.lane.or.us



TASK	ITEM	RESPONSIBLE PARTY	DUE DATE STATUS
	Elected Representatives Group Meetings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 9/12 ERG Meeting 10/7 ERG Meeting 10/14 ERG Meeting 		Complete Complete Scheduled
	Joint Elected Officials Meetings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 9/20 JEO Update 10/19 JEO Update 11/14 JEO Update 		Complete Scheduled Scheduled
1.1	Communications Plan (Internal)	CM	Final
1.2	Project Goals	CM	Final
2	Research & Data Gathering		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> City Hall <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request for SketchUp Model Request for Existing Conditions info Courthouse Public Service Building <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request for historical info Butterfly Lot Farmers Market <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CPW Report Update Park Blocks Municipal Court All properties <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Title Reports 	COE COE LC LC CM	Complete Complete Pending Pending Pending
2.1	Land Use Requirements Memo	CM	Draft
2.2	Existing Conditions Maps and Property Summaries	CM	Draft
2.3	Site Analysis Diagrams <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 9/16 Background data request to CE 	CM COE	10/19 Complete
2.4	Opportunities and Constraints Diagrams	CM	10/19
3	Facility Programming & Templates		
3.1	Facility Program Summaries	CM/RSA	Draft
3.2	Building and Site Templates	CM/RSA	Draft
3.3	Development Concept Base Files	CM	Draft
3.4	Prerequisites and Considerations	CM/RSA	Draft
4	Coordinated Development Concepts		
4.1	Preliminary Development Concepts	CM/RSA	Draft

TASK	ITEM	RESPONSIBLE PARTY	DUE DATE STATUS
4.2	Refined Development Concepts	CM/RSA/RLB	10/19
4.3	Preferred Development Concepts	CM/RSA/RLB	10/26
5	Reporting		
5.1	Draft Report	CM	11/2
5.2	Final Report	CM	11/9



CAMERON
McCARTHY

**COORDINATED DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT
LANE COUNTY & CITY OF EUGENE**

DRAFT PROGRAM SUMMARIES

October 7, 2016

EUGENE CITY HALL				NOTES
Phase 1				
Building				
Council Chambers	3,000	GSF		LEED Silver Baseline, LEED Gold Preferred
Council Work Session Room	1,200	GSF		
Lobby	2,000	GSF		
Council Office Space	1,000	GSF		
Mayor's Office + Conference Room	800	GSF		
City Manager's Office	22,000	GSF		Staff of 30
Related Meeting and Support Spaces	5,000	GSF		
Subtotal Building		35,000	GSF	
Site				
Parking, Secure (15-20 Vehicles)	7,000	GSF		20 Spaces @ 350 SF
Bike Parking, Covered Structure	500	GSF		
Public Plaza	8,000	GSF		
Service and Support	5,000	GSF		
Landscaping / Stormwater Management		GSF		Percentage of Impervious Area
Subtotal Site		20,500	GSF	
Total Combined Area Phase 1		55,500	GSF	
Phase 2				
Building				
Public Works Department	40,000	GSF		LEED Silver Baseline, LEED Gold Preferred
Planning & Development Department	40,000	GSF		Joint PW/PDD Facility is Preferred
Information Services Department	15,000	GSF		Joint PW/PDD Facility is Preferred
Human Resources and Risk Services Department	10,000	GSF		
Finance & Central Services Department	10,000	GSF		
Subtotal Building		115,000	GSF	
Site				
Parking, Secure	0	GSF		Use Downtown Parking Pool
Service and Support	5,000	GSF		
Landscaping / Stormwater Management		GSF		Percentage of Impervious Area
Subtotal Site		5,000	GSF	
Total Combined Area Phase 2		120,000	GSF	
Total Combined Phase 1 and Phase 2		175,500	GSF	
EUGENE MUNICIPAL COURT				
NOTES				
Building				
Municipal Court	18,500	GSF		LEED Silver Baseline, LEED Gold Preferred
Community Court	1,500	GSF		
Subtotal Building		20,000	GSF	
Site				
Parking, Secure	2,100	GSF		6 Spaces @ 350 SF
Parking, Public	0	GSF		Use Downtown Parking Pool
Bike Parking, Covered Structure	200	GSF		
Service and Support		GSF		
Landscaping / Stormwater Management		GSF		Percentage of Impervious Area
Subtotal Site		2,300	GSF	
Total Combined Area		22,300	GSF	



