Interim Report

Evaluation of Seven Sites

Prepared for:

University of Oregon
Department of Intercollegiate Athletics
TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPENING STATEMENT - 03
BACKGROUND - 04
SEVEN SITES - 06
PROCESS - 10
CRITERIA - 12
SITE ANALYSIS - 15
   AUTZEN STADIUM - 16
   FRANKLIN 1 (GLENWOOD EAST) - 23
   FRANKLIN 3 (GLENWOOD WEST) - 30
   HOWE FIELD - 36
   NEW FEDERAL COURTHOUSE - 55
   NORTH CAMPUS - 62
   WILLIAMS’ BAKERY - 69
CONCLUSIONS - 78
OPENING STATEMENT

International Facilities Group, LLC (IFG) is pleased to provide this Interim Report for the evaluation of seven candidate sites relative to the new arena being planned by the University of Oregon (UO). This Interim Report is being provided in advance of our full and final evaluation report per the request of the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics.

The purpose of this Interim Report is to provide information relative to the major issues, advantages, or disadvantages for each of the seven sites. Please note that this Interim Report has not yet incorporated all feedback, information, data, and analysis obtained during the preparation stages for the evaluation of the seven sites.
BACKGROUND

The University of Oregon released a market analysis and feasibility study for a new arena under consideration for development in mid-April 2003. The study, prepared by Convention, Sports & Leisure International (CSL), indicated that a new arena development would be financially feasible, recommended a range for certain building program elements, and identified twenty candidate sites in the Eugene-Springfield metropolitan area for the potential development.

The new arena would replace McArthur Court as the home for UO men’s and women’s basketball, volleyball, and wrestling competitions. While the hosting of other University and non-University events are anticipated, the new arena is planned to be basketball-centric, with an emphasis on intimate sightlines reminiscent of those at McArthur Court.

McArthur Court, located near the southern edge of the main University campus, was built in 1926 and entirely financed with student fees. Over the years, the facility has undergone numerous renovations, including the addition of two vertically oriented seating balconies. The result is an intimate seating environment that is revered and embraced by many as among the most unique and intense of its kind in collegiate sports. However, McArthur Court (also known as Mac Court and “The Pit”), lacks an adequate seating capacity (currently 9,087), and many contemporary arena standard amenities, such as spacious concourses, suites, and adequate team, food & beverage, media, and restroom facilities to mention some.

Preliminary programming assumptions for the new arena include the following:

- Total capacity of 13,000 to 15,000 seats (event dependent), including:
  - Approximately 1,000 Club Seats,
  - Approximately 2,500 Donor Seats,
  - Approximately 20 Suites,
- Secondary venue with capacity of approximately 4,000 seats,
- Between four (04) and six (06) practice courts,
- Contemporary arena standards for concourses, food and beverage service, restrooms, and other patron amenities and operating functions,
- Additional program elements may include:
  - Academic Enhancement Center for Student Athletes,
  - Alumni Center,
- On-site parking for premium seat patrons, donors, media and press personnel, and other key personnel; capacity varying per site.

Following issuance of the CSL report, University representatives determined a short-list of seven candidate sites. The seven sites were announced on 19 April 2003. International Facilities Group was retained shortly thereafter to further evaluate the seven short-listed sites.
SEVEN SITES

The seven candidate arena development sites, listed alphabetically, are as follows:

- **Autzen Stadium**

  Specifically, the site consists of the existing gravel-surfaced parking lot immediately east of Autzen Stadium.

  The site boundaries are: Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard (formerly Centennial Boulevard) to the north and east, Leo Harris Parkway to the south, Autzen Stadium to the west, and the Patterson Slough to the immediate east.

  The total area available for development is approximately 26.7 acres, or 1,163,000 square feet.

  The site is already owned by the State of Oregon, Board of Higher Education (University), and is zoned PL (Public Land) under the jurisdiction of the City of Eugene.

- **Franklin 1 (Glenwood East)**

  Specifically, the site consists of the properties at the northeastern corner of Glenwood, adjacent to the bend of the Willamette River, and at the western foot of the Main Street Bridge from Springfield.

  The site boundaries are: the Willamette River to the north and east, Franklin Boulevard and the Main Street Bridge to the south, and North Brooklyn Street to the west.

  The total area available for development (within the boundaries noted above) is approximately 17.8 acres, or 775,000 square feet.

  The site consists of properties under the ownership of seven (07) separate parties, and is zoned both LM (Light – Medium Industrial) and CC (Community Commercial) under the jurisdiction of the City of Springfield.

  It should be noted that the Franklin 1 (Glenwood East) site has been enlarged for the purposes of this evaluation when compared to the same approximate site introduced in the CSL International feasibility report. Enlarging the site is necessary due to restrictions relative to development along the Willamette River and resulting non-build-able setbacks. As a result of the enlargement, the site encompasses more area and involves more existing property owners.
Franklin 3 (Glenwood West) -

Specifically, the linear wedge-shaped site consists of the properties along the northern and northwestern edge of Glenwood, adjacent to the Willamette River and Franklin Boulevard, and centered on Glenwood Boulevard to the south.

The site boundaries are: the Willamette River to the north, Franklin Boulevard to the south, and Henderson Avenue to the east.

The total area available for development (within the boundaries noted above) is approximately 13.1 acres, or 570,000 square feet.

The site consists of properties under the ownership of seven (07) separate parties, and is zoned both LM (Light – Medium Industrial) and CC (Community Commercial) under the jurisdiction of the City of Springfield.

It should be noted that the Franklin 3 (Glenwood West) site has been enlarged for the purposes of this evaluation when compared to the same approximate site introduced in the CSL International feasibility report. Enlarging the site is necessary due to restrictions relative to development along the Willamette River and resulting non-build-able setbacks, and due to this site’s already restrictive linear configuration. As a result of the enlargement, the site encompasses more area and involves more existing property owners.

Howe Field -

Specifically, the site consists of the existing softball field (“Howe Field”), Outdoor Program facilities, and adjacent Howe Extension Field (intramurals and recreational uses) immediately south of McArthur Court. Additionally, and depending on site master planning, the Intramural Fields east and down the slope from Howe Extension Field are included in the site boundaries. Lastly, and also depending on site master planning and further evaluation, the existing facilities north of Howe Field, including McArthur Court and the indoor Student Tennis Center may be considered as part of the overall site redevelopment.

This is the only site located within the boundaries of the main University campus.

The primary site boundaries are: McArthur Court (current home for UO basketball, volleyball, and wrestling) to the north, East 18th Avenue to the south, University Street to the west, and the Track & Field practice track and hammer throw facility to the east (Agate Street beyond).

The total area available for development is approximately 6.1 acres, or 265,000 square feet, depending on the site configuration.
The site is already owned by the State of Oregon, Board of Higher Education (University), and is zoned PL (Public Land) under the jurisdiction of the City of Eugene.

- **New Federal Courthouse (Courthouse District)** -

Specifically, the site consists of the properties within the newly designated Courthouse District redevelopment area, to the immediate southeast of the site for the new federal courthouse.

The site boundaries are: East 8th Avenue to the north, East Broadway to the south, Ferry Street to the west, and Hilyard Street to the east.

The total area available for development (within the boundaries noted above) is approximately 4.9 acres, or 215,000 square feet.

The site consists of properties under the ownership of twelve (12) separate parties, and is zoned both I-2 (Light – Medium Industrial) and C-2 (Community Commercial) under the jurisdiction of the City of Eugene.

- **North Campus (“Old Coke Bottling Plant”)** -

Specifically, the site consists of land north of the main University campus, Franklin Boulevard, and the Millrace canal, and adjacent to UO fine arts studios, UO central plant and facilities offices, and Riverfront Research Park.

The site boundaries are: Union Pacific Railroad right-of-way to the north, Millrace canal and Franklin Boulevard beyond to the south, “Gallery Street” pedestrian path and fine arts studios to the west, and Riverfront Parkway (Agate Street extension) to the east.

The total area available for development (within the boundaries noted above) is approximately 5.4 acres, or 234,000 square feet.

The site consists of properties under the ownership of two (02) parties (the State of Oregon, Board of Higher Education / University and the City of Eugene), and is zoned S (Special Area) under the jurisdiction of the City of Eugene.

- **Williams’ Bakery** -

Specifically, the site consists of the properties immediately east of the northeastern corner of the main University campus, currently occupied by Williams’ Bakery and several smaller commercial entities adjacent to Villard Street.
The site boundaries are: East 13th Avenue and Franklin Boulevard beyond to the north, East 14th Avenue (if extended) to the south, Columbia Street to the west, and Villard Street to the east.

The total area available for development (within the boundaries noted above) is approximately 7 acres, or 306,000 square feet.

The site consists of properties under the ownership of four (04) separate parties, and is zoned C-2 (Community Commercial), with a portion of the site (southeastern corner) zoned both C-2 and SR (Site Review overlay required) under the jurisdiction of the City of Eugene.
PROCESS

The evaluation of the seven candidate sites is based on the review and analysis of existing and available data.

Upon the recommendation of IFG, specialized firms were retained in May 2003 to assist in the evaluation of the sites. Those firms and their respective disciplines are as follows:

- GRI - Portland, Oregon
  Geotechnical / Soils

- Balzhiser & Hubbard Engineers - Eugene, Oregon
  Civil, Mechanical, and Electrical Infrastructure

- David Evans & Associates, Inc. (DEA) - Portland, Oregon
  Transportation and Parking

Additionally, and through a competitive proposal process, the UO retained the services of HKS, Inc. of Dallas, Texas as design consultant / architect in April 2003. HKS has assisted with this site evaluation by preparing footprint analyses (testing the capacity of each site for development), and analyses for critical adjacencies, and the surrounding context, which may positively or negatively impact the arena development (and/or which may be positively or negatively impacted by the arena development).

This site evaluation has not addressed, in depth, the condition of each site relative to hazardous waste, contaminated soils, requirements for environmental remediation, or the like. The evaluation will indicate an anticipated environmental impact to each site based on existing information and data made known to us.

Land value, or cost of acquisition, has been addressed by utilizing combined land and improvement real market values (RMV) as comparatives for each site. While not necessarily considered realistic or anticipated acquisition costs for each site, the data is a consistent baseline from site to site for the purpose of this evaluation. Real market values are based on 2002 data provided by Lane County.

During the months of May, June, and July 2003, IFG contacted, met with, and/or received feedback and information from several groups relative to this site evaluation. The groups may be classified as concerned neighbors, entities subject to relocation, jurisdictional authorities, property owners, or a combination of the above. Listed alphabetically, the groups are as follows:

- City of Eugene - Neighborhoods, Housing, & Community Development,
Information from the above parties has been reviewed, interpreted, and analyzed by IFG in order to prepare this evaluation report.
CRITERIA

In order to evaluate the merits of each of the seven sites, we have established the following criteria:

- **Capacity for Development**
  
  Are the size, configuration, and topography appropriate for the arena and its anticipated program?

- **Appropriate Scale for the Context**
  
  Would the scale of the planned arena development be appropriate to the surrounding context?

- **Impact to Neighbors**
  
  What are the anticipated impacts to surrounding neighbors (positive or negative)? Is opposition anticipated?

- **Critical Adjacencies**
  
  Are adjacent and surrounding entities (context / district), positive, negative, or mixed influences to the arena development?

- **Community Revitalization Goals**
  
  Would an arena development at the given site benefit the greater community and/or aid the community’s revitalization goals?

- **Long Range Campus Goals**
  
  Would an arena development at the given site match the intent and goals of the University’s Long Range Campus Development Plan and / or overall planning objectives?

  Due to its size, an arena development at the sites located either partially or entirely within University bounds (Autzen Stadium, Howe Field, and North Campus), would be subject to an amendment to the Long Range Campus Development Plan. The amendment would require a hearing with the Campus Planning Committee.

- **Proximity to Campus**
  
  Is the site within walking and biking distance from the University campus (ie: student access)?
Access and Egress -

Are the site’s access and egress (via automobile, and transit), anticipated to be acceptable or problematic?

Parking -

Is parking on-site and within ¼-mile of the site anticipated to be adequate or better than adequate?

Assumptions -

The anticipated program for on-site parking is estimated to include a minimum capacity of approximately 600 vehicle spaces, based on preliminary estimates on required parking for donors, major sponsors, suite and premium seating patrons, media, and other event personnel. A more realistic goal for on-site parking capacity for the above users may be closer to 1,000 spaces.

It is our understanding that the City of Eugene parking code (applicable to five of the seven sites: Autzen Stadium, Howe Field, New Federal Courthouse, North Campus, and Williams’ Bakery), requires a minimum of one off-street parking space for every 4.5 facility patrons within ¼-mile (or 1,320 feet) of the facility (based on the facility being designated as an arena). Based on an assumed facility capacity of 15,000 patrons, the required available off-street parking spaces within ¼-mile of the facility would be 3,334. However, an allowed automatic 25% reduction to the total, plus a further 25% reduction with an approved transportation management plan (TMP) reduces the required available off-street capacity within ¼-mile of the facility to 1,667, based on a facility capacity of 15,000.

Through discussions with David Evans & Associates (DEA), it is anticipated that the University and the City of Eugene may wish to discuss a variance allowing an enlargement of the code-required area for off-street parking around the site from the ¼-mile boundary to a recommended ½-mile boundary, at least surrounding sites where pedestrian accommodations are good (particularly the Howe Field and Williams’ Bakery sites). For some sites, this recommended larger ½-mile arc might be more appropriate considering the facility capacity of 15,000 patrons, the anticipated percentage of those patrons expected to arrive by car (typically between 70 and 80 percent), and the benefit of a wider distribution of vehicles and parking relative to offset arrival and departure times.
It is our understanding that City of Springfield parking code (applicable to two of the seven sites: Franklin 1 / Glenwood East and Franklin 3 / Glenwood West), does not require the same code provisions for parking as the City of Eugene, nor are the requirements as clear as the City of Springfield does not have an arena, stadium, or similar classification within the existing parking code.

Based on the arena development being classified as a “recreational facility,” code required parking would include a minimum of one off-street parking space for every 100-square feet of primary building area and for every 200-square feet of secondary building area. Assuming a rough order of magnitude estimate of 200,000 square feet of primary building area (assumed to mean seating bowl, concourses, and other “public” zones), and a rough order of magnitude estimate of 300,000 square feet of secondary building area (assumed to mean back-of-house / support space, administrative functions, service areas, mechanical spaces, practice facilities, and other “non-public” zones), the code requirement for off-street available facility parking (assumed to be entirely on-site), would translate to 3,500 spaces (2,000 for primary area and 1,500 for secondary area).

Further clarification and confirmation of the above assumptions and Springfield code requirements would need to be undertaken if either of the two Glenwood sites are to be further considered for the arena development.

- **Acquisition, Anticipated Ease of**
  How difficult is the acquisition of the land / properties anticipated to be? Are the property owners interested in selling / relocating? Can the land be acquired within the required timetable in order to break ground in the summer of 2004?

