

MINUTES OF SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING
LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT

FACILITIES SUBCOMMITTEE

January 29, 1985

A meeting of the Facilities Subcommittee of the Lane Transit District Board of Directors was held in the District Conference Room at 1938 Eighth Avenue, Eugene, at noon on January 29, 1985.

Present:

Janet Calvert, Committee Chairperson
Janice Eberly
Jim Ivory, Community Representative
Phyllis Loobey, General Manager
Jo Sullivan, Recording Secretary

Absent:

Larry Parducci
Bruce Hall, Community Representative

Staff Present:

Tim Dallas, Director of Operations
Mark Pangborn, Director of Administrative Services

Consultant:

Eric Gunderson, Architect

INTRODUCTION: Mr. Dallas explained that at the January 15, 1985 Board of Directors meeting, the Board had approved the Facilities Subcommittee's recommendation to go ahead with phases 3, 4, and 5 of the Facilities Study--site selection and facility costs. The Board also approved preliminary application for federal funding for site purchase and facilities design. He stated that project architect Eric Gunderson would discuss the criteria for site selection with the Subcommittee. No decision was being asked of the Subcommittee at that time, but staff were asking for feedback on how to proceed.

DESCRIPTION--PHASES 3, 4, AND 5: Mr. Gunderson discussed the consulting firms which would be working with Wilson Bryant Gunderson Seider, architects, in reviewing the diversity of factors which need to be considered in site selection. ECO Northwest, economists, will review future operating costs on relative sites; Tom Giesen, cost estimator, will assist in developing estimated costs for construction of a new facility; Charles Thompson, appraiser, will establish probable land costs for selected sites; ALPHA Engineering, civil and traffic engineers, will review site utilities and traffic impact; L.R. Squier, geotechnical consultants, will conduct soil bearing tests on alternative sites; Rogers Engineering, mechanical engineers, will examine possible heating and cooling systems as well as water service; and Warner Engineering, electrical engineers, will examine electrical service and site power

distribution. He explained that the consulting firms would generally have the greatest input as the number of sites is narrowed to three or four.

In discussing the site selection process, Mr. Gunderson stated that the first screening would include all sites, which would be reduced to 20 to 100 sites for a second screening process. The second screening would reduce the number to three or four, and a final screening would designate a preferred site and runners up. The two basic priorities for a site are that it conforms to a long-term plan and that it incurs the lowest comprehensive cost, including both capital and operating costs.

The first screening was to be based on broad criteria, using the Lane Council of Governments (L-COG) land inventory. Mr. Gunderson stated that it would be best to be the least restrictive in this screening, in order to not eliminate any sites by accident. The criteria for this screening are: property size; zoning; a check for extreme slopes; and general location. He explained that a bus maintenance facility was not clearly defined in zoning laws, and LTD would be working with the cities of Eugene and Springfield and Lane County on this issue.

The method for the first screening was to include a map drawn or plotted by the L-COG mapping computer, which contains all tax lot property parcels in the county. This map will show all sites that meet the District's first set of criteria. Mr. Gunderson explained that if the District only searches for 11.5 or 12 acre sites, the map will only include sites owned by a single owner. It would be possible, however, to look for sites half that large and find two which are together, not necessarily belonging to the same owner.

Mr. Gunderson then explained the concept of "deadheading," which is the time when the bus is traveling from the shop to the beginning of its route, or from the end of its route back to the shop. If a facility is located close to the center of the District's runs, less time is spent on deadheading. Deadheading costs account for up to 10 percent of the District's operating budget. Mr. Gunderson stated that at this stage, LTD will try to cut general boundaries for this purpose, but should not be too restrictive.

According to Mr. Gunderson, the second stage needs to be the most flexible, and will be more lenient or restrictive depending upon the number of sites found in the first stage. The second stage will eliminate all but three or four preferred sites. Criteria for this stage include: assessed value; value of improvements; location (for deadheading purposes, and whether the site is on a bus route, allowing employees to go to work on the bus); traffic access (on or near a major arterial, if not a highway); property shape; availability of utilities; soil condition, as determined by a general review by map, not an actual study at this point; flood plain; existing easements; environmental considerations; political considerations; and property availability. Ms. Loobey added that the non-

urban routes will not be weighted as heavily as the urban routes in considering deadhead time.