CAMERON
McCARTHY

**COORDINATED DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT
LANE COUNTY & CITY OF EUGENE**

DRAFT PROGRAM SUMMARIES

October 7, 2016

LANE COUNTY COURTHOUSE				NOTES
Building				
Public Facilities & Building Support Spaces	21,963	GSF		Excludes Secure Parking
Courts	82,880	GSF		
Courts Administration	22,648	GSF		
Sheriff Transport and Central Holding	7,364	GSF		In Courthouse, Required
Main Sheriff's Office	43,414	GSF		May be in Separate Facility adjacent to Courthouse
Parole and Probation Services	5,480	GSF		May be in Separate Facility adjacent to Courthouse
State Offices	23,125	GSF		
District Attorney Office	29,256	GSF		May be in Separate Facility adjacent to Courthouse
District Attorney's Satellite Office / Grand Jury	3,904	GSF		Needed in Courthouse only if DA Offices not in Courthouse
Subtotal Building			240,034	GSF
Site				
Secure Parking, Judicial	10,500	GSF		30 Spaces @ 350 SF, Direct Access to Courthouse
Secure Parking, DA / Sheriff	3,500	GSF		10 Spaces @ 350 SF, Direct Access to DA/Sheriff
Secure Parking, Sheriff Patrol	10,500	GSF		30 Spaces @ 350 SF (Half Total) Near Sheriff Office
Bike Parking, Covered Structure	500	GSF		
Public Plaza	19,800	GSF		Size of Existing Wayne Morse Plaza
Service and Support	5,000	GSF		
Landscaping / Stormwater Management		GSF		Percentage of Impervious Area
Subtotal Site			49,800	GSF
Total Combined Area			289,834	GSF
LANE COUNTY FARMERS MARKET				NOTES
Building				
Storage	150	GSF		Tables, chairs, equipment, signage, etc.
Restrooms	300	GSF		
Indoor / Covered Facility	12,000	GSF		Included in Vending Area below; 25-30 Venders
Subtotal Building			12,450	GSF
Site				
Outdoor Vending Area (Undercover and Open)	35,550	GSF		Saturday Largest Use: 100-120 Spaces, 10x10, 10x20, 10x30 Sizes
Bike Parking, Covered Structure	500	GSF		
Service & Support	2,000	GSF		
Landscaping / Stormwater Management	2,000	GSF		Percentage of Impervious Area
Subtotal Site			40,050	GSF
Total Combined Area			52,500	GSF



CAMERON
McCARTHY

COORDINATED DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT LANE COUNTY & CITY OF EUGENE

DRAFT PREREQUISITES AND CONSIDERATIONS

October 6, 2016

SITE	
Zoning	Are the tax lots properly zoned for their intended use?
Lot Size/ Buildable Area	Does the scenario provide adequate areas to support full buildout of intended uses after setback requirements are considered?
Development	Does the scenario accommodate the independent timelines of individual projects (i.e. through phased development)? Are there opportunities for future expansion (i.e. on nearby developable sites or through the repurposing of existing facilities)? Does the scenario require extensive relocation or removal of existing infrastructure or utilities?
Configuration/ Design Implications	Does the scenario create positive outdoor open spaces? Does the scenario allow for the building(s) to create optimal solar access? Does the topography allow for universal accessibility?
Access	Does the scenario allow for adequate and appropriate vehicular access for each of the uses included? Does the scenario allow for adequate and appropriate service access for each of the uses included? Does the scenario allow for adequate and appropriate building entries?
Infrastructure	Do the proposed facilities have reasonable access to adequate utility services and infrastructure? Are the new or modified infrastructure needs (e.g. water, power, telecomm, gas, vaults, routing of utilities) cost effective?

CONTEXT	
Relationship to Surrounding Elements	Does the scenario impact adjacent buildings, including other government facilities, in terms of building height, use, and access? Does this scenario impact the Park Blocks? Does the scenario impact adjacent outdoor programs or functions? Does the scenario impact important existing landscape features and amenities? Does the scenario impact adjacent cultural and historic resources? Does the scenario impact viewsheds / view corridors?
Planning	Does the scenario aid in implementing the Eugene Downtown Plan (2004) goals and policies? Does the scenario enhance 8th Avenue as a 'Great Street'? (W2W) Does the scenario support the creation of "special" places for economic and social interaction? Does the scenario promote connections to important public places, including urban plazas and open spaces?
Public Service	Does the scenario allow for co-location of government functions in a way that improves service to the public?

TRANSPORTATION	
Parking	Does the scenario provide opportunities for addressing the impact of increased demand and/or reduced capacity associated with the proposed development?



CAMERON
McCARTHY

COORDINATED DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT LANE COUNTY & CITY OF EUGENE

DRAFT PREREQUISITES AND CONSIDERATIONS

October 6, 2016

	Does the scenario provide opportunities for addressing the impact of increased demand and/or reduced capacity associated with other planned development in the downtown area and along the riverfront?
Active Transit	Are there connections to public transit within close proximity (i.e. 3 blocks)? Are there connections to pedestrian and bicycle routes?

COST

Project Costs	What cost increases/savings can be reasonably expected for the City Hall - Phase I project under this scenario, when compared to the planned Phase I construction on the site of the former City Hall? What cost increases/savings can be reasonably expected for the Courthouse project under this scenario, when compared to the constructing on the Butterfly Lot?
Development Costs	What is the total anticipated development cost of this scenario?

ADDITIONAL WORK REQUIRED

Additional Studies	What additional studies should be conducted to fully develop this concept?
Points of Negotiation	What agreements would need to be in place in order to facilitate this concept?