- **Acquisition, Anticipated Cost of**
  How costly is the acquisition of the land / properties anticipated to be?

- **Site Development Costs**
  How costly is the give site anticipated to be to develop (includes relocations, anticipated environmental remediation, demolition, geotechnical / complexity of foundation system, utilities and infrastructure, and site preparation.)
SITE ANALYSES

Each of the seven sites is reviewed in further detail on the following pages. Information for each site is organized according to the twelve Criteria described previously in the report. As mentioned previously in the Opening Statement, not all feedback, information, data, and analysis obtained during the preparation stages for the evaluation of the seven sites has been incorporated in this Interim Report. Sites are presented in alphabetical order.
AUTZEN STADIUM

- **Capacity for Development** -

Defined primarily as the existing gravel-surfaced parking lot east of the stadium, the Autzen Stadium site is the largest of the seven candidate sites. The site is more than adequate in size for the anticipated arena program, and does not present significant challenges with regard to configuration or topography (please reference *Site Development Costs*, below for further information relative to topography and geotechnical issues).

It is not anticipated that the entire site area available for development would be required to fulfill the program requirements for the arena. In all likelihood, a portion of the available site would be consumed by the arena development program and parking structure, while the remaining site would maintain its existing condition and be available for event parking.

As indicated above, a parking structure would be required at the Autzen Stadium site as part of the overall arena development, despite the more than adequate available land area. This is due to the requirement to offset any loss of existing football surface parking from the arena and ancillary program with replacement parking inventory (ie: the existing capacity for football parking must be maintained at a minimum).

- **Appropriate Scale for the Context** -

It is anticipated that an arena development at this site would complement the scale of the immediate context, specifically the other facilities of the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics. These facilities include the recently expanded outdoor football stadium (Autzen Stadium, with a capacity of approximately 54,000), the indoor football practice facility (Moshofsky Center), the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics’ administrative offices, football locker rooms, weight room, treatment room, wrestling practice facility, and meeting rooms (Casanova Center), competition soccer and lacrosse field (Pape Field), and outdoor football practice fields.

The Whilamut Natural Area, formerly East Alton Baker Park, is an undeveloped natural habitat and park, which stretches along the Willamette River south of the Autzen Stadium site and further eastward toward Springfield. Similar to the presence of Autzen Stadium as an object building within the wider landscape, a well designed arena development could further complement the juxtaposition of the athletics complex with the natural landscape to the south.
Across Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard and northwest from the site (directly north of Autzen Stadium) is the 37-acre John Serbu Youth Campus. The campus includes the Lane County Juvenile Justice Center, the Assessment Center, Pathways (alcohol treatment and substance abuse center), and McKay Lodge (adolescent boy’s treatment program). East of the John Serbu Youth Campus and immediately north of the arena site is Eugene Masonic Lodge No. 11, occupying approximately ten acres. The lodge structure occupies a portion of the western edge of its property with an asphalt-surfaced parking lot adjacent to the east. Further north and east of the lodge and parking lot is undeveloped land. The built structures at the John Serbu Youth Campus and the Masonic Lodge are set back from Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard 100-feet or more. Also, while the structures on these properties are significantly smaller than a new arena, they are already within the context of Autzen Stadium. It is therefore not anticipated that the scale of an arena development at this site would have a negative impact to these northern properties.

East of the site, the Patterson Slough would provide a buffer between the arena development and Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard (north / south-bound), and the several apartment complexes beyond.

- **Impact to Neighbors**

An arena development at the Autzen Stadium site is not anticipated to cause significant negative impacts to existing neighbors. In fact, some neighbors may benefit from the addition of an arena.

The Eugene Masonic Lodge # 11, located north of the site and across Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard, currently avails its parking lot during football events for a fee. In addition to the significant revenue generated (relative to the lodge’s overall annual revenue; indicated, but not confirmed), the lodge has noted that member staffing of the parking lot during Autzen Stadium events strengthens fellowship by bringing members together on a regular basis. The addition of an arena at the Autzen Stadium site, even if the development included adequate parking for arena events, would likely create a significant increase in annual parking revenue opportunities for the Masonic Lodge.

Some lodge members did indicate an initial wariness when asked their thoughts relative to a new arena development across from their property. There appeared to be a perception among some members that the recent expansion (and resulting increase in seating capacity of approximately 25%), of Autzen Stadium has created a challenging condition relative to parking. However, when it was noted that a new arena development would likely include a parking structure in order to maintain existing football parking capacity, the wariness appeared to ease.
It is anticipated that some negative reaction to an arena development at the Autzen Stadium site may possibly occur relative to an increased level of activity, and the perception that the increase in activity may impact the adjacent Whilamut Natural Area.

An arena development at the Autzen Stadium site would likely be viewed positively by the student population living in the multi-unit residential developments to the near east of the site (east of north – south bound Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard). While close enough to allow easy access to the facility, the residential developments are screened from the site by the Patterson Slough. Combined, the residential complexes of Chase Village, Duck’s Village, McKenna Estates, Parkgrove, and University Commons contain over 1,500 units and an estimated resident population of over 3,000 based on the combined quantity of bedrooms. Based on an unscientific telephone survey of each complex, it is estimated that approximately 2,000 of the residents are University of Oregon students.

Impacts, due to increased frequencies of heavy traffic brought by an arena, may be perceived as negative by the commercial entities west of the site along Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard to Coburg Road, the institutional entities immediately north of the site, and residential areas to the east. However, sharing the vicinity with Autzen Stadium for many years has conditioned those living, working, and otherwise spending time in the area to event-based activities and traffic, albeit not of the calendar-frequency that an arena would add.

- **Critical Adjacencies**

  A new arena development at the Autzen Stadium site would occur within the eastern limits of the University’s Department of Intercollegiate Athletics complex. The majority of offices for the various Athletics programs are housed in the Len Casanova Center, west of Autzen Stadium and the candidate arena site. Locating the arena within the Athletics complex would allow for easy and flexible cooperation between the facilities for Athletics staff, coaches, and student athletes.

  The Autzen Stadium site lacks the presence of an immediate commercial and retail infrastructure and general University student body activities required in order to generate a critical mass. Without the support of other non-event based activity (anticipated to be exhibited more readily at the New Federal Courthouse site and the Williams' Bakery site, for example), an arena at the Autzen Stadium site would likely fall short of the opportunity to make a greater contribution to the University community.
• **Community Revitalization Goals**

  The Autzen Stadium site is not within or near any community redevelopment zones that we are aware of.

• **Long Range Campus Goals**

  Due to the relatively large size of the planned arena, its development at the Autzen Stadium site (the site is within University bounds) would be subject to an amendment to the Long Range Campus Development Plan. However, the size of the arena development at this location is not anticipated to be an issue (it may be the most appropriate site if judged solely on size and scale). Rather, the site’s lack of immediate, or very near, proximity to the main University campus is a major shortfall relative to the primary goal of student accessibility (see *Proximity to Campus*, below).

  Without proximity to the main campus, it is anticipated that achieving optimal student body event attendance would require considerably more logistical planning and resources (see *Access and Egress*, below). Falling short of an optimal student attendance at University competition events would dilute the purpose of staging such events, in part to foster collegiate unity and pride.

  Lastly, as mentioned above under *Critical Adjacencies*, the lack of very near proximity to the main University campus could compromise the planning objective for the arena development to make a greater contribution to the University community, primarily by fostering student and faculty activities during non-event times.

• **Proximity to Campus**

  While pedestrian access from the main University campus to Autzen Stadium for football events is common, and in fact considered to be part of the event experience for many patrons, the same cannot be assumed for pedestrian and bicycle access to an arena at the same site.

  Collegiate football events occur primarily during the fall months (September through November), usually on Saturdays, and typically (although not always) during daytime hours. This combination of oft agreeable, though sometimes wet, conditions on weekend afternoons lends itself to walking from campus through a scenic landscape and river crossing, culminating in arrival at the stadium. The return walk minus anticipation of a pending event can be equally appreciated, especially following a win.

  Because the new arena is planned as a University facility primarily for basketball competitions, student access via walking and bicycling must be...
a strong consideration relative to location. Collegiate basketball events occur primarily during the winter months (November through February), on Thursday evenings, Saturday afternoons or evenings, and occasionally other days. This combination of oft cold, dark, and inclement Oregon weather conditions, frequently during weekday evenings, is not as conducive to safe and comfortable passage through undeveloped park space between campus and the Autzen Stadium site.

It should be noted that an estimated 2,000 University students reside at the multi-unit residential developments east of the Autzen Stadium site (see description under Impact to Neighbors, above). The Autzen Stadium site would consequently be easily accessible to student pedestrians and bicyclists residing at these complexes.

- **Access and Egress**

  Automobile traffic and transit access and egress would be primarily via Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard (formerly named Centennial Boulevard), from the west and from the east. Proximity and access to the freeway system is adequate, although congestive conditions may be expected at the intersections of Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard and Coburg Road to the west, which leads to freeway access.

  Many patrons of University athletic events over the years, particularly football events at Autzen Stadium, have become accustomed to the process of arriving and departing at the Autzen Stadium site. Event staff, local authorities, and the regional transit authority, Lane Transit District (LTD), have developed well-coordinated planning and training to handle traffic and flow for football events. It is anticipated that similar measures would be utilized to accommodate and manage traffic and transit for arena events at the site.

  As mentioned previously, student accessibility to the arena, predominantly by walking or bicycling, is a primary consideration for the new arena development. Since the Autzen Stadium site lacks an optimal proximity to the main University campus, it is anticipated that additional planning, coordination, and resources would need to be implemented relative to transporting students between the main campus and the site for events. One likely medium could be a system of shuttles. But even a well-planned system would need to advertised, convenient, and easy to negotiate in order to consistently deliver the desired quantities of students.

  While existing events (football) at the Autzen Stadium site do create traffic congestion on the street and freeway system, the population has been conditioned to the occasional inconvenience. An arena would, however add considerably to the number of annual events held at this site. It
should be noted that traffic generated by an arena event would be significantly less in volume compared to traffic generated by an Autzen Stadium football event. While the arena’s anticipated patron capacity is approximately 15,000, the patron capacity of Autzen Stadium is significantly higher at 54,000.

- **Parking**

  Due to the more than adequate site capacity, the ability to facilitate event parking entirely on-site will be possible, if desired, with a combination of surface parking lots and structured parking (see explanation for structured parking under *Capacity for Development*, above). Complete on-site parking facilitation, however, would require a relatively large parking structure, at a significant cost, which would likely not be utilized during non-event times.

  The number of required event parking stalls estimated to be needed for an arena development at the Autzen Stadium site is between 4,040 and 4,850 (it is estimated that 80.8% of the arena patrons will drive to this site), based on analysis by David Evans & Associates.

- **Acquisition, Anticipated Ease of**

  The Autzen Stadium site is owned by the State of Oregon, Board of Higher Education (i.e.: the University of Oregon). Therefore, no direct land acquisition would be required for an arena development at this site.

- **Acquisition, Anticipated Cost of**

  As noted above, the Autzen Stadium site is owned by the State of Oregon, Board of Higher Education (i.e.: the University of Oregon). Therefore, no direct land acquisition, or associated costs, would be required for an arena development at this site.

- **Site Development Costs**

  Geotechnical Considerations:

    - The Autzen Stadium site is amongst the more challenging of the seven sites with regard to geotechnical issues, based on research conducted by GRI.

    - Site preparation and foundation system strategies would likely involve over-excavation of anticipated debris fill and introduction of new fill, or the utilization of structural piles in lieu of spread footings (foundation system).
Fill would be required as well to raise grades, as the site is partially located within the 100-year flood plain.

Possible berm strategy in lieu of depressed lower seating bowl would result in non-ideal arena entry and egress (at the approximate vertical mid-point between seating populations).

Water-retention wall may be required, depending on design strategy, to mitigate the impact of seasonal high ground water.

Utility Infrastructure Considerations:

- 45-inch domestic water main (bisects the site, running approximately west – east), at a shallow depth would need to be relocated or avoided.

- No significant issues relative to existing utility capacity.

- Possibility exists to tie arena heating system to campus steam system, though upgrades to the campus central plant may be required.

- Electrical service would best be provided from the local utility via existing primary service. Emergency power would be site based in lieu of tying into the campus’ central power plant.
FRANKLIN 1 (GLENWOOD EAST)

- **Capacity for Development** -

The Franklin 1 site is the second largest of the seven sites in total area, however the site includes development restrictions, resulting in a reduction of available area for development.

Adjacency of the site to the Willamette River requires mandatory riparian setbacks per the Willamette River Greenway. The first setback is a 75-foot no build zone, while the second is an additional 75-foot (of 150-feet from the river bank), partial-build zone. While it is not clear what development may occur within the partial build zone, it is safe to assume that the majority of arena development program would be set back from the river a minimum of 150-feet.

While the remaining site area available for development is significantly reduced as a result of the setback, it is anticipated to be more than adequate for the arena development. However, structured parking will be required on site in order to facilitate event parking. As noted below under **Parking**, the inclusion of a relatively large parking structure at this site would be a significant expense with minimal return. This is due to the site’s lack of critical mass and the resulting lack of use the parking structure would see during non-event times.

- **Appropriate Scale for the Context** -

A new arena at the Franklin 1 (Glenwood East) site would be significantly larger in mass and scale relative to the existing structures near or around the site. However, the site’s largely industrial context, subject to eventual redevelopment per City of Springfield planning efforts, its adjacency to Franklin Boulevard, a major thoroughfare, and its adjacency to the grand scale of the Willamette River and the Main Street Bridge from Springfield suggest that the arena scale could be appropriate at this site.

The City of Springfield has undertaken planning efforts relative to the redevelopment of the Glenwood district, particularly the eastern half of the district, which includes the Franklin 1 site. Perhaps the most influential effort with regard to this area is a three-plus-year eastern Glenwood nodal redevelopment study, which would include realignment of the street network and mixed-use redevelopment including office, commercial, retail, and residential uses. While this plan currently subdivides the Franklin 1 site into several sub-parcels and suggests smaller scale mixed-use development of those parcels, City of Springfield staff has indicated that it might be willing to review revisions to the concept, which would allow for an arena development at the Franklin 1 site, albeit with a
somewhat modified configuration. As noted below under Community Revitalization Goals, it is our understanding that City of Springfield City Council may be receptive to this nodal redevelopment, but has not yet committed to it yet, primarily due to a lack of resolution with regard to funding.

A second City of Springfield concept study, described in more detail under Community Revitalization Goals, below, is the City of Springfield Civic Center concept. The Civic Center, if developed, would be located across the Willamette River from the Franklin 1 site, adjacent and east of Island Park. Some master planning concepts for the Civic Center suggest a minor-league caliber baseball ballpark at the Franklin 1 site location. It is estimated that a minor league ballpark at this site would have a scale similar to an arena development, with a patron seating capacity slightly smaller (estimated at between 5,000 to 10,000 seats for the ballpark compared to 15,000 seats for the planned arena).

