

MINUTES
LANE TRANSIT DISTRICT
FACILITIES SUBCOMMITTEE
JUNE 9, 1986

The District's Facilities Subcommittee met on Monday, June 9, 1986, 12:00 noon, in the Lane Transit District Operations Conference Room.

Present:

Board Members: Janet Calvert
Janice Eberly

Chamber Representative: Bruce Hall

Staff Members: Tim Dallas
Stefano Viggiano
Shannon Evonuk, Recording Secretary

Consultant: Eric Gunderson

Absent:

Board Member: Larry Parducci

Chamber Representative: Jim Ivory

The meeting was called to order by Janet Calvert. Subcommittee members were told that, because the minutes of the last meeting were not distributed with this meeting's packet, approval of those minutes would be moved to the next meeting of the Facilities Subcommittee.

Stefano Viggiano, Facility Project Manager, said he would like to add an item to the agenda: after "Value Engineering," he asked the members of the Subcommittee to add "Site Specific Design."

Mr. Viggiano indicated that staff is recommending to contract with the State Highway Division to handle the land acquisition phase of the project. Mr. Viggiano then introduced Neil Flanagan, a State Highway Division staff member who was present to answer questions on the land acquisition process for the Subcommittee members. Mr. Viggiano remarked that the District did handle the purchase of the current facility site at 8th and Garfield, but the Glenwood site is a more difficult site to obtain, and the State Highway Division staff is highly experienced in this type of land acquisition.

Mr. Viggiano explained that two appraisals are to be done on the property, using local appraisers who are experienced with industrial property. Mr. Hall asked if the District should pick one appraiser and the property owner pick the second. Mr. Viggiano replied that the District would choose both; often, he said, the owner will have an independent appraisal done, anyway. A third appraisal, actually an appraisal review, will be conducted by the State Highway Division staff's own appraiser. The Highway staff would then come back to the Subcommittee with its findings. At that time, the Subcommittee members would decide to either go ahead with an offer to the owners, or to wait, if the findings are markedly different than was expected.

If the Subcommittee decides to make an offer to the owner, the Highway staff would proceed with negotiations. If the owner agrees to a price, it would then go to the Board of Directors for a final decision.

Ms. Calvert asked if there is a degree of negotiation that can be done; Mr. Flanagan replied yes. He said the price decided upon by the Highway staff appraiser is the minimum price that can be offered to the owner. He said his staff generally follow two rules when negotiating: 1) small acquisitions--do not increase the price over \$1,000; and 2) large acquisitions--try to stay within a 10-percent increase. Mr. Hall said it sounds as though there is more flexibility in negotiating the price than was indicated at the last Subcommittee meeting. Mr. Viggiano replied that he has discovered that to be true. Mr. Flanagan added that the negotiated price would be subject to review by the Subcommittee members. He said his staff would only bring prices to the Subcommittee which would be "participated in" by the Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA). The offer then would be taken to UMTA before being submitted to the Board of Directors.

The fee for the State Highway Division's work is \$10,000 initially; this includes \$7,000 for the appraisal fees. If condemnation is required in order to secure the land, it could cost close to \$8,000 - \$10,000, and would add about three months to the land acquisition time frame.

Mr. Hall asked to make sure the contract clearly states that the Highway Division will pay for the cost of the private appraisers out of the fee the District pays to it. He also asked for clarification of the "Relocation" section of the agreement drawn up by the Highway Division. Mr. Flanagan explained that, if alternative location expenses are required by the current property owners, the District will need to pay them because conversion of private property to public use is subject to these expenses. This cost is in addition to the price of the land. He explained that this really is a payment in lieu of moving expenses, and stressed that public agencies do not buy businesses, only property. Mr. Hall asked if the owners can keep the money for this, even if the business is not relocated; Mr. Flanagan replied that they can.

Mr. Hall asked if the fee to the Highway Division is to be paid before the work is performed. Mr. Flanagan replied that it is to be paid before the Highway staff can begin work on the project. He explained that the Highway staff's time is paid from the fee because State Highway funds cannot be used for mass transit purposes. He said that the Highway Division's Accounting Department will keep track of actual costs. If all of the money is not used in the course of the project, the remainder will be refunded to the District; however, if the project takes longer than expected, the fee will increase accordingly to cover the Highway staff's time.

Ms. Eberly moved to authorize the General Manager to enter into a contract with the State Highway Division, with the contract to reflect two changes: private appraisers are to be used for the first two appraisals, and a clear statement about the appraisal fees being included in the Highway Division staff's fee is to be incorporated. The motion was seconded by Ms. Calvert, and unanimously approved.