The third screening will be the most rigorous. Dollar amounts will be assigned, in order to make a choice based on operating and capital costs. One site will be chosen, and others ranked. Extremely detailed criteria for this stage include: building cost (estimated costs for building, modified by the conditions at each site); property cost, including the sale of the property at 8th and Garfield, if not ranked as the preferred site; street improvements; utilities; off-street improvements; equipment costs; moving costs; a dollar analysis of deadhead time, calculated by vehicle miles for an annual cost; operating cost; environmental mitigation, such as disturbing wetlands, park land, or wildlife habitats, which would have to be replaced, or the site would have to be eliminated if replacement were not feasible; and political considerations. The goal is to have the current property considered in the third screening, unless it does not meet enough criteria in the first two screenings.

Ms. Eberly wondered if it would be realistic to consider the American Steel building on Garfield and closing Garfield to traffic in that area. Mr. Pangborn replied that the District will look at all possible sites for attachment to the current property, but closing a major street involves a lot of considerations that might eliminate the that particular site.

Mr. Gunderson also discussed site selection variables. Regarding location, there has been some interest from downtown Eugene in locating the operations only, not the maintenance facility, in the downtown area. Other location variables include consideration of the existing site and future satellite properties. He stated that the most defensible approach would be to consider final costs of selecting a site--that which is most efficient and best meets the cost/benefit criteria. A question when considering future satellite properties is whether or not that would have an impact on the bus facilities being considered at this time.

Political variables include rezoning and conditional use permits; street closures; condemnation; and business relocation. Mr. Gunderson stated that the District does not want to become involved in a politically expensive situation of condemning property, and needs a reasonable assurance from the property owner that the site is available at a reasonable cost. The District would also look for significant costs in relocating existing businesses, as well as any ill-will caused by a business opposing the move.

Environmental concerns include historical, plant and wildlife, flooding, and noise considerations, as well as site lighting at night in a residential area. In considering neighbors for the site, Mr. Gunderson said that some would be prevented by zoning, and that buffer areas between the facility and neighbors would increase costs and the amount of land needed.

Mr. Gunderson stated that the methodology would include flexibility in working on problem areas when looking at specific sites. He added that staff would probably receive calls and offers to sell land to the District, and recommended that these offers be encouraged as an open process, and as early in the screening process as possible.

Mr. Ivory suggested that the District inform industrial realtors, etc., of the criteria and invite them to inform the LTD of available properties. Ms. Loobey stated that staff would take aggressive steps to let real estate people know about the screening process. Mr. Dallas said the process should also include direct feedback to realtors and property owners, with results of the screening, criteria, etc. He recommended that any persons dissatisfied with the results go through a specific process for response, beginning with Mr. Gunderson, then staff, then the Facilities Subcommittee, and, finally, the Board, which is basically the same process used for other types of protests, such as routing issues.

Ms. Calvert stated that site selection would be an open public process until the final few sites are chosen, then negotiations would need to be held.

Ms. Eberly was concerned about political issues dragging out the process. She said the District needed good communication regarding reasons for decisions. She added that there had been political talk already about LTD moving the operations facility to downtown Eugene. Mr. Pangborn stated that only 20 to 25 people would be involved if the operations facility were to be split from the maintenance facility, and that is not a substantial number of people for a separate facility. He thought the political questions could be addressed with good communication regarding criteria and the screening process. Ms. Eberly said she appreciated hearing the criteria so she could respond to questions from the public.

Mr. Ivory suggested that a City staff person could attend the Facilities Subcommittee meetings. Ms. Loobey stated that staff already were keeping others, such as City Planning and Traffic staff, apprised of the process.

Ms. Loobey stated that staff were looking to the Subcommittee to bring up questions or issues which had not have been discussed but possibly should be. Mr. Dallas gave the example of combining maintenance facilities with the school districts. That idea had been suggested in the past and would need to be re-addressed, but might not be an issue which is apparent to the public.

Ms. Loobey stated that she and Ms. Calvert would be meeting with the Register-Guard editorial board on February 5. Ms. Loobey had also met that day with several members of the City staff to discuss the facility as well as the downtown Eugene transfer station. Staff have been working to

build a good working relationship with the City. However, Ms. Loobey suggested that the Board may need to name a liaison between the City Council and the Board, or to have a Board member on the Downtown Commission.

In response to a question, Mr. Gunderson stated that Wilson Bryant Gunderson Seider had worked in the past with all the named consultants except ALPHA, and that all but one were local. Ms. Calvert wondered if the Subcommittee should be involved in final architect selection. Ms. Loobey replied that the Subcommittee would be a highly appropriate body to interview architect firms, because of the Subcommittee members' knowledge of the project.

ADJOURNMENT: Mr. Dallas stated that no further meetings had been scheduled, but would be after it becomes apparent how work on the facility project is progressing.


Recording Secretary