- **Impact to Neighbors**

An arena development at the Franklin 1 (Glenwood East) site would likely result in significant impacts to its neighbors, though not all impacts would be negative.

It is possible (perhaps probable given adequate time) that a redevelopment of the magnitude of the planned arena development within a largely industrial and under-developed context could become a catalyst for further metamorphosis of the area. This is certainly not guaranteed, and there are plenty of examples of arena or stadium developments within under-developed areas, which sit dormant and surrounded by a lack of support infrastructure, during non-event times. With time, however, it is likely that adjacent property values would rise and some support development (restaurants, retail, other entertainment functions), would follow. Some existing neighbors to the site might support this evolution, while others may see it as unwelcome change and oppose it.

The most immediate impact to neighbors (mostly a mix of industrial uses and commercial entities supporting the industrial uses), would be a significant increase in activity and traffic before and after events. This could be perceived as a major obstacle to the existing neighbors and their businesses, particularly if event traffic regularly occurs during hours of business operation. Event traffic would be especially prominent at the Franklin 1 site, as it would at the Franklin 3 site, due to the high percentage of patrons expected to arrive by car.

The Franklin 1 (Glenwood East) site’s close proximity (directly across the Willamette River), to the City of Springfield and its commercial center could translate into a greater visibility and vitality for the typically quiet
secondary hub. It is conceivable that over time the adjacency to an arena development combined with increased visibility and activity in the area could lead to a resurgence in commercial activity and development for downtown Springfield.

Lastly, as the site lies adjacent to the Willamette River, it is anticipated that some reservations, perhaps leading to opposition, can be expected relative to an arena development at this location.

- **Critical Adjacencies**

  The Franklin 1 (Glenwood East) site’s adjacency to the Willamette River, the Main Street Bridge from Springfield, and the City of Springfield commercial center provides the opportunity for grand planning and design gestures. Development of an inviting riverfront with pathways and greenways extending well beyond the site and linking with the greater network of trails, paths, and park spaces along and near to the river, to Island Park across the river, and to the neighboring Springfield commercial core, add to the positive attributes of the Franklin 1 site.

  The close adjacency to the City of Springfield could negatively affect the emotional and civic connection of the site to the greater University and City of Eugene communities. This may be seen as a negative attribute for this site.

  Adjacency to Franklin Boulevard, and a relatively close proximity to Interstate-5 access increase visibility to the site, and aid access and egress of traffic.

  The site’s context of largely industrial uses and commercial entities to support the industrial uses, will do little to support an arena development during event or non-event times. Without compatible commercial infrastructure (restaurants, retail, and other entertainment uses), and without a close proximity to the University community, the site lacks a critical mass necessary for vitality during non-event times. Over time, the site’s close proximity to the Springfield commercial core may slightly improve its vitality, and opportunities for support activity and infrastructure, when compared to the Franklin 3 (Glenwood West) site.

- **Community Revitalization Goals**

  The potential contribution from an arena development at the Franklin 1 (Glenwood East) site toward City of Springfield area revitalization and planning goals is significant. Recently, and during the past few years, the City of Springfield has considered partial and wider-ranging revitalization of the Glenwood district, primarily the eastern half, of which the Franklin 1 site is a part. Planning has considered revisions to the street network
within Glenwood, including a straightening of Franklin Boulevard, the primary east to west traffic artery through the district.

As discussed above under **Appropriate Scale for the Context**, one such planning effort involves the nodal redevelopment of Glenwood, primarily the eastern section. This study, begun approximately three years ago according to City of Springfield staff, considers the realignment of the district street and road network, and suggests mixed-use redevelopment of the area, including office, commercial, retail, and residential uses. While this concept study currently subdivides the Franklin 1 site into several sub-parcels and suggests smaller scale mixed-use development of those parcels, City of Springfield staff has indicated that a review relative to revisions to the concept, which would allow for an arena development at the Franklin 1 site, albeit with a somewhat modified configuration, might be possible. The City of Springfield might be more than willing to undertake such a concept revision to allow an arena development, as the development could be the financial and civic catalyst necessary to help realize the overall nodal redevelopment. Through discussions with City of Springfield staff, it is our understanding that this nodal redevelopment, principally the realignment of the eastern half of the district’s street system and the suggestion of a mixed-use master plan, was presented to the City of Springfield City Council in June 2003. Indications are that the City Council was receptive to the concept but has not yet committed to it, primarily due to the current uncertainty with funding sources and structure.

A second City of Springfield concept, which could involve the Franklin 1 (Glenwood East) site, is the City of Springfield Civic Center project, currently in Phase II planning. The Civic Center, if developed, would be located across the Willamette River from the Franklin 1 site, adjacent and east of Island Park (west of downtown Springfield). Concept master plans show the Civic Center development embracing the park and riverfront, with some concept sketches extending across the river to the Franklin 1 site. Concept sketches suggest a minor-league caliber baseball ballpark at the Franklin 1 site location. It is estimated that a minor league ballpark at this site would have a scale similar to an arena development, with a patron seating capacity slightly smaller (estimated at between 5,000 to 10,000 seats for the ballpark compared to 15,000 seats for the planned arena).

- **Long Range Campus Goals**

A University arena development at the Franklin 1 (Glenwood East) site would be a fractured satellite to the University community. Lacking a connection to the main University campus and Department of Intercollegiate Athletics complex, the development would not strengthen the University community and may actually weaken its unity and...
cohesiveness. Adjacency to the City of Springfield across the Willamette River to the east could give an arena development at this site a stronger perceived connection to Springfield, than to the University to the relatively distant west.

- **Proximity to Campus**

  The Franklin 1 (Glenwood East) site is perhaps the worst relative to proximity to the University campus, and resulting ease of pedestrian and bicycle access. The site is approximately two miles east of the main University campus and lacks adequate infrastructure for pedestrians and bicycles. This is a major weakness for this site.

  It is anticipated that access for students and others from the University would be best served via LTD’s planned Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system, which will include stations adjacent to the University campus and adjacent to the Franklin 1 site (see *Access and Egress*, below).

- **Access and Egress**

  Access to and from Interstate-5 is good at this site. However, primary access and egress for the Franklin 1 (Glenwood East) site would be via Franklin Boulevard from the east and west, and primarily from the west. Because Franklin Boulevard and the Main Street Bridge to and from Springfield intersect immediately adjacent to the access point for the site, severe congestion is anticipated. Left turns into the site from eastbound Franklin Boulevard (patrons arriving from Eugene and the Interstate-5 connection at Glenwood Boulevard) would be very difficult to near impossible without additional traffic controls.

  Planned Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) to and from the site, along Franklin Boulevard to the east and west, would benefit the site, and would likely be a primary means of access to the site for students.

  However, the vast majority of patrons are anticipated to drive to this site, and the severe congestion at the site’s access point would be problematic. A strategy to locate event parking a slight distance from the site in order to distribute some of the traffic may help, but those patrons would then be forced to walk from the parking area to the arena through a non-pedestrian friendly environment.

- **Parking**

  While it is anticipated that a limited quantity of event parking might be accommodated through cooperation with nearby commercial entities, this would not satisfy a large percentage of the overall event parking needs for the site, and would likely create additional congestion at the site.
before and after events (due to increased pedestrian crossings), already anticipated to be a significant problem at this site.

It is therefore likely that the vast majority of event parking would need to be accommodated on-site. Due to site restrictions and resulting available land for development, it is anticipated that a large parking structure would need to be built at a significant cost. Because the surrounding context is not conducive to significant activity during non-event times, a large parking structure at this site would be largely unused during most hours of most days. This would translate to a significant up front cost without the likelihood of a return on the investment.

The number of required event parking stalls estimated to be needed for an arena development at the Franklin 1 (Glenwood East) site is between 4,110 and 4,930 (it is estimated that 82.2% of the arena patrons will drive to this site), based on analysis by David Evans & Associates.

- **Acquisition, Anticipated Ease of**

  Due to the relatively high quantity of private property owners currently owning the parcels that make up the Franklin 1 (Glenwood East) site, acquisition of the parcels for an arena development is anticipated to be somewhat difficult.

  Due to the strong possibility that not all existing owners of parcels that make up the Franklin 1 (Glenwood East) site will be receptive to selling, condemnation proceedings through the City of Springfield might be necessary. However, such proceedings would likely be costly and time consuming, which could risk the timetable goals of the arena project (groundbreaking by summer 2004).

- **Acquisition, Anticipated Cost of**

  According to 2002 Lane County property report records, the combined land and improvement real market values (L&I RMV) for the eighteen (18) parcels making up the Franklin 1 (Glenwood East) site total approximately $3.2 million dollars, and include ownership under seven (07) different parties.

  It should be noted that land and improvement real market values derived from County records are not necessarily a realistic measure of anticipated negotiated values accompanying an actual property transaction. Also, due to the quantity of property owners at this site, is reasonable to anticipate that some owners may not be receptive to selling. While a condemnation process via the City of Springfield may be possible, such a process would likely be time consuming and could probably not occur
within the timeframe goals of the arena project (groundbreaking by summer 2004).

- **Site Development Costs** -

  Geotechnical Considerations:
  
  - The Franklin 1 (Glenwood East) site is considered to be somewhat challenging geotechnically.
  
  - Site preparation would likely involve the introduction of several feet of new fill in order to build-up the grade of the site, particularly where the site slopes toward the river. Depending on design solutions, some over-excavation of severely weathered Eugene Formation sub-soil and rock can be expected. The site is entirely within the 100-year floodplain.
  
  - Dewatering excavated areas during construction can be expected.
  
  - Foundation system is anticipated to be of spread footings.
  
  - Water-retention wall would likely be required to mitigate the impact of seasonal high ground water, particularly if the lower seating bowl is depressed to allow for main concourse entry at-grade.

Utility Infrastructure Considerations:

- New sanitary sewer service by the City of Springfield is scheduled for construction in 2005. Coordination with an arena schedule would be required.

- New domestic water service is planned in Glenwood by the end of 2004. Existing water mains are seriously undersized for an arena development.

It is anticipated that environmental remediation would be required at the Franklin 1 (Glenwood East) site to some degree.
FRANKLIN 3  (GLENWOOD WEST)

- **Capacity for Development**

  The Franklin 3 (Glenwood West) site is relatively large in overall area at just over 13 acres. However the site’s configuration, long and narrow stretching along the Willamette River, does not lend itself to optimal development of the planned arena and support program. Adding to the site’s configuration challenge is the Willamette River Greenway riparian setback of a functional 150-feet.

  The result is a limited area for development anticipated to translate into a serious compromise to the arena development program. Program would be forced into linear organization east to west, squeezed between the setback from the Willamette River to the north and Franklin Boulevard to the south. Relationships between program elements, and adjacencies desired to make the sum of the parts form a greater whole, would suffer.

  As with the Franklin 1 (Glenwood East) site, an on-site parking structure would be required to accommodate the vast majority of event parking. Due to the site’s capacity and configuration limitations, the ability to situate a large capacity parking structure within the site’s already challenging master plan would be difficult, and the parking structure would likely be forced into an expensive tight-footprint and vertical, multi-deck configuration. Like the Franklin 1 site, the lack of critical mass at Franklin 3 would render this expensive parking structure empty most of the time.

  Lastly, the restraining nature of the Franklin 3 (Glenwood West) site in the north – south direction would cause the compromised program to be severely massed along Franklin Boulevard with little relief along the sidewalk or street edge.

- **Appropriate Scale for the Context**

  A new arena development would be significantly larger in mass and scale relative to the existing structures near or around the site. However, the site’s largely industrial context, subject to redevelopment if the arena were to be sited there, its adjacency to Franklin Boulevard, a major thoroughfare, and its adjacency to the grand scale of the Willamette River suggest that the arena scale may not be entirely inappropriate. As discussed previously under **Capacity for Development**, the constrained north – south dimensions of the site would force a more severe frontage along both Franklin Boulevard and the Willamette River, even with the riparian setback. The severe frontage, especially along Franklin
Boulevard, would further accentuate the large scale of the development and would likely result in an ominous presence.

- **Impact to Neighbors**

  An arena development at the Franklin 3 (Glenwood West) site would likely result in significant impacts to its neighbors, though not all impacts would be negative.

  It is possible (perhaps probable given adequate time) that a redevelopment of the magnitude of the planned arena development within a largely industrial and under-developed context could become a catalyst for further metamorphosis of the area. This is certainly not guaranteed, and there are plenty of examples of arena or stadium developments within under-developed areas, which sit dormant and surrounded by a lack of support infrastructure, during non-event times. With time, however, it is likely that adjacent property values would rise and some support development (restaurants, retail, other entertainment functions), would follow. Some existing neighbors to the site might support this evolution, while others may see it as unwelcome change and oppose it.

  The most immediate impact to neighbors (mostly a mix of industrial uses and commercial entities supporting the industrial uses), would be a significant increase in activity and traffic before and after events. This could be perceived as a major obstacle to the existing neighbors and their businesses, particularly if event traffic regularly occurs during hours of business operation. Event traffic would be especially prominent at the Franklin 3 site, as it would at the Franklin 1 site, due to the high percentage of patrons expected to arrive by car.

  Lastly, as the site lies adjacent to the Willamette River, it is anticipated that some reservations, perhaps leading to opposition, can be expected relative to an arena development at this location.

- **Critical Adjacencies**

  The Franklin 3 (Glenwood West) site’s adjacency to the Willamette River provides the opportunity for grand planning and design gestures. Development of an inviting riverfront with pathways and greenways extending well beyond the site and linking with the greater network of trails, paths, and park spaces along and near to the river add to this positive element of the site.

  Adjacency to Franklin Boulevard, and a relatively close proximity to Interstate-5 access increase visibility to the site, and aid access and egress of traffic.
The site’s context of largely industrial uses, commercial entities to support the industrial uses, and institutional uses (Lane Transit District bus facility and State of Oregon Motor Pool facility), will do little to support an arena development during event or non-event times. Without compatible commercial infrastructure (restaurants, retail, and other entertainment uses), and without a close proximity to the University community, the site lacks a critical mass necessary for vitality during non-event times.

**Community Revitalization Goals**

While current City of Springfield efforts relative to revitalization within the Glenwood district appear primarily focused on the eastern half of Glenwood (please refer to Community Revitalization Goals within the Franklin 1 / Glenwood East site section of this report), it is anticipated as probable that the City would be receptive to improvements to the district, which may be accelerated or brought about by an arena development at the Franklin 3 (Glenwood West) site. Such a development would likely lead to further district-wide improvements, and may improve development opportunities relative to some of the concept studies under consideration for the eastern section.

**Long Range Campus Goals**

As with the Franklin 1 (Glenwood East) site, a University arena development at the Franklin 3 (Glenwood West) site would be a fractured satellite to the University community. Lacking a connection to the main University campus and Department of Intercollegiate Athletics complex, the development would not strengthen the University community and may actually weaken its unity and cohesiveness.