Mr. Viggiano said the environmental assessment has been approved, and the District received word recently from Senator Packwood's office that the District will receive \$724,000 for land acquisition on June 10. Staff can now proceed with site specific design. Mr. Viggiano had also heard that Salem Transit received its Section 3 monies. The District is next in line to receive its Section 3 monies, without which construction cannot begin.

Mr. Viggiano pointed out that, if something goes wrong with the land acquisition at the Eugene Drive-In site, some of the money for site specific design will have been lost. He explained that the District would be at risk with about \$57,000 if the land acquisition fell through, but said that the chances are good that the District will be able to obtain the land without having to go through condemnation proceedings, and the chances are very good if the District does have to follow that course.

Mr. Viggiano cautioned Subcommittee members that, if there is a delay at this point, it would change the move-in date from the Spring of 1989 to the Fall of 1989. The Subcommittee discussed the interest of the Eugene Drive-In property owners, who do seem very interested in selling the property.

Mr. Hall asked how much work would have to be redone if the land sale falls through. He was told that a delay such as that would push site work to next spring, as opposed to undertaking it this fall. Ms. Eberly remarked that the costs of waiting would probably outweigh the "at risk" costs; staff members agreed to that point.

Ms. Eberly moved to begin the site specific design, with Ms. Calvert seconding the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

Regarding value engineering, Ms. Eberly said she agreed with the third option given by staff, that of having staff screen applications and conduct interviews for a value engineer, and having the Subcommittee then review the findings and make a final decision on the firm recommended by staff. The consensus of the Subcommittee was to choose the third option.

Eric Gunderson was present to discuss the predesign phase of the new facility. He has developed design guidelines, which he acknowledged as a part of an ongoing process, with refinements made as the project progresses. He remarked that, because of the amount of time allowed on the design of the project so far, the District will be well prepared as it goes into the final design phase.

The predesign includes the following space requirements: 1) what is needed when the move is made; 2) allowance for a 10-year growth period; and 3) allowance for a 20-year growth period. Initially, UMTA stipulated a condition that the District only plan for and build a 10-year facility; however, Mr. Gunderson has calculated that the difference in total square footage in building for a 20-year facility as opposed to a 10-year facility is only 1,000 square feet more for the 20-year facility. Staff have conveyed this information to staff at UMTA, who have tentatively agreed to the funding for the longer term facility. Mr. Hall asked if UMTA would pay for the additional land needed for a 20-year facility; staff replied that UMTA has agreed to this, also.

Mr. Gunderson said it is very important that there is flexibility in the maintenance design to allow for changes and improvements in bus maintenance techniques. He found, too, after talking with LTD staff about their needs in the new facility, an overwhelming desire by staff to have windows next to their work spaces, so that will be worked into the design. Informal communication is very important to staff, so the design will also take this into consideration. Energy savings is an important facet, so "day lighting" will be used as much as possible, and "task lighting" will be incorporated into the design to focus extra light only where it is needed.

Mr. Gunderson showed the Subcommittee a chart of the predesign layout, which was drawn to scale. He discussed the different offices and work areas of the Administration and Operations areas. The design accommodates more conference rooms than are available at the current facility, as that was a high-priority request by staff. There is a possible total of seven conference rooms planned, including the Board room, which can be split into two conference rooms, if needed.

Many transit districts designing new facilities are incorporating exercise spaces into the design, and Mr. Gunderson said that is currently considered to be appropriate in designs. Ms. Eberly wondered what businesses locally have exercise spaces. Mr. Hall said many businesses do not have the space for this, or have not built new facilities which would

allow them to incorporate this. He said his company had wanted to include one when building their new offices, but ultimately did not do so because of costs. Ms. Calvert expressed some reservations about this space. Ms. Eberly said she was uncomfortable with the idea of this being included in a public agency. She felt the liability related to this is an important issue, and would like to know more about it before approving the space, although she added that she would like to see staff using private enterprise for this type of activity. In essence, this is being done through the wellness program at LTD, with the District supplying support to the employees for the programs with which they get involved. Staff informed the Subcommittee that the Safety and Risk Manager at the District is looking at the liability involved with providing this type of space.

Mr. Hall suggested making this space into a conference room at this point, and possibly later changing it to an exercise space if sentiment changes toward it.

Regarding the office predesign, Mr. Hall said his experience has shown that landscaped offices, in place of individual offices, would allow for more flexibility when making changes for growth in the future. He said the offices in his building are designed this way. When asked how the employees at his office felt about this type of design, he replied that it is just a matter of getting used to it. The general consensus of the Subcommittee members was for fewer private offices and more open spaces, although a formal decision was not made. Mr. Gunderson said he could proceed with the design even without a formal decision on this topic at this time.

It was decided that discussion of this topic would be continued in more detail at the next meeting, which tentatively will be held in mid-July.


Recording Secretary