**Proximity to Campus**

Although slightly better than the Franklin 1 (Glenwood East) site to the east, the Franklin 3 (Glenwood West) site is relatively distant from the University campus and community. As a result, pedestrian and bicycle access, particularly for students, is poor. This significant site weakness is compounded by a lack of quality pedestrian and bicycle accommodations leading up to and at the site.

It is anticipated that access for students and others from the University would be best served via LTD’s planned Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system, which will include stations adjacent to the University campus and adjacent to the Franklin 3 site (see Access and Egress, below).

**Access and Egress**

Access and egress qualities for the Franklin 3 (Glenwood West) site are better than those for Franklin 1. Glenwood Boulevard bisects the
approximate center of the Franklin 3 site to the south, allowing direct access from Interstate-5 (interchange / on and off-ramps for Interstate-5 at Glenwood Boulevard are somewhat substandard, lacking desired curvature and length by today’s standards). As with the Franklin 1 site, primary arterial access to Franklin 3 is via Franklin Boulevard from the east and west, primarily from the west. Eastbound traffic from Eugene would be required to turn left to gain access to the site. This would be difficult and tedious, and would likely require additional traffic controls.

Typically, traffic speeds along this stretch of Franklin Boulevard are high, estimated at 50 miles per hour or more going eastbound. This typically high rate of speed would both compound the issue of congestion before and after events, and would increase risks to pedestrians.

Planned Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) to and from the site, along Franklin Boulevard to the east and west, would benefit the site, and would likely be a primary means of access to the site for students.

- Parking -

An on-site parking structure would be required to accommodate the vast majority of event parking. Due to the site’s capacity and configuration limitations, the ability to situate a large capacity parking structure within the site’s already challenging master plan would be difficult, and the parking structure would likely be forced into an expensive tight-footprint and vertical, multi-deck configuration (an additional option would be to acquire additional land to the east or across Franklin Boulevard to facilitate event parking; however additional land acquisition would be difficult and costly). Like the Franklin 1 site, the lack of critical mass at Franklin 3 would render this expensive parking structure empty most of the time.

Some opportunities for event parking may occur at nearby commercial entities. However, these opportunities are anticipated to be relatively limited and could worsen congestion across Franklin Boulevard due to increased pedestrian crossings.

The number of required event parking stalls estimated to be needed for an arena development at the Franklin 3 (Glenwood West) site is between 4,040 and 4,850 (it is estimated that 80.8% of the arena patrons will drive to this site), based on analysis by David Evans & Associates.

- Acquisition, Anticipated Ease of -

Due to the relatively high quantity of private property owners currently owning the parcels that make up the Franklin 3 (Glenwood West) site,
and the size of the operation of one or more of the sites, acquisition of the
parcels for an arena development is anticipated to be difficult.

Due to the strong possibility that not all existing owners of parcels that
make up the Franklin 3 (Glenwood West) site will be receptive to selling,
condemnation proceedings through the City of Springfield might be
necessary. However, such proceedings would likely be very costly and
time consuming, which could probably not occur within the timetable
goals of the arena project (groundbreaking by summer 2004).

- **Acquisition, Anticipated Cost of**
  
  According to 2002 Lane County property report records, the combined
  land and improvement real market values (L&I RMV) for the eight (08)
  parcels making up the Franklin 3 (Glenwood West) site total
  approximately $6.6 million dollars, and include ownership under seven
  (07) different parties. Compared to the Franklin 1 (Glenwood East) site,
  the Franklin 3 (Glenwood West) site includes more substantial business
  enterprises, which could translate into significantly more difficult and
costly property acquisition.

  It should be noted that land and improvement real market values derived
  from County records are not necessarily a realistic measure of anticipated
  negotiated values accompanying an actual property transaction. Also,
due to the quantity of property owners at this site, and the significant size
  of some, is reasonable to anticipate that some owners may not be
  receptive to selling. While a condemnation process via the City of
  Springfield may be possible, such a process would likely be time
  consuming and could probably not occur within the timeframe goals of the
  arena project (groundbreaking by summer 2004).

- **Site Development Costs**

  Geotechnical Considerations:

  - The Franklin 3 (Glenwood West) site is considered to be
    somewhat challenging geotechnically.

  - Site preparation would likely involve the introduction of new fill in
    order to build-up the grade of the site, particularly at the eastern
    portion of the site. Depending on design solutions, some over-
    excavation of severely weathered Eugene Formation sub-soil and
    rock can be expected. The site is entirely within the 100-year
    floodplain.

  - Dewatering excavated areas during construction can be expected.
- Foundation system is anticipated to be of spread footings.

- Water-retention wall would likely be required to mitigate the impact of seasonal high ground water, particularly if the lower seating bowl is depressed to allow for main concourse entry at-grade.

Utility Infrastructure Considerations:

- New sanitary sewer service by the City of Springfield is scheduled for construction in 2005. Coordination with an arena schedule would be required.

- Existing sanitary sewer pump station and trunk line would require relocation or avoidance during construction.

- New domestic water service is planned in Glenwood by the end of 2004. Existing water mains are seriously undersized for an arena development.

It is anticipated that environmental remediation would be required at the Franklin 3 (Glenwood West) site to some degree.
HOWE FIELD

• Capacity for Development -

The Howe Field site capacity is adequate for the arena development depending on the design configuration and anticipated master planning of the overall site. The site is located at the southwestern corner of the nine square super-block - “Area 62” - at the south-central edge of the main University campus. Area 62 contains the majority of main-campus athletic facilities, including facilities used for intercollegiate competition, intramural sports, and recreational activities.

• Appropriate Scale for the Context -

Depending on final programming requirements, a final design, and integration within an overall anticipated Area 62 master plan, management of the scale of the development at the Howe Field site may be a challenge.

A new arena of the size planned would be significantly larger in scale than the existing structures adjacent to the site. However, it is anticipated that skillful planning and design steps could mitigate this potential challenge. These steps could include careful positioning of primary program elements, carefully designed building massing and setbacks at strategic locations, use of screening devices, and use of a variety of materials, textures, and forms to aid in “breaking-down” the larger masses, among other strategies.

Additionally, the potential for integration of McArthur Court as one of the primary program elements, the auxiliary arena (see Critical Adjacencies, below), could reduce the overall impact of the development at the site, not to mention revitalize and prolong the use of the existing facility.

An obvious concern is the scale of an arena development relative to the residential context to the immediate south of the site. While it is not realistic to assume that this issue could be completely mitigated, it is anticipated that skillful and prudent planning and design strategies, similar to those listed previously in this section, could be employed with an effort toward minimizing the discrepancy in scales.

• Impact to Neighbors -

An arena development at the Howe Field site has the potential to significantly impact the residential neighborhoods in the immediate vicinity, particularly to the south. The area to the south is primarily within
the boundaries of the South University Neighborhood. Additionally, to the near east beyond Agate Street, is the Fairmount Neighborhood.

Concerns from the residential neighbors (during a South University Neighborhood Association meeting held 21 June 2003), are focused primarily on the anticipated and likely increase in traffic and activity to the area during events at the new arena (and resulting in litter, congestive parking on neighborhood streets, and other negatives). While the site is immediately adjacent to existing McArthur Court and neighbors have been conditioned to co-exist with the activities of that facility, the new arena would represent a significant increase in size and capacity (65% greater) over McArthur Court, and possibly in event frequency and quantity. Lastly, a new arena at the Howe Field site would have a much greater presence on East 18th Avenue (across from the residential area to the south), as existing McArthur Court is set back several hundred feet from this street frontage and is much smaller in overall mass than a new arena would be.

Similar to input received at a Fairmount Neighborhood Association meeting (see Impact to Neighbors within the Williams’ Bakery site section), it was noted during the SUNA meeting that there seems to be a shortage of parking facilities on campus currently (estimates provided by the Office of University Planning indicate a total existing on-campus parking capacity of approximately 3,000 vehicles, including both on and off-street spaces). It was mentioned that locating an arena development on or near the main University campus could provide the opportunity to solve this apparent shortage of parking on campus.

The potential for impact to campus groups is also significant at the Howe Field site. Several groups would be displaced by the arena development, while others would be neighbors to the new facility and may also be impacted by its development. These groups include, but are not necessarily limited to:

- The Department of Intercollegiate Athletics’ Softball Program competition facility is Howe Field, located immediately south of McArthur Court. Howe Field is a NCAA-regulation softball field consisting of a high-performance drainage natural grass outfield and clay infield and warning tracks covering roughly 45,000 square feet in area. Flanking the playing field on two sides are separate home and visitor bullpens, and dugouts of concrete masonry unit walls and standing seam metal roofs. The outfield is bound by chain link fencing covered in transparent scrim. Behind the right field (southern) fence is a digital scoreboard adjacent to two practice batting cages. Extending from dugout end to dugout end are six sections of bench seating seven rows deep on concrete treads and risers. Above the permanent seating sections
and at grade with the adjacent service drive and parking lot between Howe Field and McArthur Court are three small portable aluminum bleacher sections, about 11-feet wide and five rows deep. Total seating capacity is about 1,000. Locker room facilities for the home team (visiting team arrives and departs in uniform via team bus from hotel), are housed in adjacent McArthur Court.

As the name of the candidate site would suggest, Howe Field would be entirely displaced by an arena development. As a result, a new NCAA regulation softball field would need to be constructed elsewhere. Due to the timeframe for the arena development (groundbreaking during summer 2004), it is anticipated that the demolition of Howe Field would need to commence immediately following the spring 2004 softball season (March through the end of May 2004).

Additional information relative to relocation of the softball field, per discussions with a representative of the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics, include:

A relocated softball field should be located close to other athletic facilities.

Many people like that the current facility is on-campus. Softball is a “drop-in” fan sport. If the facility is relocated away from the main campus, it is anticipated that some attendance may be lost.

Ideal seating capacity for a new softball field is estimated to be between 1,500 and 1,800.

Existing Howe Field includes one small concession stand with a small press box above, within a small wood-framed structure. A relocated softball field would include a slightly larger concession stand and would also include public restrooms.

Existing Howe Field does not include event lighting. Ideally, a replacement softball field would include event lighting, which would allow the UO the ability to host softball tournaments.

Existing Howe Field includes two batting cages. Ideally, three batting cages would be available and covered (to protect against inclement weather).

No practice softball field currently exists. Ideally, a practice infield would be located adjacent to the full competition field.
A new softball field at a different site would need to include a single locker room for the home team (as mentioned previously, the visiting team arrives and departs in uniform). The locker room would include approximately twenty lockers with two larger catchers lockers, and a separate area for coaches.

- The Outdoor Program’s Trip Facility (equipment storage, maintenance, and distribution) is located just south of Howe Field at the corner of University Street and East 18th Avenue. The Outdoor Program, a wilderness cooperative funded by student incidental fees, is a resource available to anyone interested in “open trips” or non-exclusive wilderness excursions based on non-competitive, safe and environmentally sound activities, and the sharing of skills and ideas. Outdoor Program offices and administrative functions are located within the Erb Memorial Union (UO student union), and proximity (easily walk-able without a major street or other obstacles between), between these offices and the Trip Facility has been emphasized as of key importance by Outdoor Program staff.

As with Howe Field, the Outdoor Program’s Trip Facility would be entirely displaced by an arena development at the Howe Field site. As a result, a new Trip Facility for the Outdoor Program would need to be constructed elsewhere. As noted above, the new Trip Facility would need to be located to be in close proximity to the Outdoor Program offices within Erb Memorial Union. The Trip Facility also needs to be located to allow for ease of accessibility for vehicles towing trailers and otherwise arriving and departing with wilderness gear and equipment.

The existing Trip Facility (approximately 4,000 square feet) includes a drive-through high bay aisle with 12-foot high overhead garage doors at each end. On one side of the high bay aisle is a maintenance area with workbenches and tool storage. On the other side of the high bay aisle are office space, kitchen and laundry facilities, separate storage areas for various types of wilderness equipment, and a restroom, all below a mezzanine floor housing sea kayak storage and other functions. Typically, three persons, including both full-time staff and students, work in the Trip Facility during the day, although the facility is accessible to trip initiators during off-hour times as well. The existing facility includes two office spaces with telecommunication and Ethernet connection to the University network. The facility also includes lounge and meeting space to facilitate clinics and gatherings, noted as an important resource.
The site (approximately 20,000 square feet) around the Trip Facility building includes a small automobile parking area adjacent to the entrance, driveway with turning radius (allowing negotiation of site and access through high bay facility without having to back-in trailers), an open lawn area to lay-out and rinse off rafts and other wilderness equipment, available parking space for six trailers, small sheds for storage of landscaping maintenance equipment (the Outdoor Program is responsible for their own landscaping maintenance) and propane storage.

Additional information relative to relocation of the Outdoor Program’s Trip Facility, per discussions with representatives of the Outdoor Program, include

The existing Trip Facility was built in the early 1990s at a cost of approximately $330,000. During the site selection process for the current facility, it was noted that the facility was “dug into” its corner site and heavily landscaped to minimize its presence at the southern gateway to the main University campus.

It was noted that some or all of the Trip Facility’s utility costs are currently paid for by the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics (electrical and natural gas services are provided via nearby McArthur Court). Relocating the Trip Facility to a different location may require the same services be connected via public service, which could result in additional operating costs to the Outdoor Program.

Since the Outdoor Program’s excursions and equipment rentals are available to the general public, not just University students and staff, the Trip Facility requires relatively good access and visibility.

The existing facility includes a security system. Good outdoor lighting is also included, and should be integrated into the program for any new or replacement facility.

The existing Trip Facility includes five vehicle parking spaces. It was noted that eight vehicle parking spaces would be preferred. Additionally, it was noted that more parking areas should be available nearby for large drop-offs (University Street is often utilized now for this function).

Landscaping should consist of plants native to the region.

Due to the high quantity of wilderness gear and equipment of many types, efficient storage within the Trip Facility is very
important. Storage areas include various types, configurations, and sizes of shelves, racks, hangers, and bins.

The existing Trip Facility’s high bay aisle includes northeast-facing clerestory windows, which provide good natural lighting into the facility. This was noted as an important quality.

While the existing facility includes additional square footage on a mezzanine floor, it was noted that all floor area could be on a single level in a new facility, if the new site’s available area allowed for this.

While the existing Trip Facility includes two open office spaces, more enclosed offices, allowing for some privacy, would be preferred in a new facility. Any new office spaces should include views and connections to the overall operation, with the ability to “close the door” when quiet or privacy is needed.

The meeting area needs to include dry erase boards, a television, and video cassette recorder for use during clinics.

Pin-up space, or tack-able wall surfaces would be a bonus for the staff and users of the Trip Facility, in order to display program literature, calendars, photographs from excursions, and other postings.

A partially covered outdoor gathering space, integrated with the percent for public art contribution to the facility, is located at the southern edge of the existing Trip Facility. This area is also considered important to the program.

Any relocation or replacement of the existing Trip Facility would need to be accomplished with minimal disruption to the Outdoor Program’s operation. This would likely require the completion of construction or readiness of a new facility prior to demolition of the existing facility.

- A Practice Putting Green (Golf), managed by the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics is nestled between Howe Field, the Outdoor Program’s Trip Facility, and Howe Extension Field. The practice putting green covers approximately 7,000 square feet and would be entirely displaced by an arena at the Howe Field site.

- Physical Activity and Recreation Services (PARS) facilitates the University’s physical education and recreational programs, including intramural sports. The majority of PARS facilities are located within the nine square blocks defined as Area 62
(described below under Critical Adjacencies). These facilities include the Student Recreation Center, Student Tennis Center (six indoor courts and five covered outdoor courts), two synthetic turf fields, and natural grass intramural fields.

Additional information relative to impacts to PARS facilities due to an arena development at the Howe Field site, based on discussions with representatives of PARS, include:

There are few remaining natural grass recreational and intramural fields on campus. One remaining natural grass field, Howe Extension Field immediately east of Howe Field, would be entirely displaced by an arena development at this site. The natural grass recreation and intramural fields east of, and down the slope from Howe Extension Field, would also likely be impacted by an arena development, if not displaced by it. As noted in the Long Range Campus Development Plan, these outdoor classrooms and recreational centers are essential University resources.

PARS manages the natural grass fields (South Bank Field) adjacent to the Willamette River and the southern end of the Autzen Footbridge. The sand-based high-performance drainage design of the fields (two side-by-side soccer fields), allows use during three out of four terms, or quarters, annually (typically, the fields are used during the fall, winter, and spring, and closed/rested during the summer). South Bank Field is not located within the bounds of the main University campus.

PARS also manages Education Field, located south of Knight Library, and Gerlinger Field, located south of Gerlinger Hall. Both fields are of natural grass, but not composed of high-performance drainage design. While the construction of these two fields could be improved to allow use during a larger portion of the year, both fields lack optimal dimensions for competition use (Education Field lacks adequate length, but could be lengthened by sacrificing or re-routing an existing drive and a small parking area to the south, and Gerlinger Field lacks adequate width). Ideally, any improvements to Education Field should include the addition of lighting.

PARS likes the benefits of diversity and flexibility by having two synthetic turf fields along with the few natural grass fields. Converting some of the remaining natural grass fields to synthetic turf is not desired. The two existing synthetic turf fields are configured end to end along the north to south center of Area 62. The two fields consume approximately two-thirds of the north to south block length, beginning at the north edge of the block along
East 15th Avenue and stretching to align with the approximate southern wall of the indoor tennis facility to the west.

Assuming some portion of the south-central or southeastern quadrants of Arena 62 is programmed as structured parking as part of an overall arena development, one option discussed with PARS involved the shifting of the two synthetic turf fields from the northern two-thirds of the Area 62 superblock toward the southern edges of the block, and reconverting the northern areas to sand-based high-performance drainage natural grass fields. While examples do exist of natural grass fields constructed over built structures, placing a synthetic turf field over a built structure (e.g.: the top deck of a parking structure), may prove more feasible, especially when long-term maintenance is considered. The major concern with the above scenario is the shortfall of available square footage on the superblock for the four desired fields of competition dimensions, combined with the existing and required program already on the superblock.

The two synthetic turf fields currently have lighting for use during non-day-lit hours. Ideally, PARS would also like two sand-based high-performance drainage natural grass fields on campus with lighting for evening and night use.

It was noted that, while not managed under PARS, Club Sports also utilizes the University’s outdoor recreational fields mentioned previously.

PARS also manages the Student Tennis Center, which includes the structure housing the six indoor courts. There is a strong likelihood that this structure could possibly be impacted, and perhaps be caused to relocate by an arena development at the Howe Field site. Depending on the master planning of the site and the configuration of the arena development program, the facilities immediately north of Howe Field, including McArthur Court, could be integrated into the arena program, or displaced by the program (see further description of McArthur Court integration under Critical Adjacencies, below).

If tennis facilities are caused to relocate (the outdoor tennis courts located across East 15th Avenue from Area 62, are also being considered as a potential site for additional student housing), by an arena development at the Howe Field site, PARS representatives described the following desires:

Ideally, a new tennis facility would have a good connection to the Student Recreation Center, envisioned as the hub for all physical
education and organized recreational activities for the campus. It was noted that the existing covered courts, of which five of the original nine remain, are not accessible enough to the Student Recreation Center, although located immediately adjacent to the facility. A similar condition originally occurred for the newer indoor court facility, containing six courts. Although it was noted that its use has increased during the past year and one-half to two years, when it first opened, the facility did not receive much use due to a lack of awareness of its existence, not a very visible location, and a lack of strong connection from the Student Recreation Center.

A new tennis facility should be located within the bounds of, or very near to the main University campus. A location at Autzen Stadium, near other Department of Intercollegiate Athletics facilities would translate to a lack of connection with the Student Recreation Center and the main University campus, and would make access difficult for many students, faculty, and staff, and would not be conducive to scheduling of physical education classes. Locating a new tennis center just east of the main University campus might be worth considering, but would require further study.

A new tennis center would ideally include a minimum of eight indoor courts and two outdoor courts for physical education purposes.

University tennis facilities are utilized by the men’s and women’s teams of the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics, for physical education classes, and for open recreation by students, faculty, staff, and alumni.

- The Department of Intercollegiate Athletics’ Track & Field Program facilities are located at the eastern third of Area 62. Facilities include Hayward Field, its east and west grandstands, the Bowerman Building, weight room and storage facilities adjacent to the east grandstand, and the hammer throw area and practice track to the south of Hayward Field.

It is not anticipated that an arena development at the Howe Field site would directly impact Hayward Field, the east or west grandstands, or the Bowerman Building. More likely to be impacted by arena development program, or perhaps by a reorganization of uses due to new master planning of the Area 62 superblock, are the Track & Field hammer throw area and the practice track south of Hayward Field, near the corner of East 18th Avenue and Agate Street.
The hammer throw area and practice track are required elements of the Track & Field Program. Their current adjacency to Hayward Field and the other Track & Field facilities should be maintained to maximize efficiency of flow and strength of connection during competitions and events. Some separation from the public is necessary during events in order to minimize disruption of event flow and distractions to competitors.

It should be noted that directly across University Street and west of the Howe Field site is Pioneer Cemetery. The cemetery is not University property but is bordered by the University on three sides (west, north, and east), and is considered by many to be a campus fixture. While light pedestrian traffic through the cemetery is common, and probably increases to an extent before and after some events at McArthur Court, the overall increase in traffic with a new arena could translate to increased traffic through the cemetery before and after some events (particularly during daytime hours and under agreeable weather conditions). While it is not anticipated that this would be a significant issue to be managed, any planning and design relative to arrival and departure to and from the site should be sensitive to the cemetery and take care to minimize any encouragement of significant pedestrian event-based flow through it.

- **Critical Adjacencies**
  
  While it lacks the adjacent commercial activity and infrastructure of the Williams' Bakery site, the Howe Field site still offers the potential for a unique, healthy, and enduring critical mass. A primary strength of this site is its bond to the University campus, its like facilities, thriving student, faculty, and staff population, and common goals and purpose. This campus bond would translate into significant opportunities for site activity and vitality, even during non-event times. This support of activities could also carry over into the adjacent residential neighborhoods to the south (i.e.: the close proximity to the neighborhoods could foster opportunities for neighborhood functions and gatherings, and foster a positive bond between University and neighborhood). This potential could also aid in efforts relative to a new arena’s impact to the residential neighbors (see *Impact to Neighbors*, above), and the perception of a new arena at the Howe Field site as a positive contribution, not a negative one.

  The Howe Field site is located at the southwestern corner of the “super-block” referred to as Area 62 within the Long Range Campus Development Plan. Bordering the southern edge of the University’s main campus, Area 62 encompasses nine square city blocks. Area 62 contains the majority of main-campus athletic facilities, including facilities used for intercollegiate competition, intramural sports, and recreational activities.
Immediately north of the Howe Field site is McArthur Court, current home to UO basketball, volleyball, and wrestling. The preliminary new arena development program includes a secondary or auxiliary arena with a seating capacity of approximately 4,000. Conversion of McArthur Court for this use is considered a potential option, and could thereby retain the facility as a viable University asset into the future.

One statement made during the 27 May 2003 Campus Planning Committee meeting questioned the wisdom of placing a “behemoth next to a behemoth,” i.e.: placement of a new arena next to existing McArthur Court, also perceived as a large building. If planned and executed well, such a placement could enrich the function and vitality of both buildings (increasing the longevity of McArthur Court as a beneficial campus asset and establishing a dichotomy between old and new), and create a unique and flexible combination of large assembly spaces.

Adjacent to McArthur Court to the east is the indoor facility of the Student Tennis Center. To the north, and encompassing the remaining western third of the Area 62 superblock are Esslinger Hall, Leighton Pool, and the newer Student Recreation Center.

The eastern third of the Area 62 superblock consists entirely of facilities used by the Track & Field Program. The facilities include Hayward Field and its east and west grandstands, the Bowerman Building, weight room and storage facility immediately south of the east grandstand, and the hammer throw and practice track areas covering slightly more than the southeastern quadrant of the superblock.

Occupying the approximate middle-third (north to south) of Area 62 are open fields consisting of two synthetic turf fields to the north, and natural grass intramural fields to the south.

Adjacency of a new arena development to the Area 62 superblock would reinforce the athletic and recreational “heart” of the main University campus, and maintain clarity of function and use relative to an overall University master plan.

- **Community Revitalization Goals** -

  The Howe Field site is not within or near any community redevelopment zones that we are aware of.
- **Long Range Campus Goals**

Due to the relatively large size of the planned arena, its development at the Howe Field site (it is within University bounds) would be subject to an amendment to the Long Range Campus Development Plan.

As mentioned above under *Critical Adjacencies*, an arena development at the Area 62 superblock would be consistent in athletic and recreational function and use relative to existing facilities and uses on the block. This consistency would maintain and, with careful and skillful planning, strengthen clarity in organization and purpose for University master planning.

Occupying the approximate middle-third (north to south) of Area 62 are open fields consisting of two synthetic turf fields to the north, and natural grass intramural fields to the south. These “outdoor classrooms” are noted in the Long Range Campus Development Plan as “…essential University resources to be managed in a way that maximizes their benefit to the University community as a whole, and they ought not be considered as available building sites simply because they are open.”

- **Proximity to Campus**

The Howe Field site’s location within the bounds of the main University campus provides excellent pedestrian and bicycle access, particularly for students living on or near campus. The site is also near to a high concentration of off-campus student and faculty housing.

- **Access and Egress**

Howe Field site access to and from Interstate-5 from the south is good, while from the north is not as clear. Franklin Boulevard would provide main arterial access to the site via several feeder streets. Westbound (from Springfield or northbound I-5), traffic on Franklin will be seriously affected by the elimination of the left turn lane off of Franklin onto Agate Street. This issue will need to be considered as part of an overall transportation management plan. That many patrons have already been conditioned to access this site for events at McArthur Court over the years should benefit access and egress for a new arena development at this site.

While congestion should be expected along East 18th Avenue before and after events at a new arena at the Howe Field site, this traffic congestion would predictably dissipate further away from the site to the west and east. This does not mean that event traffic impacts would not be felt as far away as Franklin Boulevard, Agate Street, the Hilyard and Patterson Streets couplet, and beyond. It would. However, a carefully developed comprehensive transportation management plan for an arena
development at the Howe Field site (also recommended for the
development at any of the seven sites), could mitigate the traffic impacts
and allow a new arena development at the Howe Field site to function
well.

Much of the success of good access and egress for the Howe Field site
will depend on location and availability of event parking (see Parking,
below). Distribution of available event parking to more than one location
around the site would result in a decreased congestion at the site.

Another significant component relative to good access and egress is
transit, specifically busses and shuttles. A well developed, coordinated,
and executed system, in cooperation with LTD, could increase ridership
and reduce vehicle arrivals and resulting parking demands.

- **Parking**

Parking accommodations for event patrons of a new arena at the Howe
Field site could be a major challenge without a comprehensive global
strategy combined with a transportation management plan. As mentioned
previously under *Impacts to Neighbors*, the impacts to the residential
areas near the Howe Field site could be significant, and particularly due
to an increase in activity, traffic, and parking challenges. These impacts
can and should be mitigated, pending a development at this site.

In order to satisfy program requirements for the arena development, and
to mitigate parking challenges and event-based traffic congestion, it is
likely that structured parking will need to be utilized for a successful arena
development at the Howe Field site. With careful and skillful global
planning and strategy, structured parking could be inserted into the
University fabric (ideally at the seams of the fabric, or along the periphery
of the campus), and not only solve the significant challenges relative to an
influx of arena event traffic, but also benefit the greater University
community.

While on-campus parking is at a premium, it is probably not a wise long-
term strategy to simply increase parking capacity significantly with an
effort toward saturation of the demand. Doing so would likely encourage
more students, faculty, and staff to drive in lieu of walking, bicycling, or
using transit, and traffic congestion could worsen.

A better strategy might be to thoughtfully place a small quantity of efficient
and higher capacity parking facilities along the edges of campus (along
the Franklin Boulevard corridor and perhaps Agate Street and Alder
Street are possibilities). This could possibly be achieved, in part or
entirely, by converting some of the existing larger University-owned
surface parking lots into low-profile parking structures. Possible surface
lots to consider for conversion to low-profile parking structures could include:

- Surface parking lot located on the east side of Agate Street between Franklin Boulevard and East 13th Avenue (existing capacity is approximately 200 spaces, but will be reduced by an estimated 40 to 50 stalls with the revisions to Franklin Boulevard due to Bus Rapid Transit).

- Surface parking lot located south of Bean residence hall complex and east of the Museum of Natural History (existing capacity is approximately 450 stalls, not including parking adjacent to the Church Warehouse).

- Surface parking lot located east of Alder Street, south of the College of Education, and northwest of the School of Music (existing capacity is approximately 215 stalls).

- Surface parking lot located north of East 14th Avenue between Alder Street and Kincaid Street (existing capacity is estimated to be approximately 150 stalls). It should be noted that this lot is situated at the western terminus of the east – west promenade and view corridor anchored at the east end by Erb Memorial Union. Future development of this lot, as noted in the Long Range Campus Development Plan (Area 17), is an opportunity to site a major campus building, which should appropriately serve as the western terminus of this promenade and view corridor. Based on this lot’s future development opportunity as a significant campus building, development as a parking structure (even though its location at the western edge of campus near primary pedestrian and bicycle access points and near the East 13th Avenue campus commercial hub is a perhaps an excellent location for structured parking), may not be an appropriate use of the space.

- The Joe Romania automobile dealership property located on the south side of Franklin Boulevard between Orchard Street and Walnut Street. It is our understanding that this automobile dealership is planning to relocate to a site near the Valley River Center shopping center within approximately one year. Acquisition of this soon to be available site, and development by the University into primarily a parking structure, perhaps with a commercial edge along Franklin Boulevard and a residential edge (for University housing, perhaps in the form of medium density row-house apartments) along East 15th Avenue, could offer many benefits to the University and the surrounding neighbors. Including the mixed-use elements along the north and south
edges, and designing the parking garage to maintain a low profile (maximum of two or three levels above grade) could increase the vitality of the site and soften the impact of a parking structure near the residential neighbors to the south. It is estimated that a parking structure at this site, with commercial and residential uses along the north and south edges respectively, could yield approximately 400 parking stalls per level. A two level structure would consequently yield about 800 parking stalls, and the structure could perhaps be designed to allow for an additional level of parking to be added, if needed, in the future. While the Joe Romania site is relatively distant from the center of the University campus (East 13th Avenue and University Street), at about a ½-mile, structured parking at the site could serve eastern campus functions well, and could provide event parking for an arena development at either the Howe Field site, or especially the Williams’ Bakery site, well. For either daily campus use or event parking for an arena at the Howe Field site, periodic shuttle service from the lot to the center of campus and the arena site respectively may be desired or even necessary, especially during inclement weather.

- Specifically relative to an arena development at the Howe Field site, “on-site” parking might be accomplished with development of a parking structure at the southeastern quadrant of the Area 62 superblock (at the corner of East 18th Avenue and Agate Street). This location is currently occupied by the Track & Field Program’s hammer throw area and practice track, both vital components to the program requiring immediate adjacency to the Hayward Field complex. It is suggested that perhaps with careful planning and ease of access between Hayward Field and an elevated hammer throw and practice track area located on the top deck of a parking structure, that these components would not be compromised. A parking structure at this location would be ideally located to facilitate event parking for an arena at the Howe Field site, to distribute traffic before and after events onto both Agate Streets and East 18th Avenue, to also facilitate event traffic for Hayward Field events, and to facilitate parking during non-event times for the main University campus community. It is estimated that a three level parking structure at this location (likely comprised of one or two levels below grade, and one or two levels above grade, for a total of three parking levels, plus the Track & Field functions occupying the top deck, a fourth level), would yield between 1,000 and 1,200 parking stalls.

- A summary of the above listed existing parking lots (excluding the lot at the western terminus of the east – west promenade from Erb Memorial Union), and other locations suggested for potential
parking structure development, and their estimated capacities as parking structures follows:

- Agate Street between Franklin Boulevard and East 13\textsuperscript{th} Avenue: estimated capacity as a three level parking structure is 360 stalls, or about 120 stalls per level.

- South of Bean residence hall complex and east of the Museum of Natural History: estimated capacity as a three level parking structure (one level suggested below grade), is 1,200 stalls, or about 400 stalls per level.

- East of Alder Street, south of the College of Education, and northwest of the School of Music: estimated capacity as a three level parking structure (one level suggested below grade), is 540 stalls, or about 180 stalls per level.

- Joe Romania lot, located on the south side of Franklin Boulevard between Orchard Street and Walnut Street: estimated capacity as a two level (recommended as expandable to three levels), parking structure with suggested commercial and residential uses at the north and south edges respectively, is 800 stalls. If maximized use with periodic shuttle service between campus and the lot is desired, programming one additional below-grade level for 1,200 stalls, expandable to four levels (three above grade) and a capacity of 1,600 stalls is possible, albeit at significant additional cost.

- Corner of East 18\textsuperscript{th} Avenue and Agate Street, current location of hammer throw and practice track facilities: estimated capacity as a three level parking structure with the hammer throw and practice track functions on a top deck, is between 1,000 and 1,200 stalls.

- Total number of structured parking stalls at the perimeter of the main University campus per the above maximum case scenario would be between 3,900 and 4,900 stalls. Current on-campus parking capacity is approximately 3,200 stalls according to information provided by the Office of University Planning.

- Because the development of this many parking structures would be extremely expensive (estimated to cost between $12,000 and $20,000 per parking stall, depending on site conditions, size of parking structure, number of levels, and design of parking structure, e.g.: exterior skin materials
and articulation, number of levels below grade, etc.), it is not likely that more than one or two would be developed at any one time. Also, even with a gradual increase in the student enrollment in mind, and an arena development at one of the on or near campus locations, it is not likely that such a significant increase to campus parking capacity would be desired. Therefore, a more moderate scenario, a scaled-back version of the above-suggested locations and capacities, phased in over time, might be more prudent.

A resulting benefit of the addition of one or more arena development parking structures, also utilized by the main University campus, could be the gradual phasing out or elimination of street parking within the campus core (primarily along East 13th Avenue between University Street and Agate Street, along University Street between East 13th Avenue and East 18th Avenue, and along East 15th Avenue between University Street and Agate Street). This would result in improved conditions and safety for pedestrians and bicyclists and reduce congestion within the heart of campus.

The number of required event parking stalls estimated to be needed for an arena development at the Howe Field site is between 3,575 and 4,290 (it is estimated that 71.5% of the arena patrons will drive to this site), based on analysis by David Evans & Associates.

- **Acquisition, Anticipated Ease of**

  The Howe Field site is owned by the State of Oregon, Board of Higher Education (i.e.: the University of Oregon). Therefore, no direct land acquisition would be required for an arena development at this site.

  Due to the anticipated required relocations of existing site users and facilities (see *Impact to Neighbors*, above), significant coordination can be expected, and it is possible that land acquisition may be necessary elsewhere in order to facilitate the relocated entities.

- **Acquisition, Anticipated Cost of**

  The Howe Field site is owned by the State of Oregon, Board of Higher Education (i.e.: the University of Oregon). Therefore, no direct land acquisition, or land acquisition costs, would be required for an arena development at this site.

  However, several existing University facilities and uses on the site would be displaced by the development and would require relocation. Those
facilities and uses, and preliminary estimated costs associated with rebuilding the same or similar facility or use at an undetermined location, include:

- **Softball Program** - Budgeted replacement cost for a similar facility built new at a different site is anticipated to be a minimum of $1,000,000, not including land acquisition costs. Costs would be greater if existing program was augmented with event lighting, covered spectator seating, larger capacity of spectator seating, stadium seating in lieu of bench seating, improved and larger media and press, concessions, restrooms, practice, and home team locker facilities.

- **Outdoor Program Trip Facility** - Budgeted replacement cost is anticipated to be between $500,000 and $750,000 not including land acquisition costs.

- **Putting Green (Golf)** – Budgeted replacement cost is anticipated to be between $50,000 and $75,000, not including land acquisition costs, if necessary.

- **Intramural fields** - Budgeted replacement cost, assuming two natural grass fields with high-performance sand-based drainage of approximately 65,000 square feet in area each, is anticipated to be between $845,000 and $1,000,000 for two fields depending on site preparation at a new location (budgets do not include land acquisition costs, if required). Field lighting would be an additional cost.

- Estimated costs relative to relocation or replacement of the indoor facility portion of the Student Tennis Center are not included at this time.

- Estimated costs relative to relocation of the hammer throw and practice track areas are not included at this time.

### Site Development Costs

Geotechnical Considerations:

- Along with the Williams’ Bakery site, the Howe Field site is anticipated to be the least challenging of the seven sites with regard to geotechnical issues.

- Minimal dewatering is anticipated during construction, especially if construction occurs during summer month.
Foundation system design is anticipated to be by economical spread footings.

Utility Infrastructure Considerations:

- Entire site is outside of the 500-year floodplain and more than one foot above the 100-year floodplain.

- Coordination with the University’s existing tunnel network should be considered.

- On-site generation of chilled water, steam, and emergency power should be planned in lieu of connection to the University’s central plant.
NEW FEDERAL COURTHOUSE  (COURTHOUSE DISTRICT)

- **Capacity for Development** -

  The site is among the smallest under consideration at approximately five acres. The limitations of its size and containment within the existing street grid on all four sides could result in challenges relative to planned arena program. On-site parking may be nearly impossible short of additional acquisition of properties adjacent to the site.

  City of Eugene development staff has indicated that a realignment of East 8th Avenue northward, in order to increase the overall site development area, may be possible. However, at this time, such realignment is not assured and would require further discussions, process, and approvals by the City.

- **Appropriate Scale for the Context** -

  The new arena development would be significantly larger in scale and mass than any nearby structures. However, the area’s largely commercial environment, the redevelopment of the Courthouse District, and the adjacency of the Broadway / Franklin corridor (a primary traffic artery), suggests increased development densities in the future, of which an appropriately designed arena would likely be compatible.

  The scale and proximity of the Willamette River to the near northeast also suggests an opportunity for a grand gesture embracing and enriching the riverfront. A landmark destination building, such as an arena, could create the opportunity for this gesture and connection.

  The New Federal Courthouse site is the closest site to Eugene’s downtown district, where increased scales and densities exist and are expected. Adjacency to downtown Eugene provides an opportunity for a larger scale.

- **Impact to Neighbors** -

  An arena development at the New Federal Courthouse (Courthouse District) site would likely be seen as providing a beneficial impact to nearby commercial neighbors, specifically the several motels and restaurants along East Broadway to the south, west, and east of the site. Increased event-based activity to the area generated by an arena development would likely result in a significant increase in business for these entities. A combination of an arena development and the overall redevelopment of the Courthouse District would possibly, over time, create pressure for many of the existing commercial entities to improve,
enlarge, or otherwise transform their facilities to meet an increased demand.

Downtown Eugene, to the near west of the New Federal Courthouse site, would likely see significant benefits from an arena development at the site. It is likely that regular event-generated activity and patronage would carry over into the downtown district’s core, benefitting its hotels, motels, restaurants, shops, and parking facilities. Adjacency to downtown could increase the potential for the arena facility to host trade shows and convention-type events, in addition to the planned University athletics events.

Adjacency to the New Federal Courthouse to the immediate northwest of the arena site is not anticipated to be, or cause, a significant impact. The Federal Courthouse will operate primarily during daytime hours on weekdays, during which the arena facility would likely be non-active much of the time. Concerns relative to security for either facility are not anticipated to be a significant obstacle toward function and operations.

The greatest potential negative impact from an arena development at this site is due to the significant increase in event-based traffic to an already typically congested corridor (specifically East Broadway, Coburg Road, and the intersection of the two to the near west of the site). This increase in event-based traffic could be seen as a negative by area businesses and residents.

- Critical Adjacencies -

The New Federal Courthouse site possesses a relatively high potential for achieving critical mass, which is unmatched by some of the other sites. A close proximity to several motels and restaurants, and proximities to downtown Eugene to the west the main University campus to the southeast would likely translate into increased likelihood for activity at and near the site, even during non-event times. Other redevelopment anticipated within the Courthouse District would add to this positive potential.

A close adjacency to the Willamette River and the riverfront to the northeast of the site is an opportunity for additional activity, primarily recreational, near the site. The development of an arena at this site in combination with the redevelopment of the Courthouse District would provide an opportunity to enrich the riverfront, which would benefit not only the immediate context but also the entire community. Establishment of a view corridor between the arena site and much of the Courthouse District and the river would be improved by relocating the existing EWEB electrical substation to the north of the site.
Community Revitalization Goals

The Courthouse District Concept Plan Final Report, approved by Eugene City Council on 31 July 2002, specifies the area described in this report as the New Federal Courthouse arena site as an area designated for mixed-use development. The Concept Plan Final Report does make mention of the University’s arena study / plans, and notes that, with further action by Eugene City Council, an arena may be considered as an appropriate use within the Courthouse District. Because concept planning envisions this arena candidate site for multi-use development, and because further action by City Council would be necessary for an arena development to occur at this site, such a development cannot be assumed as possible at this time.

With the above stated, an arena development at this site would likely be a catalyst for Courthouse District redevelopment, providing significant momentum in combination with the development of the new Federal Courthouse itself.

Long Range Campus Goals

An arena development at the New Federal Courthouse site would be a new satellite facility to the University community. While not as fractured and separated, both emotionally and geographically from the main University campus as the two Franklin / Glenwood sites, an arena at this site would lack the significant bond to the main campus that would likely be achieved at the Howe Field, Williams’ Bakery, and even the North Campus sites.

A relatively large amount of off-campus student housing does exist to the east of the main campus and south of the New Federal Courthouse site. While not significant, this eastern student population could help to link an arena at this site to the campus.

Perhaps the greatest benefit to the University community, and possibly to long term planning efforts, relative to an arena development at the New Federal Courthouse site is the site’s proximity to downtown Eugene. The site in fact lies roughly mid-way between the main University campus and downtown. By spanning this distance, an arena at this site could strengthen the bond between these two cores, and could provide more opportunities for the University community to engage downtown and conversely, downtown to engage the UO.

Proximity to Campus

While not as poor as the two Franklin / Glenwood sites, or even the Autzen Stadium site, with regard to proximity to the main University campus and resulting pedestrian and bicycle access to the site, the New
Federal Courthouse site is not ideal in this regard. As mentioned previously in this site section, a relatively large quantity of off-campus student housing exists to the east of the main campus and south of this site. It is probable, however, that the majority of the student population does not reside in close proximity to the Courthouse District. The distance between the campus and the site would be emphasized during dark, wet, and cold winter months, which is the condition during much of the basketball season.

Adding to the challenge of student access to the site is the lack of nearby connection to planned Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), an element that at least partially offset the poor proximity to campus exhibited by the two Franklin / Glenwood sites.

Lastly, those students who do make the trek from campus to the New Federal Courthouse site will be faced with crossing busy and congested East Broadway. An already significant challenge for this site, traffic congestion will only be increased by pedestrian crossings of this major thoroughfare, unless such crossings are made via a grade change (probably not possible without additional land acquisition of the south site of East Broadway from the site).

- **Access and Egress**

  Access from Interstate-5 from both the north and south is relatively good at the New Federal Courthouse site. While the site has several arterial routes feeding it from most directions, these routes all intersect in close proximity to the site, resulting in anticipated serious congestion.

  This site would require considerable efforts and coordination relative to development of a comprehensive transportation management plan, and cooperation of many parties to ensure such a plan is successfully executed.

  Improvements along East Broadway adjacent to the site, including pedestrian accommodations and connection of East Broadway to other streets and thoroughfares, especially Coburg Road, are anticipated to be necessary for this site to function from a transportation standpoint.

- **Parking**

  Due to the constraints of the site's boundaries, parking at the New Federal Courthouse site is anticipated to be a significant challenge. Inclusion of parking within the boundaries of the site proper would be very minimal at best. More likely would be the necessity for additional land acquisition to the north (which would consume additional Courthouse District area envisioned for other uses), south, west, or east of the site.
Already anticipated to be a significant challenge within the bounds of the site proper, additional land acquisition to facilitate required arena development program would be time consuming and costly.

On-street parking to the south is currently either metered or limited by permit-only, and is limited in quantity. The majority of existing parking infrastructure in downtown Eugene to the west is not within a ¼-mile of the site.

Potentially increasing the parking challenges at this site is our understanding that the new Federal Courthouse to the immediate northwest of the arena site is planned to include no public parking (limited parking for judges and select staff will be located beneath the courthouse).

It is anticipated that in order to consider this site workable from a parking standpoint, assistance and cooperation from the City of Eugene will be required.

The number of required event parking stalls estimated to be needed for an arena development at the New Federal Courthouse (Courthouse District) site is between 3,875 and 4,650 (it is estimated that 77.5% of the arena patrons will drive to this site), based on analysis by David Evans & Associates.

- **Acquisition, Anticipated Ease of**

  Due to the quantity of property owners at the New Federal Courthouse (Courthouse District) site, and the indication from several that they are not interested in selling and relocating, we anticipate that acquisition of the properties making up this site would be very difficult and costly without significant cooperation and assistance from the City of Eugene. A condemnation process via the City of Eugene may be necessary, and such a process would likely be time consuming. Without the significant partnering and assistance from the City of Eugene, property acquisition at the New Federal Courthouse site, via condemnation or not, would probably not be possible within the timeframe goals of the arena project (groundbreaking by summer 2004).

- **Acquisition, Anticipated Cost of**

  According to 2002 Lane County property report records, the combined land and improvement real market values (L&I RMV) for the twenty-three (23) parcels making up the New Federal Courthouse (Courthouse District) site total approximately $5.9 million dollars, and include ownership under eleven (11) different parties.
It should be noted that land and improvement real market values derived from County records are not necessarily a realistic measure of anticipated negotiated values accompanying an actual property transaction.

Also, due to the quantity of property owners at this site, and the indication from several that they are not receptive to selling and relocating, we anticipate that acquisition of the properties making up this site would be very difficult and costly without significant cooperation from the City of Eugene. A condemnation process via the City of Eugene may be necessary, and such a process would likely be time consuming. Without the significant partnering and assistance from the City of Eugene, property acquisition at the New Federal Courthouse site, via condemnation or not, would probably not be possible within the timeframe goals of the arena project (groundbreaking by summer 2004).

- **Site Development Costs** -
  
  Geotechnical Considerations:
  
  - The New Federal Courthouse (Courthouse District) site is considered to be somewhat challenging geotechnically.
  
  - Site preparation would likely involve some over-excavation of severely weathered Eugene Formation sub-soil and rock, depending on design considerations. The site is entirely within the 100-year floodplain.
  
  - Dewatering excavated areas during construction can be expected.
  
  - Foundation system is anticipated to be of spread footings; use of a water-tight “bathtub” structure for embedded portions is likely.
  
  - Water-retention wall would likely be required to mitigate the impact of seasonal high ground water, particularly if the lower seating bowl is depressed to allow for main concourse entry at-grade.

  Utility Infrastructure Considerations:
  
  - New Federal Courthouse site’s access to existing utility infrastructure is very good; existing infrastructure is of adequate capacity.
  
  - On-site generation of chilled water, steam, and emergency power should be planned in lieu of connection to the University’s central plant.
It is anticipated that environmental remediation would be required at the New Federal Courthouse (Courthouse District) site to some degree.
NORTH CAMPUS ("OLD COKE BOTTLING PLANT")

- **Capacity for Development**
  
The North Campus site is among the smallest under consideration at approximately five acres. The size limitations of the North Campus site could result in challenges and compromises relative to planned arena goals and program.

- **Appropriate Scale for the Context**
  
  An arena at the North Campus site, even with utilization of skillful planning and design to minimize the massing and scale, would likely dwarf the remaining context of the site, particularly to the west and east. To the south, adjacent to the Franklin Boulevard commercial corridor and across Franklin from the main University campus, the large scale of a well-designed arena would not be as problematic. However, the large scale of an arena adjacent to the Millrace canal to the immediate south could be severe if not mitigated through design.

- **Impact to Neighbors**
  
  The North Campus site is probably the most negatively impacted of the seven candidate sites by an arena development. Such a development at this site would not only displace several facilities and users, it is anticipated that it would also likely trigger the relocation of several more. While this is seen by some as a potential opportunity for many of these existing facilities to improve their conditions / facilities, the planning, logistics, and cost involved with the many relocations would be severe, and would most probably not be conducive with the timetable goal for the arena project (groundbreaking by summer 2004).

  Additionally, an arena at this site would impact the long term planning and existing conditional use permits of the above users and more. Lastly, it is anticipated that an arena at this site would affect the quality, and perhaps even the safety of, some facilities. Facilities and users impacted by an arena development at the North Campus site include, but may not be limited to:

  - Riverfront Research Park (RRP) - Would force revisions to the RRP conditional use permit, and would require re-master planning of all RRP future development. Arena development would dwarf existing RRP facility, and potentially impact RRP parking.
  
  - Several School of Architecture and Allied Arts (AAA) facilities including the Urban Farm - Relocation of several existing facilities
would be disruptive to the programs. Urban Farm is seen as a living being which cannot simply be relocated without losing years of valuable work. Petition gathered several hundred signatures relative to this element considered very important by the AAA Landscape Architecture Department.

- Biology - Two greenhouses and a support building would need to be relocated or replaced.

- Zebrafish Facility - Impacts relative to an increased activity surrounding the facility are a concern. Expansion of the arena development site westward (beyond Gallery Street), would displace the facility (long and sensitive preparation process involved with start-up).

- Facilities and Planning - Nearly entire inventory of facilities at the north campus would be impacted, forced to relocate. Disruption to operations would be severe.

- Commercial - Impacts to (and from) nearby commercial infrastructure would be largely positive.

- Union Pacific Railroad right-of-way - No significant impacts anticipated.

**Critical Adjacencies**

The North Campus site is directly north of the main University campus, but separated by a major thoroughfare, Franklin Boulevard.

Adjacency to the commercial infrastructure along Franklin Boulevard, including the several motels and restaurants, would be supportive to the arena development, and conversely the arena activity would support the commercial elements.

The North Campus site is close to the Willamette River, separated by the elevated Union Pacific Railroad right-of-way.

The arena development at the North Campus site would be immediately adjacent to the Riverfront Research Park and several other existing and relocated site users, including AAA, biology, facilities, and Zebrafish Facility. All of the above users and facilities would likely view the arena development in a negative light.

**Community Revitalization Goals**
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While not located within or near a designated redevelopment area, increased activity from an arena development at the North Campus site would likely benefit the commercial entities located along the nearby Franklin Boulevard corridor. This benefit could result in additional developments and improvements along the corridor.

However, an arena development at this site may be a negative impact to the Riverfront Research Park and some University groups (see Impact to Neighbors, above).

- **Long Range Campus Goals**

  Due to the relatively large size of the planned arena, its development at the North Campus site (it is partially within University bounds) would be subject to an amendment to the Long Range Campus Development Plan.

  Consisting primarily of a portion of Area 5 (combined with the adjacent City of Eugene owned land to the east), as defined in the Long Range Campus Development Plan, an arena development at the North Campus site would directly impact several existing Architecture & Allied Arts facilities (see Impact to Neighbors, above). Conflicts with the intended use of this site as described in the Long Range Campus Development Plan include:

  - Development consistent with the Conditional Use Permit for the AAA North Site Additions and Alterations project.
  
  - Reservation of open space within the site area to allow for somewhat “industrial” activities generated by the school, and for expansion of such activities.
  
  - Maintenance of adequate active open space for outdoor academic uses, including the Urban Farm.
  
  - Limitation of site programming, which would encourage frequent (potentially dangerous) pedestrian and bicycle crossings of Franklin Boulevard from the main University campus.
  
  - Protection of “Gallery Street” (the north – south pedestrian and bicycle path bisecting Area 5 from the Millrace canal to the Autzen footbridge and beyond), from building encroachment. Gallery Street is designated within the LRCDP as an opportunity to align a future pedestrian crossing of Franklin Boulevard from the north campus to the main campus (perhaps via grade separation, e.g. a sky bridge). The candidate arena site does actually not compromise this requirement, as the western border of the site is Gallery Street. However, the limitations of the size of this site and
the scale of the combined arena and additional program would risk severely impacting the quality of the pathway, if not jeopardizing its existence.

As mentioned previously under Impact to Neighbors, master planning of the Riverfront Research Park would be seriously impacted by an arena development at the North Campus site. The arena development would displace several existing site users, primarily AAA-based, who would need to be relocated to a different location within the same northern campus proximity. These relocations would trigger additional relocations of other users, which would impact site area allocated for future Riverfront Research Park development.

- **Proximity to Campus**

  The North Campus site is located immediately north of the main University campus. However, the site is also separated from the campus by a major thoroughfare, Franklin Boulevard. Due to this separation and to “minimize dangers to pedestrians and bicyclists,” the Long Range Campus Development Plan specifies that programming within the academic section of the northern campus (defined as Area 05), not encourage frequent crossings of Franklin Boulevard.

  The geographic proximity of the North Campus site to the main University campus and student population centers does not, therefore, directly translate to ease of pedestrian and bicycle access to the site. Unless a grade-change crossing were to be introduced (e.g.: a skybridge), pedestrian and bicycle crossings from the main campus to the North Campus site could increase traffic congestion at the already limited access points to the site.

- **Access and Egress**

  Access to Interstate-5 from the south is good; not quite as good from the north. The majority of traffic will access the site via Franklin Boulevard from the east and the west. Agate Street will also serve as a primary feeder street to the site.

  Perhaps the greatest weakness of the North Campus site relative to transportation issues, is that it has just one existing access and egress road, Riverfront Parkway (Agate Street extension). A minimum of one additional access road of capacity would be required at a significant cost. While wider distribution of access points would be preferred from a traffic management standpoint (i.e.: extension of Riverfront Parkway north of the Union Pacific Railroad right-of-way towards the west to re-connect at or near East Broadway), perhaps the most cost effective means of adding the second access road would involve improvements to Onyx Street, and
the small bridge spanning the Millrace canal, to the near west of Riverfront Parkway.

A planned Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) station immediately south of the site near the intersection of Franklin Boulevard and Agate Street / Riverfront Parkway would provide access to some patrons. However station capacity is not anticipated to be adequate for large influxes of event crowds. Additionally, and perhaps more importantly, the location of the BRT station would require riders to cross Franklin Boulevard to reach the North Campus site. Such crossings, when mixed with additional pedestrians crossing from the main University campus, would likely create congestive conditions at this intersection.

- Parking -

North Campus on-site area available for programmed parking is extremely limited. Achieving the arena development goals for on-site parking may require additional land acquisition, most likely along Franklin Boulevard. One such consideration could be the commercial properties immediately south of the North Campus site and the Millrace canal, and north or Franklin Boulevard. This is a relatively small area, however, and would require several structured levels of parking, or other facilities to reach desired, and required, parking capacities.

Additional parking, either existing or potential for development of structured parking is mainly across Franklin Boulevard to the south. While adequate parking might be found to the south (although probably not within a ¼-mile radius of the site), this would result in more pedestrian crossings of Franklin Boulevard to reach the North Campus site, which would likely result in congestion at the intersection.

One thought potentially worth reviewing involves small vehicles shuttling patrons from Autzen Stadium parking over the Autzen Footbridge to the site. While this seems logistically problematic at best (how many patrons could be shuttled per vehicle and would it be an efficient means of transport? Is the Autzen Footbridge wide enough to all shuttles in both directions?), the large quantity of available parking at the Autzen Stadium site would make this idea worth a second look if the North Campus site were to be seriously considered for the arena development.

The number of required event parking stalls estimated to be needed for an arena development at the North Campus site is between 3,810 and 4,570 (it is estimated that 76.2% of the arena patrons will drive to this site), based on analysis by David Evans & Associates.

- Acquisition, Anticipated Ease of -
The western and northern sections of the North Campus site are owned by the State of Oregon Board of Higher Education (i.e.: the University of Oregon). However, the eastern section (just under half of the total site area) is owned by the City of Eugene and would need to be acquired. This single acquisition from the City is not anticipated to be difficult or significantly costly.

While actual land acquisition at the North Campus site is relatively minor, the required relocations of many existing facilities and users is considerable. These relocations would be highly complex, very costly, and require time-consuming planning, approvals, coordination, and logistics. Unless anticipated arena project groundbreaking is delayed (estimated by at least a year), it is highly unlikely that the North Campus site could be "reorganized" to allow the arena project timetable goal (groundbreaking by summer 2004) to be maintained.

- **Acquisition, Anticipated Cost of**

  According to 2002 Lane County property report records, the combined land and improvement real market values (L&I RMV) for the one (01) parcel making up the North Campus site (and not already owned by the State of Oregon Board of Higher Education) totals approximately $525,000 million dollars, and is owned by one party, the City of Eugene.

  It should be noted that land and improvement real market values derived from County records are not necessarily a realistic measure of anticipated negotiated values accompanying an actual property transaction.

  It is not anticipated that acquisition of the single parcel currently owned by the City of Eugene would be difficult or costly.

- **Site Development Costs**

  Geotechnical Considerations:

  - The North Campus site is considered to be somewhat challenging geotechnically.

  - Site preparation would likely involve some over-excavation of severely weathered Eugene Formation sub-soil and rock, depending on design considerations.

  - Dewatering excavated areas during construction can be expected.

  - Foundation system is anticipated to be of spread footings; use of a water-tight "bathtub" structure for embedded portions is likely.
• Water-retention wall would likely be required to mitigate the impact of seasonal high ground water, particularly if the lower seating bowl is depressed to allow for main concourse entry at-grade.

Utility Infrastructure Considerations:

• Existing public pump stations for stormwater sewer and sanitary sewer would need to be relocated or avoided during construction. Relocation could be cost prohibitive. The sanitary sewer is not of adequate capacity for the estimated arena development loads, and would therefore need to be upgraded. Estimated cost for this upgrade is approximately $250,000.

• Extension to and coordination with the main campus’ existing tunnel network and system should be considered.

• On-site generation of chilled water and steam should be planned for as existing infrastructure to the central plant, although very near to this site, is not adequate to support the arena development. Connection to the University’s emergency power grid could be facilitated with the addition of a new 1.5 megawatt generator.

Other Site Development Considerations:

• An arena development at the North Campus site would trigger relocation of several adjacent facilities and users.

• Due to the above relocations, significant demolition activities and scope would be required at the North Campus site and the adjacent areas, primarily to the west.

• A second primary road would need to be built to allow for adequate site access and egress at a significant cost.

• It is anticipated that environmental remediation would be required at the North Campus site to some degree.
WILLIAMS’ BAKERY

- **Capacity for Development**

  While not the largest site under consideration, the Williams’ Bakery site at approximately seven acres is considered to be adequate in size to support the majority of arena development program. The site is rectilinear in configuration, bound on all sides, and predominantly flat and level. Inclusion of the desired quantity of on-site parking for premium seat holders, donors, and the like would, however, pose a challenge short of resorting to extraordinary, and probably costly, design solutions.

  In order to meet the anticipated program parking requirements (see *Parking*, below for further analysis), development of additional properties, including the potential for further acquisitions or long-term agreements with other entities or property owners may be required.

  The potential exists where Williams’ Bakery property acquisition may be successful, but acquisition of properties currently owned by other entities at the eastern edge of the site may not (see *Acquisition, Anticipated Ease of*, below). If this were to occur, the overall site size would be reduced by approximately 13%, and the ability to support the arena development program could be challenged. Also, the parcels at the eastern edge of the site, particularly those on or near the corner of Franklin Boulevard and Villard Street are considered important for the development’s presence in the wider context and ability to form a new University landmark and possible gateway.

- **Appropriate Scale for the Context**

  While significantly larger than any existing buildings in the immediate or nearby context, an appropriately designed new arena at the Williams’ Bakery site should not be inappropriate in scale to the surrounding context. Similar to, but perhaps not as severe as the scale issues noted at the Howe Field site, the Williams’ Bakery site benefits from the adjacency to a primary arterial, Franklin Boulevard. The greater width, volume, and velocity of Franklin compared with side or feeder streets, and the concentration of commercial activity along the corridor would help to offset the scale of the development.

  Additionally, and as mentioned previously relative to the Howe Field site, it is anticipated that skillful planning and design steps could mitigate the discrepancy in scale between the arena and this site’s context. These steps could include careful positioning of primary program elements, carefully designed building massing and setbacks at strategic locations, use of screening devices, and use of a variety of materials, textures, and
forms to aid in “breaking-down” the larger masses, among other strategies.

- **Impact to Neighbors**

  The Williams’ Bakery site is adjacent to several residential entities, which may be impacted by an arena development. These entities include the University residence hall complexes to the west and southwest of the site, the University’s graduate student housing complex to the southeast of the site, and the Fairmount Neighborhood, primarily to the south and east, but also to the north of the site.

  Five of the University’s residence hall complexes lie westward and within close proximity of the Williams’ Bakery site. Immediately bordering the site to the west and southwest are two complexes, Hamilton Hall to the west (at the opposite side of Columbia Street), and Bean to the south (at the western half of the site). Hamilton Hall is the University’s largest residence hall, consisting of ten smaller halls housing approximately 780 undergraduate students. Bean also consists of ten smaller halls and is the second largest residence hall housing approximately 700 undergraduate students.

  South of the site, along its eastern half is the East Campus Graduate Village, consisting of 72 units primarily for graduate students living alone. While significantly smaller in resident population that the Hamilton and Bean complexes, the East Campus Graduate Village is equally, if not more sensitive to the impacts an arena development could make at the site. Typically, according to representatives of the Office of University Housing, graduate students demand residential facilities with a peaceful environment highly conducive to concentration and minimal distractions.

  The redevelopment of the Williams’ Bakery site to a University arena is an opportunity to potentially improve conditions for the neighboring residential complexes assuming it is well planned, designed, engineered, and executed. The bakery complex is an active commercial and industrial operation, which generates noise and other distractions, often during late-night or early-morning hours. Much of this noise and activity, due to arrivals, loading, and departures of large trucks, is concentrated at the western edge of the site, adjacent to the two largest University residence halls. Additionally, the bakery generates the scent of baked goods, pleasurable to some but offensive to others.

  The following information and feedback has been received through discussions with, and correspondence from, the Office of University Housing during research and preparation for this report. The feedback includes concerns, sensitivities, and design issues to be considered.
relative to an arena development at the Williams’ Bakery site, and its impact on the University’s residential complex described above:

- Sound attenuation, or containment of event sounds and noises within the facility, would be highly important, particularly on sides facing the resident complexes (west and south).

- Avoid location of mechanical units on the west and south sides due to noise and emissions and impact to housing residents.

- Avoid location of service areas on the west and south sides, specifically trash and recycling centers and associated pick-up by haulers (potential noisy and disruptive). Load-ins at loading / truck docks could also be noisy and disruptive.

- If possible, concentrate event pedestrian flow to sidewalks along East 13th Avenue in lieu of through courtyards of residence hall complexes or landscaped quadrangles adjacent to residence hall complexes. Heavy traffic through these areas could be disruptive to student residents, damaging to landscaping, and produce litter. Also, protection of the peaceful nature of the courtyards and landscaped areas for student use and relaxation is important.

- Avoid placement of arena facility and site lighting that may glare or shine into windows of residence halls.

- Maintain the pedestrian and bicycle path which borders the southern edge of the Williams’ Bakery site (aligned with East 14th Avenue, if extended), which allows access from the main campus to East Campus Graduate Village and nearby commercial and retail entities.

- Maintenance of Columbia Street as an access-way for loading and receiving of goods (also catering deliveries), by the campus catering and food service entities located at the southern end of Columbia Street (within the residence halls). Avoid planning that would cause event congestion (pedestrian, vehicle, or otherwise), at these areas.

The most likely voice of concern relative to impacts brought to the area by an arena development at the Williams’ Bakery site is anticipated to come from the nearby residential property owners to the south. During a 20 May 2003 meeting of the Fairmount Neighborhood Association, residents noted concerns relative to the size and scale of the planned arena facility, the increased amount of traffic and activity it is anticipated to bring to the area, and the amount of parking needed to host arena events, suggesting the need for a parking structure. Some residents voiced concern that an
arena at the Williams’ Bakery site could change and re-define the character and scale of the neighborhood, seen as a negative by most in attendance. Comments were made relative to the already somewhat dysfunctional performance of some of the intersections along Franklin Boulevard near the site, particularly at Villard, Orchard, and Walnut Streets. Some comments were made relative to the main University campus already lacking adequate parking facilities, causing parking to overflow into neighborhood streets.

It is anticipated that an arena development at the Williams’ Bakery site would largely benefit (and be viewed positively by), the nearby commercial infrastructure, particularly along the Franklin Boulevard corridor. An owner of several commercial properties to the east of the site has indicated that the arena would likely increase activity at his stores, translating to increased business. The relatively significant quantities of both restaurants and motels along Franklin Boulevard near the site would also likely benefit by increased, event-based, activity generated by an arena development. Some concerns may be voiced relative to increased traffic and congestion, and concerns about parking, relative to arena events. Careful planning combined with a transportation management plan should be able to mitigate these concerns.

- **Critical Adjacencies**

  The Williams’ Bakery site offers the potential for realization of a critical mass that the majority of other candidate sites do not have. This synergy of University, commercial, and residential activities would aid in fostering a vital site, even during non-event times.

  The Williams’ Bakery site is immediately adjacent to the main University campus. This adjacency would not only enable easy access for students and other University personnel, but could make possible additional opportunities, including:

  - Incorporation of additional program that could benefit the greater University community, such as an alumni center and a relocated and improved Office of Public Safety.
  - Cooperative efforts with the Department of Housing’s catering entity, which is located adjacent to the site at the Bean resident hall complex.
  - Other student and faculty-based activities that would enliven the facility and site, even during non-event hours.

  The already significant commercial infrastructure along Franklin Boulevard near the site would benefit, and benefit from, an arena development. The series of motels on the north side of Franklin Boulevard would support out of town patrons of the facility, and should
significantly benefit from the increased activity an arena would bring to the vicinity. The same can be anticipated for the many retail and restaurant establishments along the Franklin corridor.

The impact of an arena development at the Williams’ Bakery site may be perceived as a negative to residential neighbors south of the site (see Impact to Neighbors, above) due to an intermittent (event-based) increase in activity and traffic.

- **Community Revitalization Goals**

  While the Williams’ Bakery site and the immediate surroundings are not within or near any community redevelopment zones that we are aware of, the redevelopment of the site by an arena and support program could be a significant catalyst towards further improvements along the Franklin Boulevard corridor.

- **Long Range Campus Goals**

  Redevelopment of the Williams’ Bakery site for University use, and incorporation of the site to University ownership, would result in a natural eastward expansion of the main University campus. The site is located at the northeastern corner of the main campus and adjacent to the Franklin Boulevard commercial corridor. This location, assuming acquisition is successful, is perhaps the most appropriate “on campus” location for a facility of this size and function.

  Positioned at the northeastern edge of the main campus and at the intersections of Franklin Boulevard, East 13th Avenue (eastern terminus), and Villard Street, the Williams’ Bakery site provides the opportunity for the arena development to become a gateway landmark for the greater University community, and perhaps even the Eugene community, primarily for traffic traveling westbound on Franklin Boulevard. This would include inbound traffic from Springfield and from northbound Interstate-5.

- **Proximity to Campus**

  The Williams’ Bakery site is immediately east of the main University campus, and adjacent to a significant portion of the University’s on-campus student housing facilities. Pedestrian and bicycle access to the site from campus would be excellent.

  Additionally, the site is adjacent to the residential Fairmount Neighborhood to the south and southeast. The neighborhood includes some off-campus student and faculty housing, pedestrian and bicycle access from which would also be excellent.
• **Access and Egress**

Access to the site from Interstate-5 from the south is good; not as good from the north. Franklin Boulevard would be the primary means of vehicle access and egress to and from the Williams’ Bakery site from the east and west.

It is anticipated that westbound traffic, including vehicles arriving from Springfield and I-5 from the south would turn off of Franklin Boulevard via an improved intersection at Villard Street. This is due primarily to the elimination of the left-hand turn off of westbound Franklin onto Agate Street due to planned Bus Rapid Transit (BRT). Eastbound traffic, including vehicles arriving from most of Eugene west of the site and I-5 from the north, would access the site off of Franklin Boulevard via a right turn onto Agate Street.

Access to parking facilities for an arena at the Williams’ Bakery site will need to be well planned and coordinated, starting with a transportation management plan. The presence of BRT stations in close proximity to the site will aid access to events. However, it is our understanding that planned stations lack the adequate capacity to handle significant quantities of patrons before and after events.

• **Parking**

The size of the Williams’ Bakery site is anticipated to allow for a relatively small portion of the required event parking to be within the site boundaries, likely below grade. The specific quantity of on-site parking would likely be determined by a cost benefit analysis (feasibility to maximize vertically-oriented structured parking), programmatic organization of the site (site master plan), and anticipated ability to utilize other nearby parking for events (reducing the need for a maximum quantity of parking on site).

As with the Howe Field site, a carefully planned global strategy with regard to event parking could also ultimately benefit the greater University community. The development of one or more structured parking facilities near the Williams’ Bakery site and the main University campus could result in near constant use: arena parking during event times and University parking during non-event times. Potential locations identified for structured parking include:

- Existing surface parking lot east of Agate Street between Franklin Boulevard and East 13th Avenue. This lot, relatively small currently, is slated to be reduced in size along its northern edge due to improvements to Franklin Boulevard relative to Bus Rapid Transit (BRT).
• Joe Romania automobile dealership site, located two blocks east of the Williams’ Bakery site, on the south site of Franklin Boulevard between Orchard Street and Walnut Street.

• The existing surface parking lot south of the Bean residence hall complex and east of the Museum of Natural History.

Please reference *Parking* within the Howe Field site section for more description and information relative to the potential for planned structured parking to benefit and on or near-campus arena development and the greater University community.

The number of required event parking stalls estimated to be needed for an arena development at the Williams’ Bakery site is between 3,575 and 4,290 (it is estimated that 71.5% of the arena patrons will drive to this site), based on analysis by David Evans & Associates.

**Acquisition, Anticipated Ease of**

Acquisition of properties within the Williams’ Bakery site is anticipated to be difficult. While the quantity of existing owners is relatively small (4) compared to the other primarily commercial sites (Franklin 1, Franklin 3, and New Federal Courthouse), the primary owner of the properties within the site, Williams’ Bakery, is an active and functioning business entity, which has expressed little or no interest in relocating or selling. Further, two of the commercial entities at the eastern edge of the site, a property not owned but functionally controlled by 7-Eleven and a property owned and operated by a dental practice, have indicated reservations toward relocating and selling.

While it is our understanding that the University has the ability to leverage eminent domain (it is also our understanding that this power has never been used by the University), condemnation proceedings, if enforced, could likely be time consuming and not conducive to the goals of the project timetable (groundbreaking by summer 2004).

**Acquisition, Anticipated Cost of**

According to 2002 Lane County property report records, the combined land and improvement real market values (L&I RMV) for the nineteen (19) parcels making up the Williams’ Bakery site total approximately $7.7 million dollars, and include ownership under four (04) different parties, most notably Williams’ Bakery (a division of United States Bakery and Franz Family Bakery).
It should be noted that land and improvement real market values derived from County records are not necessarily a realistic measure of anticipated negotiated values accompanying an actual property transaction.

Due to the significance of the Williams’ Bakery ownership of the majority of the site (approximately 87-percent of the overall site’s square footage), and that it is an active and functioning commercial operation on the site, acquisition of the Williams’ Bakery owned parcels becomes potentially more complicated and costly. Indeed, a report published by The Register Guard of Eugene on 14 August 2003 noted a cost provided by an executive of the parent company of Williams’ Bakery’s of $25 million to relocate the Williams’ Bakery operation and with duration of one year. These figures, assuming a direct translation to a negotiated acquisition, indicate that acquisition of the parcels of the site currently owned by Williams’ Bakery may be cost-prohibitive and may not be conducive to the timeline goals for the project.

Also, two of the other three property owners at the Williams’ Bakery site have indicated that they would not be receptive to selling their properties and relocating. Through a multi-year land lease, 7-Eleven controls, but does not technically own, the property it operates on the corner of Franklin Boulevard and Villard Street. From information provided by a real estate firm representing the property owner, it is our understanding that 7-Eleven is not interested in allowing the sale of the property. Additionally, the dentist owner and operator of the Villard Building, has indicated that they enjoy their current location and would prefer not to sell.

While a condemnation process at this site is possible, it would likely be costly and time consuming.

- **Site Development Costs**

  Geotechnical Considerations:

  - Along with the Howe Field site, the Williams’ Bakery site is anticipated to be the least challenging of the seven sites with regard to geotechnical issues.
  
  - Some over-excavation of severely weathered Eugene Formation sub-soils and rock may be required.
  
  - Minimal dewatering is anticipated during construction, especially if construction occurs during summer month.
  
  - Foundation system design is anticipated to be by economical spread footings.
Utility Infrastructure Considerations:

- Entire site is outside of the 500-year floodplain.
- Several existing utility lines of various types are anticipated to require relocation.
- Coordination with the University’s existing tunnel network should be considered.
- On-site generation of chilled water, steam, and emergency power should be planned in lieu of connection to the University’s central plant.

Other Site Development Considerations:

- Demolition of existing structures would be required at the Williams’ Bakery site. Site demolition has been estimated at under $500,000, excluding removal of underground utilities, and environmental remediation and abatement.
- It is anticipated that environmental remediation would be required at the Williams’ Bakery site to some degree.
CONCLUSIONS

At this time, we are not including a definitive scoring of the seven sites with a resulting ranking. Each of the seven candidate sites exhibits both strengths and weaknesses. No site is ideal in every way, nor is any site ultimately unworkable. However, based on our evaluation, we would classify the sites into the following three groups or tiers (sites are listed alphabetically within each tier):

- **Tier One** -
  - Autzen Stadium
  - Howe Field
  - Williams’ Bakery

- **Tier Two** -
  - Franklin 1 (Glenwood East)
  - New Federal Courthouse

- **Tier Three** -
  - Franklin 3 (Glenwood West)
  - North Campus